

Data Structures for Weighted Matching and Extensions to b -matching and f -factors*

Harold N. Gabow[†]

December 18, 2014; revised August 28, 2016

Abstract

This paper shows the weighted matching problem on general graphs can be solved in time $O(n(m+n \log n))$ for n and m the number of vertices and edges, respectively. This was previously known only for bipartite graphs. The crux is a data structure for blossom creation. It uses a dynamic nearest-common-ancestor algorithm to simplify blossom steps, so they involve only back edges rather than arbitrary nontree edges.

The rest of the paper presents direct extensions of Edmonds' blossom algorithm to weighted b -matching and f -factors. Again the time bound is the one previously known for bipartite graphs: for b -matching the time is $O(\min\{b(V), n \log n\}(m+n \log n))$ and for f -factors the time is $O(\min\{f(V), m \log n\}(m+n \log n))$, where $b(V)$ and $f(V)$ denote the sum of all degree constraints. Several immediate applications of the f -factor algorithm are given: The generalized shortest path structure of [21], i.e., the analog of the shortest path tree for conservative undirected graphs, is shown to be a version of the blossom structure for f -factors. This structure is found in time $O(|N|(m+n \log n))$ for N the set of negative edges ($0 < |N| < n$). A shortest T -join is found in time $O(n(m+n \log n))$, or $O(|T|(m+n \log n))$ when all costs are nonnegative. These bounds are all slight improvements of previously known ones, and are simply achieved by proper initialization of the f -factor algorithm.

1 Introduction

This paper solves a well-known problem in data structures to achieve an efficient algorithm for weighted matching. It also extends the results to the most general weighted matching problems. This section defines the problems and states the results.

A *matching* on a graph is a set of vertex-disjoint edges. A matching is *perfect* if it covers every vertex. More generally it is *maximum cardinality* if it has the greatest possible number of edges, and *cardinality k* if it has exactly k edges. Let each edge e have a real-valued *weight* $w(e)$. The weight $w(S)$ of a set of edges S is the sum of the individual edge weights. Each of the above variants has a maximum weight version, e.g., a *maximum weight matching* has the greatest possible weight, a *maximum weight perfect matching* has maximum weight subject to the constraint that it is *perfect*, etc. Alternatively edges may have real-valued costs, and we define *minimum cost matching*, etc. The *weighted matching problem* is to find a matching of one of these types, e.g., find a maximum

*This paper is a combination of two conference papers: A preliminary version of the data structures part appeared in *Proc. 1st Annual ACM-SIAM Symp. on Disc. Algorithms*, 1990 [15]. A preliminary version of the extensions part, based on reduction to matching, appeared in *Proc. 15th Annual ACM Symp. on Theory of Comp.*, 1983 [13].

[†]Department of Computer Science, University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, Colorado 80309-0430, USA. Research supported in part by NSF Grant No. CCR-8815636. E-mail: hal@cs.colorado.edu

weight perfect matching on a given graph, etc. All these variants are essentially equivalent from an algorithmic viewpoint. For definiteness this paper concentrates on maximum weight perfect matching.

In stating resource bounds for graph algorithms we assume throughout this paper that the given graph has n vertices and m edges. For notational simplicity we assume $m \geq n/2$. In the weighted matching problem this can always be achieved by discarding isolated vertices.

Weighted matching is a classic problem in network optimization; detailed discussions are in [27, 29, 33, 34, 5]. Edmonds gave the first polynomial-time algorithm for weighted matching [9]. Several implementations of Edmonds' algorithm have been given with increasingly fast running times: $O(n^3)$ [11, 27], $O(mn \log n)$ [4, 20], $O(n(m \log \log \log_{2+m/n} n + n \log n))$ [18]. Edmonds' algorithm is a generalization of the Hungarian algorithm, due to Kuhn, for weighted matching on bipartite graphs [25, 26]. Fredman and Tarjan implement the Hungarian algorithm in $O(n(m + n \log n))$ time using Fibonacci heaps [10]. They ask if general matching can be done in this time. We answer affirmatively: We show that a search in Edmonds' algorithm can be implemented in time $O(m + n \log n)$. This implies that the weighted matching problem can be solved in time $O(n(m + n \log n))$. The space is $O(m)$. Our implementation of a search is in some sense optimal: As shown by Fredman and Tarjan [10] for Dijkstra's algorithm, one search of Edmonds' algorithm can be used to sort n numbers. Thus a search requires time $\Omega(m + n \log n)$ in an appropriate model of computation.

Weighted matching algorithms based on cost-scaling have a better asymptotic time bound when costs are small integers [23]. However our result remains of interest for at least two reasons: First, Edmonds' algorithm is theoretically attractive because its time bound is strongly polynomial. Second, for a number of matching and related problems, the best known solution amounts to performing one search of Edmonds' algorithm, e.g., most forms of sensitivity analysis for weighted matching [4, 8, 14, 38]. Thus our implementation of a search in time $O(m + n \log n)$ gives the best-known algorithm for these problems.

The paper continues by presenting versions of Edmonds' blossom algorithm for weighted b -matching and weighted f -factors. These problems generalize ordinary matching to larger degree-constrained subgraphs and are defined as follows. For an undirected multigraph $G = (V, E)$ with function $f : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$, an f -factor is a subgraph where each vertex $v \in V$ has degree exactly $f(v)$. For an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ where E may contain loops, with function $b : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$, a (perfect) b -matching is a function $x : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ where each vertex $v \in V$ has $\sum_{w:vw \in E} x(vw) = b(v)$. Given in addition a weight function $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, a *maximum b -matching* is a (perfect) b -matching with the greatest weight possible; similarly for *maximum f -factor*. We find maximum b -matchings and f -factors in the same time bound as was known for bipartite graphs: for b -matching the time is $O(\min\{b(V), n \log n\}(m + n \log n))$ where $b(V)$ is the sum of all degree constraints; for f -factors the time is $O(\min\{f(V), m \log n\}(m + n \log n))$ where $f(V)$ is the sum of all degree constraints. A blossom algorithm for b -matching is given in Pulleyblank's thesis [31] ([32] gives a very high level description, different from our algorithm). The pseudo-polynomial parts of the above bounds (i.e., the bounds using $b(V)$ and $f(V)$) can also be achieved using the current paper's algorithm for ordinary matching plus the reduction to matching presented in the original version of the current paper [13].

Here we prefer direct implementations of the general matching algorithms, to avoid practical inefficiencies and to illuminate the properties of blossoms. As an example of the latter, the algorithm's blossom structure is shown to be exactly the generalized shortest path structure of Gabow and Sankowski [21], i.e., the analog of the shortest path tree for conservative undirected graphs. (The paths in blossoms that are used to augment the matching give the shortest paths to the fixed source in a conservative undirected graph.) Our discussion of blossoms also leads to (and requires)

simple proofs of (previously known) min-max formulas for the maximum size of a b -matching, equation (4.5), or partial f -factor, (5.6). Lastly our algorithm shows that b -matching blossoms have the same structure as ordinary matching blossoms (unlike f -factors there are no “ $I(B)$ -sets”, i.e., pendant edges, and no “heavy blossoms”, only “light” ones, at least in the final output).

We find the generalized shortest path structure in time $O(|N|(m + n \log n))$ for N the set of negative edges ($0 < |N| < n$ for conservative costs) and a shortest T -join in time $O(n(m + n \log n))$, or $O(|T|(m + n \log n))$ for nonnegative costs. These bounds are slight improvements of previously known ones and are achieved simply by proper initialization of the f -factor algorithm. (The strong polynomial bound of Gabow and Sankowski [21, Section 10] can be modified to achieve the same time as ours for the matching part, plus additional time $O(m \log n)$ for post-processing.) Good implementations of the T -join algorithm of Edmonds use time $O(n^3)$ for general costs and the same time as ours plus $O(|T|^3)$ for nonnegative costs, both cubic terms coming from finding a minimum cost matching on a complete graph [34, p.486 and p.488].)

The paper is organized as follows. This section concludes with some terminology and assumptions. Section 2 reviews Edmonds’ algorithm and defines the “blossom-merging problem” – the last ingredient needed to obtain the time bound we seek. Section 3 specializes this problem to “tree-blossom-merging” and solves it. Section 4 gives our b -matching algorithm and Section 5 gives the f -factor algorithm. Appendix A gives further details of Edmonds’ matching algorithm. Appendix B gives some further details for b -matching and f -factors. Appendix C gives an efficient implementation of the grow and expand steps of Edmonds’ algorithm. Gabow [14] gives a faster algorithm, but Appendix C is simpler and suffices to achieve our overall time bound. Appendix C also gives the details for grow and expand steps for b -matching and f -factors. The latter is more involved but follows the same outline.

Our algorithm for tree-blossom-merging requires an algorithm that computes nearest common ancestors in trees that grow by addition of new leaves. The conference version of this paper [15] presented the required algorithm, as well as extensions. For reasons of succinctness the data structure for nearest common ancestors is now given separately in [16].

Portions of this paper may be read independently. Our implementation of Edmonds’ matching algorithm is in Section 3; readers familiar with Edmonds’ algorithm can skip the review in and go directly to Section 2.3. Those interested in generalized versions of matching should concentrate on f -factors, our most general algorithm (Section 5), although some basic lemmas are proved in Section 4.

History of this paper The conference paper [15] presented a preliminary version of the tree-blossom-merging algorithm. The current paper simplifies that algorithm, e.g., there is no need to refine the strategy for sparse graphs ($m = o(n \log^2 n)$). The tree-blossom-merging algorithm uses an algorithm that computes nearest common ancestors in trees that grow by addition of new leaves. [15] presented the required algorithm, as well as extensions. As mentioned this is now given in [16]. Subsequent to [15] Cole and Hariharan [6] used a similar approach to allow other operations; they also achieve time bounds that are worst-case rather than amortized.

The results on b -matching and f -factors evolve from the conference paper [13]. That paper achieved similar time bounds to those presented here by reducing the problems to matching. The current paper gives direct approaches to the problems, thus illuminating the structure of blossoms (see Sections 4.1 and 5.1) and avoiding the blow-up in problem size incurred by reduction.

Terminology We often omit set braces from singleton sets, denoting $\{v\}$ as v . We use interval notation for sets of integers: for $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $[i..j] = \{k \in \mathbb{Z} : i \leq k \leq j\}$. We use a common summing

notation: If x is a function on elements and S a set of elements then $x(S)$ denotes $\sum_{s \in S} x(s)$. $\log n$ denotes logarithm to the base two. Assume that for a given integer $s \in [1..n]$ the value $\lfloor \log s \rfloor$ can be computed in $O(1)$ time. This can be done if we precompute these n values and store them in a table. The precomputation time is $O(n)$.

For a graph G , $V(G)$ denotes its vertices and $E(G)$ its edges. For vertices x, y an xy -path has ends x and y . For a set of vertices $S \subseteq V$ and a subgraph H of G , $\delta(S, H)$ ($\gamma(S, H)$) denotes the set of edges with exactly one (respectively two) endpoint in S . (Loops are in γ but not δ .) $d(v, H)$ denotes the degree of vertex v in H . When referring to the given graph G we often omit the last argument and write, e.g., $\delta(S)$. (For example a vertex v has $d(v) = |\delta(v)| + 2|\gamma(v)|$.)

Fix a matching M on the given graph. A vertex is *free* if it is not on any matched edge. An *alternating path* is a vertex-simple path whose edges are alternately matched and unmatched. (Paths of 0 or 1 edges are considered alternating.) An *augmenting path* P is an alternating path joining two distinct free vertices. To *augment the matching along* P means to enlarge the matching M to $M \oplus P$ (the symmetric difference of M and P). This gives a matching with one more edge.

2 Edmonds' algorithm and its implementation

This section summarizes Edmonds' algorithm and known results on its implementation. Sections 2.1–2.2 sketch the high level algorithm. They include all the details needed for our implementation but do not give a complete development. For the latter see, e.g., [9, 11, 27, 33]. Section 2.3 reviews the portions of the algorithm for which efficient implementations are known, and the outstanding problem of efficient “blossom merging”.

2.1 Blossoms

Throughout this section the notation $P(x, y)$ denotes an xy -path. This includes the possibility that $x = y$, i.e., $P(x, x) = (x)$.

Edmonds' algorithm is based on the notion of blossom. We start with a data-structure-oriented definition, illustrated in Fig. 1. Begin by considering two even-length alternating paths $P(x_i, y)$, $i = 0, 1$, with $x_0 \neq x_1$ and y the only common vertex. Each path begins with the matched edge at x_i , unless $x_i = y$. These paths plus an edge x_0x_1 form a simple example of a blossom. Edmonds' algorithm contracts blossoms. This leads to the general, recursive definition:

Definition 2.1 *Let G be a graph with a distinguished matching. A blossom is a subgraph defined by rules (a) and (b):*

(a) *Any single vertex b is a blossom.*

(b) *Let \overline{G} be a graph formed from G by contracting zero or more vertex-disjoint blossoms. Let X_0, X_1, Y be \overline{G} -vertices, $X_0 \neq X_1$. For $i = 0, 1$ let $P(X_i, Y)$ be an even-length alternating path that starts with a matched edge or has $X_i = Y$, with Y the only common \overline{G} -vertex. These paths plus an edge X_0X_1 form a blossom.*

In Fig. 1 blossom B is formed from paths $P(B_4, B_0)$, $P(B_6, B_0)$ and edge γ . We use the term “vertex” to refer to a vertex of the given graph G . For a blossom B , $V(B)$ is the set of vertices of G contained in any blossom in either path $P(X_i, Y)$; we sometimes refer to them as *the vertices of* B . The maximal blossoms in the paths $P(X_i, Y)$ are *the subblossoms of* B .

We use some properties of blossoms that are easily established by induction. Any blossom has a *base vertex*: In Definition 2.1 a blossom of type (a) has base vertex b . A blossom of type (b) has the same base vertex as Y . We usually denote the base of B as $\beta(B)$ (or β if the blossom is clear).




Figure 1: Blossoms in a search of Edmonds' algorithm. Blossom B is formed from subblossoms B_0, \dots, B_6 . Heavy edges are matched.

$\beta(B)$ is the unique vertex of B that is not matched to another vertex of B . $\beta(B)$ is either free or matched to another vertex not in B . We call B a *free blossom* or *matched blossom* accordingly.

Consider a blossom B with base vertex β . Any vertex $x \in V(B)$ has an even-length alternating path $P(x, \beta)$ that starts with the matched edge at x . ($P(\beta, \beta)$ has no edges.) For example in Fig.1 in blossom B , $P(a, \beta(B))$ starts with $P(a, \beta(B_1)) = (a_0, a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$ followed by edge $(\beta(B_1), \beta(B_2))$ and the reverse of $P(c, \beta(B_2))$, and continuing along paths in B_3, B_4, B_6, B_5, B_0 .

To define $P(x, \beta)$ in general consider the two paths for B in Definition 2.1. Among the blossoms in these paths let x belong to a blossom designated as B_0 . The edges of B (i.e., the edges of $P(X_i, Y)$ plus X_0X_1) contain a unique even-length alternating path A from B_0 to Y . Here A is a path in \overline{G} .

First suppose $B_0 \neq Y$. A starts with the matched edge at B_0 . $P(x, \beta)$ passes through the same blossoms as A . To be precise let the \overline{G} -vertices of A be $B_i, i = 0, \dots, k, B_k = Y$, with $k > 0$ even. Let β_i be the base vertex of B_i . So there are vertices $x_i \in V(B_i)$ such that the edges of A are

$$\beta_0\beta_1, x_1x_2, \beta_2\beta_3, x_3x_4, \dots, x_{k-1}x_k.$$

Here the $\beta_i\beta_{i+1}$ edges are matched and the $x_i x_{i+1}$ edges are unmatched. Recursively define $P(x, \beta)$ as the concatenation of $k + 1$ subpaths

$$(2.1) \quad P(x, \beta) = P(x, \beta_0), P(\beta_1, x_1), P(x_2, \beta_2), P(\beta_3, x_3), \dots, P(x_k, \beta_k).$$

For odd i , $P(\beta_i, x_i)$ is the reverse of path $P(x_i, \beta_i)$.

Now consider the base case $B_0 = Y$. If Y is a vertex then $Y = x = \beta$ and $P(x, \beta) = (x)$. Otherwise $P(x, \beta)$ in blossom B is identical to $P(x, \beta)$ in B_0 .¹

Edmonds' algorithm finds an augmenting path \overline{P} in the graph \overline{G} that has every blossom contracted. \overline{P} corresponds to an augmenting path P in the given graph G : For any contracted blossom B on an unmatched edge xy ($x \in V(B)$) of \overline{P} , P traverses the path $P(x, \beta(B))$. If we augment the matching of G along P , every blossom becomes a blossom in the new matched graph: For instance the above vertex x becomes the new base of B . In Fig.1 if \overline{P} contains an unmatched edge α' that enters B at vertex a , P contains the subpath $P(a, \beta(B))$. The augment makes a the base of B as well as B_1 ; in the contracted graph α' is the matched edge incident to B .

2.2 Edmonds' weighted matching algorithm

For definiteness consider the problem of finding a maximum weight perfect matching. The algorithm is easily modified for all the other variants of weighted matching. Without loss of generality assume a perfect matching exists.

The algorithm is a primal-dual strategy based on Edmonds' formulation of weighted matching as a linear program. It repeatedly finds a maximum weight augmenting path and augments the matching. The procedure to find one augmenting path is a *search*. If the search is successful, i.e., it finds an augmenting path P , then an *augment step* is done. It augments the matching along P . The entire algorithm consists of $n/2$ searches and augment steps. At any point in the algorithm $V(G)$ is partitioned into blossoms. Initially every vertex is a singleton blossom.

The following pseudocode gives a precise specification of the search for an augmenting path; a more detailed discussion with examples follows. Assume the graph has a perfect matching so this path exists. For any vertex v , B_v denotes the maximal blossom containing v .

A search constructs a subgraph \mathcal{S} . \mathcal{S} is initialized to contain every free blossom. It is enlarged by executing three types of steps, called *grow*, *blossom*, and *expand steps* in [14]. In addition the search changes the linear programming dual variables in *dual adjustment steps*. After a dual adjustment step, one or more of the other steps can be performed. Steps are repeated until \mathcal{S} contains the desired augmenting path.

\mathcal{S} consists of blossoms forming a forest. More precisely if each blossom is contracted to a vertex, \mathcal{S} becomes a forest $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ whose roots are the free blossoms. A blossom of \mathcal{S} that is an even (odd) distance from a root of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ is *outer* (*inner*). (The third possibility is a blossom not in \mathcal{S} .) A vertex of \mathcal{S} is outer or inner depending on the blossom that contains it. Any path from a root to a node in its tree of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ is alternating. So the matched edge incident to a nonroot outer blossom goes to its parent; the matched edge incident to an inner blossom goes to its unique child.

In Fig. 1 suppose B_0, \dots, B_6 are maximal blossoms, edges $\gamma, \delta, \varepsilon$ are not part of \mathcal{S} , and blossom B has not yet formed. If B_0 is outer, the outer blossoms are the B_i with i even. If a blossom step forms blossom B , the B_i with i odd change from inner to outer. Now we discuss the three steps that build up \mathcal{S} (see also Fig. 2).

Grow steps A grow step enlarges \mathcal{S} . It is executed for an edge vx where vertex v is outer and x is not in \mathcal{S} . Let x be in the maximal blossom B with base vertex β . B is a matched blossom (by the

¹The $P(x, \beta)$ paths may intersect in nontrivial ways. For instance in Fig. 1, $P(\beta(B_3), \beta(B))$ and $P(\beta(B_5), \beta(B))$ traverse edge γ in opposite directions. So the paths have common subpaths, e.g., the subpath of $P(\beta(B_5), \beta(B))$ joining γ and edge $(\beta(B_3), \beta(B_4))$, and disjoint subpaths, e.g., the subpath of $P(\beta(B_5), \beta(B))$ joining $\beta(B_3)$ and edge α . This intersection pattern can continue inside blossom B_0 . So in general for two vertices x_0, x_1 in a blossom B with base β , the paths $P(x_i, \beta)$ can have arbitrarily many subpaths that are alternately common and disjoint.

```

make every free vertex or free blossom the (outer) root of an  $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ -tree
loop
  if  $\exists$  tight edge  $e = xy$ ,  $x$  outer and  $y \notin \mathcal{S}$  then
    /* grow step */
    let  $\beta$  be the base of  $B_y$ , with  $\beta\beta' \in M$ 
    add  $xy, B_y, \beta\beta', B_{\beta'}$  to  $\mathcal{S}$ 
  else if  $\exists$  tight edge  $e = xy$ ,  $x, y$  outer in the same search tree,  $B_x \neq B_y$  then
    /* blossom step */
    merge all blossoms in the fundamental cycle of  $e$  in  $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ 
  else if  $\exists$  tight edge  $e = xy$ ,  $x, y$  outer in different search trees then
    /* augment step */
    /*  $xy$  plus the  $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ -paths to  $x$  and  $y$  form an augmenting path  $P$  */
    augment the matching along  $P$  and end the search
  else if  $\exists$  a nonsingleton inner blossom  $B$  with  $z(B) = 0$  then
    /* expand step */
    let  $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$  contain edges  $xy$  and  $\beta\beta'$  incident to  $B$  where  $\beta$  is the base of  $B$ ,  $x \in V(B)$ 
    let  $B$  have subblossoms  $B_i$ 
    in  $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$  replace  $B$  by the even length alternating path of subblossoms  $B_0, \dots, B_k$ 
      that has  $x \in B_0, \beta \in B_k$ 
    /* the remaining subblossoms of  $B$  are no longer in  $\mathcal{S}$  */
  else adjust duals

```

Figure 2: Pseudocode for a search in Edmonds' algorithm.

initialization of \mathcal{S}). Let $\beta\beta'$ be the corresponding matched edge. β' is the base vertex of a maximal blossom B' . The grow step adds edge vx , B , edge $\beta\beta'$ and B' to \mathcal{S} . B and B' are new inner and outer blossoms respectively.

In Fig. 1 if \mathcal{S} contains outer blossom B_0 but no other B_i , a grow step for edge α adds α , B_1 , $(\beta(B_1), \beta(B_2))$ and B_2 to \mathcal{S} . Two more grow steps add the other B_i , $i = 3, \dots, 6$.

Blossom steps A blossom step is executed for an edge e that joins two distinct outer blossoms in the same tree of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$. It combines all blossoms along the fundamental cycle of e to form a new blossom B . Note that B is outer: In proof let A be the blossom closest to the root in e 's fundamental cycle. B is outer if A is. If e is incident to A then A is outer, by definition. If e is not incident to A then the ends of e descend from 2 distinct children of A . A must be outer, since as previously noted any inner blossom has only one child.

In Fig. 1 suppose \mathcal{S} contains blossoms B_i , $i = 0, \dots, 6$, with B_i outer for i even. A blossom step for γ would form blossom B . Alternatively the search might do a blossom step for ε , then later one for δ , and still later one for γ . Other sequences are possible, and the one executed depends on the costs of these edges.

Expand steps An expand step replaces an inner blossom B of \mathcal{S} by some of its subblossoms. Specifically let B , with base vertex β , be incident to edges xy and $\beta\beta'$ in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$, with $x \in V(B)$. Let $x(\beta)$ be in the maximal subblossom B_0 (B_r) of B , respectively, and let $P(B_0, B_r)$ be the even-length alternating path formed from edges of B . Then B is replaced by $P(B_0, B_r)$ in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$. The remaining subblossoms of B are no longer in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ – they are now eligible to enter $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ in grow steps. $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ remains a forest.

In Fig. 1 when \mathcal{S} contains all blossoms B_i , an expand step for B_1 replaces it by vertices a_0, a_1 , blossom A , a_3 , and a_4 . The other two subblossoms of B_1 leave $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$.

This completes the description of the three steps that construct \mathcal{S} . Note that once a vertex becomes outer it remains in \mathcal{S} and outer for the rest of the search. In contrast vertices can alternate between being inner and not being in \mathcal{S} (perhaps ultimately becoming outer in a grow or blossom step). This alternation can occur $\Theta(n)$ times for a given vertex v in one search (the upper bound n holds since each time v is involved in an expand step, the size of the maximal blossom containing v decreases).

The sequence of steps executed by the search depends on the costs of edges and the values of the dual variables. The algorithm executes a given step when a corresponding edge becomes *tight*, i.e., its dual variables satisfy the complementary slackness conditions of linear programming. For example in Fig. 1 the blossom step for γ is done when γ becomes tight. The dual adjustment step modifies dual variables so that additional edges become tight and corresponding grow, blossom or expand steps can be done. The dual adjustment step involves finding a candidate edge that is closest to being tight, and then changing the dual variables to make it tight. It is given in detail in Appendix A.

The search terminates in an augment step. It is executed for an edge e that joins 2 different trees of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$. Let e join blossoms X_0 and X_1 , with X_i in the tree rooted at free blossom B_i . e plus the edges of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ from X_i to B_i forms an augmenting path \overline{P} in the current contracted graph \overline{G} . We augment the matching along the path P in G , as described above. This changes base vertices of various blossoms on \overline{P} as well as P .

After an augment the algorithm halts if every vertex is matched. Otherwise the next search is initialized: Every free blossom is made a tree root of \mathcal{S} . Then we proceed as above. Note that the

initialization retains all the blossoms – a maximal blossom that is not free is now a blossom not in \mathcal{S} .²

Data structure for blossoms The data structure consists of two parts, both used in most implementations of Edmonds’ algorithm. The maximal outer blossoms are tracked using a data structure for set-merging. It suffices to use an algorithm that executes $O(m)$ *finds* and $O(n)$ *unions* in a universe of n elements in $O(m + n \log n)$ total time and $O(n)$ space (e.g., the simple relabel-the-smaller-set algorithm [1, 7]). The incremental-tree set-merging algorithm of Gabow and Tarjan [22] improves this to linear time. The set-merging data structure is used to manipulate the vertices of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$, e.g., a blossom step does *finds* to identify the outer vertices in the fundamental cycle in \overline{G} and *unions* to contract the cycle. (The inner vertices are identified using the algorithm of Appendix C, as discussed at the start of Section 2.3.)

The second part of the data structure is based on a forest representing the laminar family of blossoms. The main use is to compute $P(x, \beta)$ paths. These paths are used to find augmenting paths, and to compute the supporting forest for tree-blossom-merging (Section 3). The data structure is also used in expand steps to update $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$.

The laminar family is defined as follows. Every maximal blossom B^* has a corresponding tree $T(B^*)$. The root of $T(B^*)$ is a node corresponding to B^* and the leaves correspond to $V(B^*)$. The children of any node B are the subblossoms B_i of B . $T(B^*)$ is an ordered tree, with the children B_i of B ordered according to the edges of B that form a cycle spanning the contracted B_i (in Definition 2.1 these are the edges of the two paths $P(X_i, Y)$ plus X_0X_1).

The data structure for the laminar family has the following components. The root node (for B^*) records the vertex $\beta(B^*)$. The children of any node B form a doubly linked ring. Each link also records the edge xy of G ($x, y \in V(G)$) that joins the two subblossoms. Finally $T(B^*)$ has parent pointers. Additionally we assume the edges of the matching M are marked as such.

This data structure has size $O(|V(B^*)|) = O(n)$. In proof the leaves of the tree form the set $V(B^*)$. Each interior node is a nonsingleton blossom, so there are fewer than $|V(B^*)|$ interior nodes.

The data structure is initially constructed in the blossom step. The expand step involves replacing the inner node B^* with a path formed from the children of B^* . The other applications are based on $P(x, \beta)$ paths. For completeness we give a routine for computing these paths.

We start with some simple primitive operations. Given $x \in V(B^*)$ the blossoms containing x are identified by tracing the path from the leaf x to the root of $T(B^*)$. An interior node $B \neq B^*$ with a link corresponding to edge $xy \in M$, $x \in V(B)$ has base vertex x . If neither link from B is matched then the base vertex of B is that of its first ancestor having an incident matched edge.

We turn to computing the $P(x, \beta)$ paths. The main algorithm requires $P(x, \beta)$ in the form of a list of edges, say L . The supporting forest requires this list to be ordered as an $x\beta$ -path. The following recursive routine uses a global list L . Each recursive invocation enlarges L with the appropriate edges.

Consider any blossom B (maximal or not) and a vertex $x \in V(B)$. The recursive routine adds the edges of $P(x, \beta(B))$ or its reverse to L . The routine is called with 4 arguments:

- vertex x and the child B_0 of B that contains x ;
- the base vertex $\beta(B)$;
- a bit r equal to 1 if the reverse path $P(\beta(B), x)$ is desired, else 0.

²This contrasts with maximum cardinality matching, where initialization discards the blossoms. As a result there are no inner blossoms.

The following procedure is used if $r = 0$: First consider the general case $B_0 \neq B_k$. Starting at B_0 follow links to the siblings B_i corresponding to the blossoms of (2.1). The last blossom B_k is identified as the node whose two links both have unmatched edges. For each B_i use a recursive call to find the corresponding subpath of (2.1), and then for $i < k$ add the edge corresponding to the link leaving B_i (i.e., $\beta_i\beta_{i+1}$ or x_ix_{i+1}) to L . The arguments for each recursive call $P(x_i, \beta(B_i))$ are easily found using the above primitives, with the value of r corresponding to (2.1). (The argument $\beta(B_i)$ is known from the matched edge incident to B_i , for any $i < k$. For $i = k$ it is known from the matched edge incident to an ancestor of B , unless $\beta(B) = \beta(B^*)$. That base is explicitly recorded in the data structure.) The base case $B_0 = B_k$ is handled as in the definition of $P(x, \beta)$, i.e., immediately return if B_0 is a vertex else recurse as above.

Now suppose the routine is called with $r = 1$. The base case is unchanged. For the general case first find which of the two links from B_k corresponds to an edge on the desired path. Do this by following links from B_0 to B_k , starting with the appropriate link from B_0 . Then follow links from B_k to B_0 , starting with the appropriate link. As in the $r = 0$ case, issue recursive calls, and for $i > 0$ add the edge leaving B_i . The recursive calls have r set to the complement of the bit corresponding to (2.1).

The arguments for the initial call to find $P(x, \beta(B))$ are found as above.

Regarding efficiency first observe that the procedure is easily implemented to use time $O(|V(B)|)$, as follows. For any recursive call $P(x_i, \beta(B_i))$ the path-tracing to find the subblossom containing x_i is only done the first time it is needed. Once the path is known it is treated like a stack to get subsequent subblossoms containing x_i .

The time can be improved to $O(|P(x, \beta(B))|)$. This requires eliminating part of the path-tracing to find the blossoms containing x_i . Specifically we must skip over the smallest blossoms containing x_i as base vertex, since they do not contain any edge of the output $P(x, \beta(B))$. To accomplish this we augment the data structure so each matched edge corresponding to a link in $T(B^*)$ has a pointer to that link. The path-tracing for x_i starts at the link for the matched edge incident to x_i . This bypasses all the unwanted blossoms with base vertex x_i .

2.3 The blossom-merging problem

This completes the sketch of Edmonds' algorithm. Our task is to implement a search in time $O(m + n \log n)$. It is known how to implement most parts within the desired time bound. For dual adjustment steps a Fibonacci heap \mathcal{F} is used. It contains the candidate edges for tightness mentioned above. The heap minimum gives the next edge to be made tight. This is analogous to Fredman and Tarjan's implementation of Dijkstra's algorithm by Fibonacci heaps and uses the same time per search, $O(m + n \log n)$. Dual variables are maintained in time $O(n)$ per search using offset quantities (e.g., [20]). The processing associated with grow and expand steps can be done in time $O(m\alpha(m, n))$ using a data structure for list splitting given in Gabow [14].³ A simpler algorithm is presented in Appendix C; it suffices for our time bound and makes this paper self-contained. The current blossom containing a given vertex is found using the set-merging data structure of last section for outer vertices and the grow/expand algorithm for nonouter vertices. Finally note after a successful search, the corresponding augment step can be done in time $O(n)$ using the $P(x, \beta)$ paths [12]. This leaves only the blossom steps: implementing the blossom steps of a search in time $O(m + n \log n)$ gives the desired result. (This observation is also made by Gabow, Galil, and Spencer[18].)

The problem of implementing the blossom steps of a search can be stated precisely as the

³After the conference version of this paper the time for list splitting was improved by Pettie [30] and Thorup [37].

blossom-merging problem which we now define. ([18] defines a similar problem called on-line restricted component merging, solving it in time $O(m \log \log \log_{2+m/n} n + n \log n)$.) The universe consists of a graph with vertex set \mathcal{O} and edge set \mathcal{E} , both initially empty. (\mathcal{O} will model the set of outer vertices, \mathcal{E} the set of edges joining two \mathcal{O} -vertices and thus candidates for blossoms.) At any point in time \mathcal{O} is partitioned into subsets called blossoms. The problem is to process (on-line) a sequence of the following types of operations:

- make_blossom*(A) – add the set of vertices A to \mathcal{O} and make A a blossom
(this assumes $A \cap \mathcal{O} = \emptyset$ before the operation);
- merge*(A, B) – combine blossoms A and B into a new blossom
(this destroys the old blossoms A and B);
- make_edge*(vw, t) – add edge vw , with cost t , to \mathcal{E} (this assumes $v, w \in \mathcal{O}$);
- min_edge* – return an edge vw of \mathcal{E} that has minimum cost subject to the constraint
that v and w are (currently) in distinct blossoms.

Let us sketch how these four operations are used to implement a search. Grow, expand and blossom steps each create new outer blossoms. They perform *make_blossom* operations to add the new outer vertices to \mathcal{O} . They also perform *make_edge* operations for the new edges that join two outer vertices. For example in Fig. 1 if B_0, B_5 and B_6 are in \mathcal{S} and a grow step is done for edge α then *make_blossom*(B_2) is done; also *make_edge* is done for edge δ . Note that in *make_edge*(vw, t), t is not the given cost $c(vw)$. Rather t is $c(vw)$ modified by dual values; this modification allows the algorithm to make dual adjustments efficiently (see e.g., Gabow, Micali, and Galil[20]). The value of t is unknown until the time of the *make_edge* operation. From now on, since we are only concerned with the blossom-merging problem, the “cost” of an edge of \mathcal{E} refers to this value t , not the cost input to the matching algorithm.

A blossom step performs *merges* to construct the new blossom. In Fig. 1 the operations *merge*(B_i, B_0), $i = 1, \dots, 6$ construct B . Note that information giving the edge structure of blossoms is maintained and used in the outer part of the algorithm – it is not relevant to the blossom-merging problem. For this problem a blossom B is identical to its vertex set $V(B)$; the *merge* operation need only update the information about the partition of \mathcal{O} induced by blossoms. Also in the blossom-merging problem “blossom” refers to a set of the vertex partition, i.e., the result of a *make_blossom* or *merge* operation. The latter may be only a piece of a blossom in Edmonds’ algorithm (as in the 6 merges above) but this is not relevant.

A *min_edge* operation is done at the end of each of the three search steps. The returned edge, say e , is used in the above-mentioned Fibonacci heap \mathcal{F} that selects the next step of the search. Specifically \mathcal{F} has one entry that maintains the smallest cost edge of \mathcal{E} . If that entry already contains e nothing is done. If the entry contains an edge of larger cost than e , the entry is updated to e and a corresponding *decrease_key* is done. The smallest key in \mathcal{F} (which may or may not be the key for e) is used for the next dual adjustment and the next step of the search.

To illustrate this process in Fig. 1 suppose \mathcal{O} consists of B_i for $i = 0, 1, 2, 5, 6$ and $\mathcal{E} = \{\delta, \varepsilon\}$. Furthermore the entry in \mathcal{F} contains edge δ . A grow step for B_3 and B_4 adds $V(B_4)$ to \mathcal{O} and *make_edge* is done for γ . If γ is now the smallest edge in \mathcal{E} , the entry in \mathcal{F} for the next blossom step changes from δ to γ and a corresponding *decrease_key* is performed.

Our task is to implement a sequence of these operations: *make_blossoms* adding a total of $\leq n$ vertices, $\leq m$ *make_edges*, $\leq n$ *merges* and $\leq n$ *min_edges*, in time $O(m + n \log n)$. The bound on *min_edges* follows since *min_edge* need not be done after an expand step that does not create a new outer vertex (e.g., in Fig. 1 with blossom B_1 already expanded, expanding A does not add

outer vertices). Every other step creates a new outer vertex (a blossom step changes an inner vertex to outer). So there are at most n such steps and n corresponding *min_edges*.

The difficulty in solving the blossom-merging problem is illustrated by Fig. 1. When each B_i , $i = 0, \dots, 6$ is a blossom, edges γ, δ, ϵ are candidates for *min_edge*. If a blossom step for γ is done, δ and ϵ become irrelevant – they no longer join distinct blossoms. If we store the edges of \mathcal{E} in a priority queue useless edges like δ, ϵ can end up in the queue. These edges eventually get deleted from the queue but the deletions accomplish no useful work. The time bound becomes $\Omega(m \log n)$. (This also indicates why there is no need for a *delete_min* operation in the blossom-merging problem: If edge γ gets returned by *min_edge* and as above a blossom step forms B , edge γ becomes irrelevant.)

3 Tree-blossom-merging

Tree-blossom merging incorporates the topology of the search graph into general blossom-merging, in two ways. This section starts by defining the tree-blossom-merging problem and showing how it can be used to implement the blossom steps of Edmonds' algorithm. Then it presents our tree-blossom-merging algorithm.

The first goal is to maintain a representation of the search graph \mathcal{S} by a forest that changes as little as possible. We cannot avoid adding nodes, e.g., in grow steps. But we can define a forest that does not change in expand steps. Consider a search tree, i.e., a tree \overline{T} in the forest $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$.

Definition 3.1 *A tree T supports the search tree \overline{T} if each blossom B of \overline{T} has a corresponding subtree T_B in T , these subtrees partition the vertices of T and are joined by edges of \overline{T} , and for each blossom B :*

Case B is outer: *Let B have base vertex β . $V(B) = V(T_B)$. If B is incident to the matched edge $\beta\beta'$ in \overline{T} then β' is the parent of β in T . If B is a free vertex then β is the root of T .*

Case B is inner: *Let B be incident to edges $vx, \beta\beta'$ in \overline{T} , where $x, \beta \in V(B)$ and $\beta\beta'$ is matched. Then T_B is the path $P(x, \beta)$ and v is the parent of x in T .*

Take any vertex v in an outer blossom B of \overline{T} . v has a path to the root in both \overline{T} and T , say $p_{\overline{T}}(v)$ and $p_T(v)$ respectively. Let $p_{\overline{T}}(v) = (B_0 = B, B_1, \dots, B_k)$. $p_T(v)$ consists of subpaths through each subtree T_{B_i} . For even i the subpath contains the base vertex $\beta(B_i)$ and perhaps other B_i -vertices. For odd i the subpath is the entire path T_{B_i} . This correspondence will allow us to track potential blossom steps, as well as execute them, in the supporting forest.

We will maintain the supporting tree T using this operation:

add_leaf(x, y) – add a new leaf y , with parent x , to T .

Here we assume x is a node already in T and y is a new node not in T . We also assume the data structure for T records parent pointers created by *add_leaf*.

We now show how T is maintained as the search algorithm executes grow, blossom and expand steps. Assume the partition of $V(T)$ into outer blossoms and individual vertices in inner blossoms is maintained by a set-merging algorithm.

Suppose a grow step enlarges \mathcal{S} by adding unmatched edge vx , inner blossom B , matched edge $\beta\beta'$ and outer blossom B' , where vertices $v \in V(\overline{T})$, $x, \beta \in B$ and $\beta' \in B'$. First compute $P(x, \beta)$ and write it as x_i , $i = 0, \dots, k$ where $x_0 = x$, $x_k = \beta$. Enlarge T by performing *add_leaf*(v, x_0),

$add_leaf(x_i, x_{i+1})$ for $i = 0, \dots, k-1$, $add_leaf(x_k, \beta')$ and finally $add_leaf(\beta', w)$ for every $w \in B' - \beta'$. Merge the vertices of B' into one set. (The search algorithm accesses the vertices of B' from the blossom data structure at the end of Section 2.2.)

Consider a blossom step for edge vw . It combines the blossoms on the fundamental cycle C of vw in \overline{T} . Let blossom A be the nearest common ancestor of the blossoms containing v and w in \overline{T} . A is an outer blossom. C consists of the subpaths of $p_{\overline{T}}(v)$ and $p_{\overline{T}}(w)$ ending at A . In T , merge every outer blossom in C into the blossom A . For each inner blossom B in C , do $add_leaf(v, u)$ for every vertex $u \in B - V(T)$. Then merge every vertex of B into A . The new blossom A has the correct subgraph T_A so the updated T supports \overline{T} .

Lastly consider an expand step. The expand step in the search algorithm replaces an inner blossom B by the subblossoms along the path $P(x, \beta)$, say subblossoms B_i , $i = 0, \dots, k$, where $x \in B_0$ and $\beta \in B_k$. By definition T_B is the path $P(x, \beta)$. For odd i , B_i is a new outer blossom of \overline{T} . Perform $add_leaf(\beta(B_i), v)$ for every vertex $v \in B_i - V(T)$. Merge the vertices of B_i .

For correctness note that for even i , B_i is a new inner blossom of \overline{T} . Equation (2.1) gives the subpaths of $P(x, \beta)$ through the B_i . T contains the path $P(x_i, \beta(B_i))$, and x_{i-1} is the parent of x_i . So T_{B_i} satisfies Definition 3.1 as required.

This completes the algorithm to maintain T . It is easy to see the total time in maintaining T is $O(n)$, since $P(x, \beta)$ paths are computed in time linear in their size.

As mentioned the correspondence between paths p_T and $p_{\overline{T}}$ allows us to track potential blossom steps in the supporting forest. This still appears to be challenging. Our second simplification of the problem is to assume $make_edge$ adds only back edges, i.e., edges joining a vertex to some ancestor. Clearly a blossom step for an edge vw is equivalent to blossom steps for the two edges va and wa , for a the nearest common ancestor of v and w in T . So we can replace vw by these two back edges.

To accomplish this reduction we use a data structure for dynamic nearest common ancestors. Specifically the algorithm maintains a tree subject to two operations. The tree initially consists of a dummy root ρ , and it grows using add_leaf operations. The second operation is

$nca(x, y)$ – return the nearest common ancestor of vertices x and y .

In summary we implement Edmonds' algorithm as follows. The search algorithm constructs supporting trees for the trees of \overline{S} using add_leaf operations. (Each supporting tree is rooted at a child of ρ .) When the search discovers an edge $vw \in E$ joining two outer vertices, it performs $nca(v, w)$ to find the nearest common ancestor a . If $a = \rho$ an augmenting path has been found. Otherwise the search algorithm executes the blossom-merging operations $make_edge(va, t)$ and $make_edge(wa, t)$ for appropriate t .

Each grow, blossom, and expand step performs all the appropriate $make_edges$, and concludes with a min_edge operation. Assume this operation returns back edge va , corresponding to edge $vw \in E$. Assume neither va nor wa has been previously returned. As mentioned above, the Fibonacci heap \mathcal{F} records edge vw as the smallest candidate for a blossom step. If vw is selected for the next step of the search algorithm, the corresponding blossom step is performed. Also blossom-merging $merge$ operations are executed to form the new blossom in the supporting tree. These operations place v and w in the same blossom of the supporting tree. So wa will never be returned by future min_edges (by definition of that operation).

Let us estimate the extra time that these operations add to a search of Edmonds' algorithm. The algorithm for maintaining the supporting tree T uses the incremental-tree set-merging algorithm of Gabow and Tarjan [22] for $merge$ operations. It maintains the partition of $V(T)$ into maximal blossoms in linear time. The dynamic nca algorithm of [15, 16] uses $O(n)$ time for n add_leaf

operations and $O(m)$ time for m *nca* operations.⁴ So excluding the time for *make_edges* and *min_edges* the extra time is $O(m + n)$.

We have reduced our task to solving the *tree-blossom-merging problem*. It is defined on a tree T that is constructed incrementally by *add_leaf* operations. Wlog assume the operation *add_leaf*(x, y) computes $d(y)$, the depth of vertex y in its supporting tree. There are three other operations, *make_edge*, *merge* and *min_edge*, defined as in the blossom-merging problem with the restriction that all edges of \mathcal{E} , i.e., the arguments to *make_edge*, are back edges.

There is no *make_blossom* operation – we assume Edmonds’ algorithm does the appropriate *add_leaf* and *merge* operations. Note that \mathcal{E} is a multiset: A given edge vw may be added to \mathcal{E} many times (with differing costs) since although an edge $uv \in E$ will become eligible for a blossom step at most once, different u vertices can give rise to the same back edge vw . Our notation assumes the edges of \mathcal{E} are directed towards the root, i.e., $vw \in \mathcal{E}$ has $d(v) > d(w)$.

As before for any vertex x , B_x denotes the blossom currently containing x . Assume that the *merges* for a blossom step are performed in the natural bottom-up order, i.e., for $vw \in \mathcal{E}$ the search algorithm traverses the path in $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ from B_v to B_w , repeatedly merging (the current) B_v and its parent blossom. In tree-blossom-merging we call any set resulting from a *merge* operation a “blossom” even though it need not be a blossom of Edmonds’ search algorithm.

3.1 The tree-blossom-merging algorithm

This section solves the tree-blossom-merging problem in time $O(m + n \log n)$. First it presents the basic principles for our algorithm. Then it gives the data structure, the algorithm statement, and its analysis.

Two features of the supporting forest are essentially irrelevant to our algorithm: The only role played by inner vertices, prior to becoming outer, is to contribute to depths $d(v)$. The fact that supporting trees are constructed incrementally is of no consequence, our algorithm only “sees” new *merge* and *make_edge* operations.

Our strategy is to charge time to blossoms as their size doubles. We use a notion of “rank” defined for edges and blossoms: The *rank* of an edge $vw \in \mathcal{E}$ is defined by

$$r(vw) = \lfloor \log(d(v) - d(w)) \rfloor.$$

The rank of an edge is between 0 and $\lfloor \log(n - 1) \rfloor$. A blossom B has *rank*

$$r(B) = \lfloor \log |B| \rfloor.$$

(Recall that in this section a blossom is a set of vertices.)

These notions are recorded in the algorithm’s data structure as follows. (A complete description of the data structure is given below.) We use a simple representation of T , each vertex x in T recording its parent and depth $d(x)$. Each blossom B records its size $|B|$ and rank $r(B)$.

There are $\leq n$ *merges*, so each can perform a constant number of time $O(\log n)$ operations, like Fibonacci tree *delete_mins* or moving $\log n$ words. There are $\leq 2m$ *make_edges*, so each can perform $O(1)$ operations. Each vertex v always belongs to some current blossom B_v , and $\leq \log n$ *merge* operations increase the rank of B_v . So we can charge $O(1)$ time to a vertex v every time its blossom increases in rank.

We associate each edge $vw \in \mathcal{E}$ with one of its ends, say vertex $u \in \{v, w\}$, in such a way that a merge that places v and w in the same blossom increases the rank of B_u . To do this we assign a

⁴After the conference version of this paper Cole and Hariharan [6] used a similar approach to allow these and other dynamic *nca* operations. In addition their time bounds are worst-case rather than amortized.

Type	Conditions		u	r
l	$r(e) > r(A_v)$		v	$r(e)$
s	$r(e) \leq r(A_v)$,	$r(A_v) \leq r(A_w)$	v	$\max\{r(A_v) + 1, r(A_w)\}$
d	$A_v \neq A_w$	$r(A_v) > r(A_w)$	w	$r(A_v)$

Table 1: Edge $e = vw \in \mathcal{E}$ has Type l, s , or d defined by the Conditions. Merging blossoms B_v and B_w gives a blossom of rank $\geq r > r(A_u)$ (Proposition 3.1).




Figure 3: l , s , and d edges associated with blossom B , i.e., $A_u \subseteq B$.

type to every edge – *long*, *short* or *down*, respectively, or synonymously *l-edge*, *s-edge*, *d-edge*. At any point in the execution of the algorithm an edge has a unique type, but the type can change over time.

Types are defined in Table 1 and illustrated in Tables 2–3 and Fig.3. In Table 1 A_v and A_w denote the blossoms containing v and w , respectively, when the definition is applied to assign the edge’s type. Edges with a long span, type l , are treated based on their span; edges with a short span, type s or d , are treated according to the relative sizes of the two blossoms containing their ends. Clearly the Conditions column specifies a unique type for any edge vw with $A_v \neq A_w$.

The edge type of $e = vw$ determines the end that e is associated with – this is vertex $u \in \{v, w\}$ as specified in Table 1. As the algorithm progresses and B_v and B_w grow the type of e and other values in Table 1 may change. (Indeed eventually we may have $B_v = B_w$ and e has no type at all.) The algorithm will not track every change in the type of e , instead it examines e from time to time, each time assigning a new type according to the table. This is illustrated in Fig.3 and the following example.

Example 1. Tables 2–3 give classifications performed in a hypothetical execution of the algorithm.

State	$r(A_v)$	$r(A_w)$	$e : r$	reclassified
1	2	2	$e_1 : 3$	4
2	2	4	$e_2 : 4$	4
3	2	5	$e_3 : 5$	
4	4	6	$e_1 : 6$	

Table 2: s -edges e_1, e_2, e_3 , all copies of vw , and their blossom parameters; $u = v$. e_1 and e_2 are reclassified in state 4.

State	$r(A_v)$	$r(A_w)$	$e : r$	reclassified
1	3	2	$e_1 : 3$	4
2	3	2	$e_2 : 3$	4
3	5	2	$e_3 : 5$	
4	6	3	$e_1 : 6$	

Table 3: d -edges e_1, e_2, e_3 , all copies of vw , and their blossom parameters; $u = w$.

Table 2 shows type s classifications of three edges, all of which are copies of the same edge vw with $r(vw) = 2$. $\text{make_edge}(e_2)$ is executed after $\text{make_edge}(e_1)$ and so e_2 is classified after e_1 , as illustrated in states 1–2. e_3 is classified later still, in state 3. At this point all three edges have different classifications. In state 4, e_1 gets reclassified (as noted in the last column of the table). The algorithm also examines e_2 , detects it as a copy of e_1 with greater cost, and so permanently discards e_2 . e_3 is not reclassified at this point. Further details of this scenario are given below in Example 2. Table 3 gives a similar executions for three d -edges vw .

We call the values specified in Table 1 (specifically the edge type, blossoms A_v and A_w , r , and u) the *type parameters* of the classification. At a given point in the algorithm, an edge $e = vw \in \mathcal{E}$ will have two pairs of blossoms that are of interest: the edge’s current type parameters A_v and A_w , and the current blossoms B_v and B_w . Clearly $A_v \subseteq B_v$ and $A_w \subseteq B_w$.

As mentioned above a merge making $B_v = B_w$ increases $r(B_u)$ to r or more. The following proposition makes this precise.

Proposition 3.1 *Let $e = vw$ have type parameters A_v, A_w, r, u .*

- (i) $r > r(A_u)$.
- (ii) A blossom Z containing v and w has $r(Z) \geq r$.

Proof: (i) An l -edge has $r = r(e) > r(A_v)$ and $v = u$. An s -edge has $r \geq r(A_v) + 1$ and $v = u$. A d -edge has $r = r(A_v) > r(A_w)$ and $w = u$.

(ii) Suppose e is an l -edge. Z contains the path from v to w so $|Z| > d(v) - d(w) \geq 2^{r(e)} = 2^r$. Thus $r(Z) \geq r$.

If e is a d -edge then $A_v \subseteq Z$. So $r(Z) \geq r(A_v) = r$.

If e is an s -edge then $A_v, A_w \subseteq Z$ and $r(A_w) \geq r(A_v)$ imply $|Z| \geq |A_v| + |A_w| \geq \max\{2^{r(A_v)+1}, 2^{r(A_w)}\}$. So $r(Z) \geq r$. □

A crucial property for the accounting scheme is that the s and d edges are limited in number. To make this precise recall that the vertices of a blossom form a subtree of the supporting tree, so we can refer to a blossom’s root vertex. (This differs from the notion of base vertex. For instance recall that a tree-merging blossom needn’t be a complete blossom of Edmonds’ algorithm.) For

any blossom B define $stem(B)$ to consist of the first $2|B|$ ancestors of the root of B (or as many of these ancestors that exist).

Proposition 3.2 *Let $e = vw$ where a blossom B contains v but not w and $r(e) \leq r(B)$. Then $w \in stem(B)$.*

Remark: The proposition shows an s or d edge $e = vw$ has $w \in stem(A_v)$, since the definition of Table 1 has $r(e) \leq r(A_v)$.

Proof: Let $r = r(B)$. Thus $2^r \leq |B|$. Since $r(e) \leq r$, $d(v) - d(w) < 2^{r+1} \leq 2|B|$. Rearranging to $d(v) - 2|B| < d(w)$ puts w in the stem of B . \square

Let \mathcal{M} be the set of all blossoms B formed in the algorithm that are rank-maximal, i.e., B is not properly contained in any blossom of the same rank. A given vertex belongs to at most $\log n$ such rank-maximal blossoms. Thus $\sum_{B \in \mathcal{M}} |B| \leq n \log n$. Our plan for achieving the desired time bound involves using the proposition to charge each blossom $B \in \mathcal{M}$ $O(1)$ time for each vertex in $stem(B)$. The total of all such charges is $O(n \log n)$ and so is within our time bound.

The data structure We describe the entire data structure as well as its motivation.

Each current blossom B has $\leq \log n$ lists of edges designated as $packet(B, r)$ for $r \in [r(B) + 1.. \log n]$. $packet(B, r)$ consists of edges whose classification parameters u, r have $A_u \subseteq B$ and r matching the packet index. As motivation note all these edges are similar in the sense of producing the same rank increase (Proposition 3.1(ii)). This allows the edges of a packet to be processed as a single group rather than individually.⁵

Each $packet(B, r)$ is implemented as a ring, i.e., a circularly linked list. This allows two packets to be concatenated in $O(1)$ time. A header records the packet rank r and $smallest(B, r)$, the edge of smallest cost in the packet.

The packets of blossom B are stored in a list in arbitrary order, i.e., they are not sorted on r . Also if $packet(B, r)$ currently contains no edges, its header is omitted. These two rules limit the space for the algorithm to $O(m)$. For graphs with $m = \Omega(n \log n)$ an alternate organization is possible: Each current blossom has an array of $\log n$ pointers to its packets.⁶

Each current blossom B has an additional list $loose(B)$. It consists of all edges classified with $A_u = B$ but not yet in a packet of B . This list is a “waiting area” for edges to be added to a packet. It allows us to omit the array of pointers to packets mentioned above. $loose(B)$ is a linked list.

The value $smallest(B)$ is maintained as the minimum cost edge in one of B ’s lists (i.e., a B -packet or $loose(B)$).

A Fibonacci heap \mathcal{H} stores the values $smallest(B)$ for every current blossom B . It is convenient to do lazy deletions in \mathcal{H} : An operation $merge(A, B)$, which replaces blossoms A and B by the combined blossom C , marks the entries for A and B in \mathcal{H} as deleted, and inserts a new entry for C . To do a min_edge operation we perform a Fibonacci heap $find_min$ in \mathcal{H} . If the minimum corresponds to a deleted blossom, that entry is deleted (using $delete_min$) and the procedure is repeated. Eventually we get the smallest key for a current blossom. Its edge is returned as the min_edge value.

⁵Our notion of packet is similar in spirit, but not detail, to the data structure of the same name in [18, 19].

⁶Various devices can be added to this approach to achieve linear space for all m . Such an organization is used in the conference version of this paper [15]. However our current approach is more uniform and simpler.

An auxiliary array $I[1..n]$ is used to perform a *gather* operation, defined as follows: We have a collection of c objects, each one having an associated index in $[1..n]$. We wish to gather together all objects with the same index. We accomplish this in time $O(c)$, by placing objects with index i in a list associated with $I[i]$. An auxiliary list of indices that have a nonempty list allows the lists to be collected when we are done, in $O(c)$ time. Gathering operations will be done to maintain packets in *merges*.

Finally each blossom B has a number of bookkeeping items: Its rank $r(B)$ is recorded. There is also a representation of the partition of \mathcal{O} into blossoms. A data structure for set-merging [36] can be used: The blossom-merging operation $merge(A, B)$ executes a set-merging operation $union(A, B)$ to construct the new blossom; for any vertex v , the set-merging operation $find(v)$ gives B_v , the blossom currently containing v .

For simplicity we will omit the obvious details associated with this bookkeeping. We can also ignore the time and space. For suppose we use a simple set-merging algorithm that does one *find* in $O(1)$ time, all *unions* in $O(n \log n)$ time, and uses $O(n)$ space (e.g., [1]). Clearly the space and the time for *unions* are within the desired bounds for Edmonds' algorithm; the time for *finds* can be associated with other operations. Hence we shall ignore this bookkeeping.

The algorithms We present the algorithms for tree-blossom-merging, verify their correctness, and prove the desired time bound $O(m + n \log n)$.

The algorithm maintains this invariant:

(I1) The set S of all edges in a *loose*-list or packet satisfies:

- (i) every edge of S joins 2 distinct blossoms;
- (ii) for every 2 blossoms joined by an edge of \mathcal{E} , S contains such a joining edge of smallest cost.

(I1) guarantees that for every blossom B , $smallest(B)$ is a minimum-cost edge joining B to another blossom. In proof, (ii) guarantees that such a minimum-cost edge belongs to some *loose*-list or packet of B . (i) guarantees that this edge gives the value of $smallest(B)$ (i.e., without (i) it is possible that the minimum-cost edge has both ends in the same blossom and so is not useful).

As mentioned min_edge is a Fibonacci heap $find_min$ in \mathcal{H} . This edge gives the next blossom step by the definition of $smallest(B)$ and invariant (I1). The total time for all *min_edges* is $O(n \log n)$, since there are $O(n)$ blossoms total and each can be deleted from \mathcal{H} .

$make_edge(vw)$ is implemented in a lazy fashion as follows: If $B_v = B_w$ then e is discarded. Otherwise we classify $e = vw$ as type l , s , or d , by computing $r(e), r(B_v)$ and $r(B_w)$, as well as vertex u and rank r , in time $O(1)$. e is added to $loose(B_u)$ and $smallest(B_u)$ is updated, with a possible *decrease_key* in \mathcal{H} . The time is $O(1)$ (amortized in the case of *decrease_key*). This time is charged to the creation of e .

We now present the algorithm for $merge(X, Y)$. It forms the new blossom Z . (Note that a given edge e_0 that is selected by the search algorithm for the next blossom step will cause one or more such *merge* operations. The *merge* algorithm, and its analysis, does not refer to e_0 .)

Let the set R_0 consist of all edges that must be reclassified because of the *merge*, i.e., the edges in packets of X or Y of rank $r \leq r(Z)$, and the edges in $loose(X)$ or $loose(Y)$. The edges of R_0 are pruned to eliminate redundancies, i.e., we ensure that at most one such edge joins Z to any blossom $B \neq Z$. This is done with a gather operation using $I[1..n]$. Among all edges joining Z and a given blossom $B \neq Z$, only one of smallest cost is retained. Edges with both ends in Z are discarded. These actions preserve (I1).

Let R denote the set of remaining edges. We assign each edge of R to its appropriate packet or *loose*-list, and form the final packets of Z , as follows.

Take any edge $e = vw \in R$. Compute the new type of vw using $r(e), r(B_v)$ and $r(B_w)$. Two types of edges get added to *loose*-lists: An *s*-edge vw with $w \in Z$ gets added to $loose(B_v)$. As usual we also update $smallest(B_v)$, possibly doing *decrease_key*. Similarly a *d*-edge vw with $v \in Z$ gets added to $loose(B_w)$.

The other edges are added to packets of Z as follows. Use the subarray $I[r(Z) + 1.. \log n]$ in a gather operation. Specifically $I[r]$ gathers all individual edges that are r -promoters for Z and forms them into a list. It also gathers $packet(X, r)$ and $packet(Y, r)$, if they exist. These two packets are treated as lists, not examining the individual edges, so $O(1)$ time is spent adding them to the list $I(r)$. The final $I(r)$ is taken as the list for $packet(Z, r)$.

We complete $packet(Z, r)$ by computing $smallest(Z, r)$ from $smallest(X, r)$, $smallest(Y, r)$, and the costs of all its other edges. The smallest of all these values gives $smallest(Z)$. This value is inserted into \mathcal{H} . The *loose* list of Z is empty.

Example 2. The algorithm achieves the states given in Table 2 as follows.

State 1: $make_edge(e_1)$ is executed when $|B_v| = |B_w| = 4$, so the algorithm adds e_1 to $loose(B_v)$. A merge makes $|B_v| = 5$ and adds e_1 to $packet(B_v, 3)$.

State 2: $make_edge(e_2)$ is executed and merges increase $|B_w|$ to 16. A merge makes $|B_v| = 6$, transferring e_2 from $loose(B_v)$ to $packet(B_v, 4)$.

State 3: Achieved similar to state 2, with $|B_w|$ increasing to 32 and then $|B_v|$ increasing to 7.

State 4: Merges increase $|B_w|$ to 64. A merge makes $|B_v| = 16$, so the edges in the rank 3 and rank 4 packets of B_v are added to R_0 . e_2 is discarded by the gather operation and e_3 is added to $packet(B_v, 6)$.

Table 3 is similar. $|B_w|$ starts as 4 and increases to 5 (giving state 1), then 6 (state 2), then 7 (state 3). When $|B_w|$ increases to 8 edges e_1 and e_2 are added to R_0 , e_2 is discarded and e_1 is added to the rank 6 packet (state 4).

For correctness of this algorithm observe that Proposition 3.1(i) shows the new packet assigned to an edge of R actually exists. To show invariant (I1i) for Z consider the edges in packets of Z that are not examined individually, i.e., edges e in a packet of X or Y of rank $r > r(Z)$. Proposition 3.1(ii) shows a blossom containing both ends of e has rank $\geq r > r(Z)$. Thus e satisfies (I1i).

The time for *merge* is $O(\log n)$ plus $O(1)$ for each edge added to R_0 . The first term amounts to $O(n \log n)$ for the entire algorithm (there are $\leq n$ merges).

We account for the second term in two ways. The first is to charge time to blossoms, via their stems. To do this recall that an *s*- or *d*-edge vw has $w \in stem(B_v)$ (for the current blossom B_v containing v ; Proposition 3.2). We will charge the stems of blossoms $B \in \mathcal{M}$. To do this it is important to verify that that e is the only edge from B to w making the charge.

The second accounting mechanism is a system of credits. It pays for reclassifications that involve *loose* lists. As motivation note that successive merges may move an edge $e = vw$ from $loose(B_w)$ to a packet of B_w to $loose(B_v)$ to a packet of B_v ; credits will pay for these moves. Define a credit to account for $O(1)$ units of processing time, specifically the time to process an edge $e \in R_0$. Credits are maintained according to this invariant (I2):

- (I2i) An l - or s -edge in a *loose* list has 1 credit.
- (I2ii) A d -edge in a packet has 2 credits.
- (I2iii) A d -edge in a *loose* list has 3 credits.

Lemma 3.3 *The time spent on all edges of R_0 in all merges is $O(m + n \log n)$.*

Proof: A *make_edge* operation adds e to the appropriate *loose* list with credits corresponding to (I2i) or (I2iii). Note this accounts for the case of e starting as an l -edge.

Now consider an edge $e = vw$ that belongs to R_0 in an operation *merge*(X, Y) which forms the new blossom Z . An edge $e \notin R$ pays for the $O(1)$ time spent processing e . This is acceptable since no future merge has $e \in R_0$.

We can now assume $e \in R$ starts as type s or d . Let e start out with classification parameters A_v, A_w, u, r . By symmetry assume X contains an end v or w of e .

If e starts out in a packet, i.e., *packet*(X, r), then $X \in \mathcal{M}$. In proof, the definition of X 's packets shows $r(X) < r$. Since the merge has $e \in R$, $r \leq r(Z)$. Combining gives $r(X) < r(Z)$, so X is rank-maximal.

Now consider the two possible types for e .

Case e starts as an s -edge: We consider two possibilities.

Subcase e starts in a packet: e is the unique edge of R that is directed to w . We charge the reclassification of e to $w \in \text{stem}(X)$. Clearly $X \in \mathcal{M}$ implies this is the only time the algorithm charges $w \in \text{stem}(X)$.

The charge to $w \in \text{stem}(X)$ is $O(1)$ time to account for the processing of e in this merge. In addition if e is added to *loose*(B_w) there is a charge of 3 credits which, given to e , establish (I2iii).

Subcase e starts in *loose*(X): (I2i) shows it has 1 credit. If e gets added to a packet the credit pays for the processing of e . Suppose e gets added to *loose*(B_w). Since e changes from s to d we have $r(A_v) \leq r(A_w) \leq r(B_w) < r(B_v)$. Note $A_v = X$, $B_v = Z$. (The former holds since in general, an edge in a list *loose*(B) is in R_0 in the first merge involving B .) So $r(X) < r(Z)$. Thus $X \in \mathcal{M}$. So we can charge $w \in \text{Stem}(X)$ as in the previous subcase.

Case e starts as a d -edge:

Subcase e starts in a packet: e is the only edge of R directed from B_v to w . Let A_v^+ be the smallest blossom of \mathcal{M} that contains A_v . We charge the reclassification of e to $w \in \text{stem}(A_v^+)$. The reclassification has $r(Z) \geq r = r(A_v)$. So future blossoms B_w have $r(B_w) \geq r(A_v)$, and these blossoms will not have a packet of rank $r(A_v) = r(A_v^+)$. Thus this case for w and A_v^+ will never hold again. So this is the only charge the algorithm makes to $w \in \text{stem}(A_v^+)$. (Note A_v need not be rank-maximal, we might even have $A_v = B_v \subset A_v^+$.)

The charge is $O(1)$ time to account for the processing of e in this merge. In addition we charge 2 credits (1 credit) if e is added to a packet of Z (*loose*(B_v)) respectively.

Subcase e starts in *loose*(X): (I2iii) shows e has 3 credits. If e gets added to a packet 1 credit pays for the processing and the other 2 establish (I2ii). If e gets added to *loose*(B_v) we can discard 1 credit and still pay for the processing and (I2i). □

Example 3. In Table 3 the transfer of e_1 from the rank 3 packet to rank 6 is charged to $w \in \text{stem}(A_v^+)$. Here $A_v^+ \in \mathcal{M}$ is the rank 3 blossom corresponding to states 1 and 2. If a future merge

transfers e_3 from the rank 5 packet to a higher one, the time is charged to $w \in \text{stem}(A_v^+)$ where $A_v^+ \in \mathcal{M}$ is the rank 5 blossom of state 3.

In Table 2 the transfer of e_1 from the packet of rank 3 to rank 6 is charged to $w \in \text{stem}(A_v^+)$ where $A_v^+ \in \mathcal{M}$ is the rank 2 blossom corresponding to states 1–3. This merge increases $r(B_v)$ from 2 to 4. If a future merge transfers e_3 from the rank 5 packet to a higher one, the time is charged to $w \in \text{stem}(A_v^+)$ where $A_v^+ \in \mathcal{M}$ will have rank ≥ 4 .

Having analyzed the algorithms for *min_edge*, *make_edge*, and *merge*, we can conclude our tree-blossom-merging algorithm achieves the desired time bound:

Theorem 3.4 *The tree-blossom-merging problem can be solved in time $O(m + n \log n)$. □*

4 *b*-matching

This section presents a simple generalization of Edmonds’ algorithm to *b*-matching. The major difference from ordinary matching is that *b*-matchings allow 2 varieties of blossoms, which we call “light” (analogous to ordinary matching) and “heavy”. Our goal is an algorithm that is as similar to ordinary matching as possible, by minimizing the use of heavy blossoms. Heavy blossoms seem impossible to avoid but our algorithm keeps them “hidden”. Section 4.1 gives the basic properties of *b*-matching blossoms. Section 4.2 presents the generalized algorithm and shows we can find a maximum *b*-matching in time $O(b(V)(m + n \log n))$. Section 4.4 extends the algorithm to achieve the strongly polynomial time bound $O(n \log n (m + n \log n))$, the same bound as known for bipartite graphs.

A degree constraint function b assigns a nonnegative integer to each vertex. We view *b*-matching as being defined on a multigraph. Every edge has an unlimited number of copies. In the context of a given *b*-matching, an edge of the given graph has an unlimited number of unmatched copies; the number of matched copies is specified by the *b*-matching. In a *partial b*-matching every vertex v has degree $\leq b(v)$. In a (*perfect*) *b*-matching every vertex v has degree exactly $b(v)$. Note that “*b*-matching” (unmodified) refers to a perfect *b*-matching, our main concern.

We use these multigraph conventions: Loops are allowed. A cycle is a connected degree 2 subgraph, be it a loop, 2 parallel edges, or an undirected graph cycle.

Contracting a subgraph does not add a loop at the contracted vertex (all internal edges including internal loops disappear). We will even contract subgraphs that just contain a loop. We use the following notation for contractions. Let \overline{G} be a graph derived from G by contracting a number of vertex-disjoint subgraphs. $V(\overline{G})$ denotes the vertex set of $G(\overline{G})$, respectively. A vertex of \overline{G} that belongs to V (i.e., it is not in a contracted subgraph) is an *atom*. We identify an edge of \overline{G} with its corresponding edge in G . Thus an edge of \overline{G} is denoted as xy , where x and y are V -vertices in distinct \overline{V} -vertices, and $xy \in E$. Let H be a subgraph of \overline{G} . The *preimage* of H is a subgraph of G consisting of the edges of H , plus the subgraphs whose contractions are vertices of H , plus the atoms of H . $\overline{V}(H)$ ($V(H)$) denotes the vertex set of H (the preimage of H), respectively. Similarly $\overline{E}(H)$ ($E(H)$) denotes the edge set of H (the preimage of H), respectively.

4.1 Blossoms

This section presents the basic properties of *b*-matching blossoms. We define blossoms in two steps, first specifying the topology, then specializing to “mature” blossoms which can have positive dual variables. We give a data structure for blossoms and show how blossoms are updated when the matching gets augmented.




Figure 4: An augmenting trail (a) and the augmented matching (b).

Unlike ordinary matching, contracted b -matching blossoms do not behave exactly like original vertices. For instance Fig.4(a) shows an augmenting trail – interchanging matched and unmatched edges along this (nonsimple) trail enlarges the matching to Fig.4(b). (As in all figures square vertices are free and heavy edges are matched. In Fig.4(b) one vertex remains free after the augment.) The triangle is a b -matching blossom (just like ordinary matching). In Fig.4(a) contracting this blossom gives a graph of 5 vertices that has no augmenting path. Contracted blossoms behave in a more general way than ordinary vertices.

When a blossom becomes “mature” it behaves just like a vertex – in fact a vertex with b -value 1 just like ordinary matching! It also behaves like an ordinary matching blossom in that its z -value can be positive (in contrast an immature blossom, e.g., the blossom of Fig.4, cannot have positive z).

We will define a blossom in terms of its topology – it is a subgraph that when contracted can behave like a vertex or like Fig.4. We will then specialize this notion to the case of mature blossoms. For completeness we give 2 versions of the topological definition (Definitions 4.1 and 4.2) the second one being more useful algorithmically. The first simpler definition is a type of ear decomposition.

Let G be a graph with a partial b -matching, i.e., every vertex v is on $\leq b(v)$ matched edges. A trail is *closed* if it starts and ends at the same vertex. A trail is *alternating* if for every 2 consecutive edges exactly one is matched. The first and last edges of a closed trail are not consecutive. Say that the M -type of an edge is M or $E - M$, according to the set that contains it. The following definition is illustrated in Fig.5.




Figure 5: Blossoms with base vertex β . (a) is light, (b) is heavy, (c) is heavy or light.

Definition 4.1 (Ear Blossom) A blossom is a subgraph of G recursively defined by two rules:

(a) A closed alternating trail of G is a blossom if it starts and ends with edges of the same M -type.

(b) In a graph derived from G by contracting a blossom α , let C be a closed alternating trail that starts and ends at α but has no other occurrence of α . The preimage of C in G is a blossom.

An example of (a) is a loop.

For uniformity we extend the notation of (b) to (a): C denotes the blossom's trail and α denotes its first vertex. The *base vertex* of a blossom is α in (a) and the base vertex of α in (b). Clearly the base is always in V . The base vertex of blossom B is denoted $\beta(B)$ (or β if B is clear). The M -type of B is the M -type of the starting and ending edges in (a), and the M -type of α in (b). It is convenient to call a blossom of M -type M *heavy* and M -type $E - M$ *light*.

Example 1. In Fig.5(a) the entire graph forms a closed alternating trail that starts and ends at β . It is a blossom with base vertex β , by part (a) of the definition. There is essentially no other way to view the graph as a blossom, since the two edges at β do not alternate.

In Fig.5(b) the unique closed alternating trail starting and ending at β is the triangle. So it is a minimal blossom. Contracting it to α gives a graph with a unique closed alternating trail that starts and ends at α . So the graph is a blossom with base vertex β . Again this is essentially the only way to parse this graph as a blossom.

Fig.5(c) is a light blossom with base β if we start the decomposition with the left triangle. Starting with the right triangle gives a heavy blossom based at β . No other blossom decomposition is possible.

Only light blossoms occur in ordinary matching, and they are the main type in b -matching. We note two instances of the definition that will not be treated as blossoms in the algorithm. Both instances are for a light blossom B . If $d(\beta, M) \leq b(\beta) - 2$ then (a) actually gives an augmenting trail. Secondly the definition allows $d(\beta, \gamma(V(B), M)) = b(\beta)$. This never holds in the algorithm – β is either on an edge of $\delta(V(B), M)$ or $d(\beta, M) < b(\beta)$.

Consider a blossom B with base vertex β . Similar to ordinary matching, each vertex $v \in V(B)$ has 2 associated $v\beta$ -trails in $E(B)$, $P_0(v, \beta)$ and $P_1(v, \beta)$, with even and odd lengths respectively. Both trails are alternating and both end with an edge whose M -type is that of B (unless the trail has no edges). The starting edge for $P_1(v, \beta)$ has the same M -type as B ; it has the opposite M -type for $P_0(v, \beta)$. As examples, $P_1(\beta, \beta)$ is the entire trail in (a). This trail could be a loop. $P_0(\beta, \beta)$ is always the trivial trail (β) . It is the only trivial P_i trail.

The recursive definitions of the P_i trails follow easily from Definition 4.1. We omit them since they are a special case of the P_i trails defined below.

We will use another definition of blossom that is oriented to the structures discovered in the algorithm. We always work in graphs \overline{G} where zero or more blossoms have been contracted. So a vertex of \overline{G} is an atom (defined at the start of the section) or a blossom.

Definition 4.2 (Algorithmic Blossom) Let \overline{G} be a graph derived from G by contracting a family \mathcal{A} of zero or more vertex-disjoint blossoms. Let C be a closed trail in \overline{G} that starts and ends at a vertex $\alpha \in \overline{V}(G)$. The preimage of C is a blossom B with base vertex $\beta(B)$ if C has the following properties:

If α is an atom then C starts and ends with edges of the same M -type. B has this M -type and $\beta(B) = \alpha$.

If $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ then B has the same M -type as α and $\beta(B) = \beta(\alpha)$.

Lemma 4.1 *The ear blossoms and algorithmic blossoms are equivalent families. More precisely every ear blossom is an algorithmic blossom. Every algorithmic blossom has an equivalent ear blossom.*

Proof: Clearly we need only establish the second assertion. So consider an algorithmic blossom B . Let \mathcal{A}, C , and α be as in the definition. We prove that B has an equivalent ear blossom using by induction on $\mu(B)$. The base case $\mu(B) = 0$ corresponds directly to Definition 4.1.

Take any algorithmic blossom $A \in \mathcal{A} - \alpha$. Let e be an edge of $\delta(\beta(A), C)$ with opposite M-type from A , let f be the other edge of $\delta(A, C)$, and let v be the end of f in $V(A)$. (If there are two possibilities for e choose arbitrarily.)

Case $v = \alpha(A)$ and e and f have the same M-type: So $v = \beta(A)$. In C replace the contracted blossom A by $C(A)$. This gives an algorithmic blossom B_1 equivalent to B . Since $\mu(B_1) < \mu(B)$ induction shows B_1 has an equivalent ear blossom. This is the desired ear blossom equivalent to B .

Case $v = \alpha(A)$ and e and f alternate, or $\{v\} \subset \alpha(A)$: In C replace A by $\alpha(A)$. In both cases this gives an algorithmic blossom B_1 . Since $\mu(B_1) < \mu(B)$ it has an equivalent ear blossom E_1 . Contract it to \overline{E}_1 . The closed trail consisting of \overline{E}_1 and $C(A)$ is an algorithmic blossom with μ -value $< \mu(B)$. (This motivates the definition of μ : Inducting on $|\mathcal{A}^*|$ can fail here.) By induction it has an equivalent ear blossom E_2 . E_2 is the desired ear blossom equivalent to B .

Case $v \notin \alpha(A)$: Choose an occurrence of v in $C(A)$. There is a corresponding partition of $C(A)$ into 2 $v\alpha(A)$ -trails, one starting with a matched edge, the other unmatched. Let P be the trail whose starting edge alternates with f , and let Q be the other trail. Replacing the contraction of A by P in C gives another alternating trail. This gives an algorithmic blossom, with an equivalent ear blossom E_1 . Contract E_1 to a vertex \overline{E}_1 . We will form an algorithmic blossom equivalent to B by adding Q as follows. Let Q_1 be the subtrail of Q starting with its first edge and ending with the first edge that enters E_1 . Q_1 , which starts and ends with vertex \overline{E}_1 , is the closed trail of an algorithmic blossom. It has an equivalent ear blossom E_2 . If $V(Q - Q_1) \subseteq V(E_2)$ then E_2 is the desired ear blossom equivalent to B . Otherwise continue in the same manner, defining Q_2 as the subtrail of $Q - Q_1$ starting with the first edge that leaves E_2 and ending with the first edge that enters it. Eventually Q is exhausted and we get the desired ear blossom. \square

From now on we only use algorithmic blossoms. Our next step is to show that the P_i trails defined above exist in these blossoms. Observe that the definition of P_i implies that for a blossom B with edge $f \in \delta(B)$ and v the end of f in B , $P_i(v, \beta(B))$ alternates with f iff

$$(4.1) \quad i = \begin{cases} 0 & f \text{ and } B \text{ have the same M-type} \\ 1 & f \text{ and } B \text{ have opposite M-types.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly any trail $P_i(v, \beta(B))$ is required to contain at least one edge unless $i = 0$ and $v = \beta(B)$. We shall define $P_0(\beta(B), \beta(B))$ to be the trail of no edges ($\beta(B)$). (Indeed it is the only possibility for this trail in blossoms where all edges incident to $\beta(B)$ have the same M-type.) This choice satisfies (4.1) vacuously.

We shall use the following property of the P_i trails: If f alternates with $P_i(v, \beta(B))$ as in (4.1), and $e \in \delta(\beta(B))$ is of opposite M-type from B , then $f, P_i(v, \beta(B)), e$ is an alternating trail. This is obvious for all cases, even when $P_i(v, \beta(B))$ has no edges.

Lemma 4.2 *Trails $P_i(v, \beta)$, $i = 0, 1$ always exist (in an algorithmic blossom).*

Proof: The overall argument is by induction on $|V(B)|$. Consider two possibilities for v .

Case v is an atom: We will first specify \overline{P} , the image of the desired trail $P_i(v, \beta)$ in \overline{G} . Then we will enlarge \overline{P} to $P_i(v, \beta)$ by specifying how it traverses the various blossoms of \mathcal{A} .

If $v = \alpha$ there is nothing to prove for $i = 0$ ($P_0(v, \beta) = (\beta)$). If $i = 1$ then \overline{P} is the entire trail C .

If $v \neq \alpha$ choose an arbitrary occurrence of v in C . The edges of C can be partitioned into 2 $v\alpha$ -trails in \overline{G} , one starting with a matched edge, the other unmatched. Choose \overline{P} from among these trails so its starting edge has the M -type of the desired trail $P_i(v, \beta)$.

To convert \overline{P} to the desired trail, for every contracted blossom \overline{A} in \overline{P} we will enlarge \overline{P} by adding a trail Q that traverses $V(A)$ correctly. To do this let e and f be the edges of \overline{P} incident to \overline{A} , with $e \in \delta(\beta(A))$ of opposite M -type from A . (If there are 2 possibilities for e choose arbitrarily. If $\overline{A} = \alpha$ then only f exists, since $v \notin \alpha$.) Let u be the end of f in $V(A)$. Let Q be the trail $P_j(u, \beta(A))$ of blossom A , with j chosen so the trail alternates with f at u , specifically (4.1) holds. (For example if $u = \beta(A)$ and f has M -type opposite from A then $Q = P_1(\beta(A), \beta(A))$.) By definition Q alternates with e at its other end $\beta(A)$. So Q (or its reverse) is the desired trail traversing $V(A)$. Enlarge \overline{P} with every such Q . Each \overline{A} occurs only once in B , so no edge is added to \overline{P} more than once, i.e., the final enlarged \overline{P} is a trail.

Case v is a vertex of blossom $A \in \mathcal{A}$: If $A = \alpha$ then $P_i(v, \beta)$ for blossom B is that trail as defined for blossom A .

If $A \neq \alpha$ we construct the desired trail as the concatenation of two trails,

$$(4.2) \quad P_i(v, \beta) = P_j(v, \beta(A))P_k(\beta(A), \beta).$$

Recall that a P_i trail is alternating with length congruent to $i \pmod{2}$. Apply the argument of the previous case (v atomic) to vertex $\beta(A)$, using the edge of $\delta(\beta(A), C)$ of opposite M -type from A as the starting edge. We get an alternating $\beta(A)\beta$ trail of length congruent to $k \pmod{2}$ for

$$k = \begin{cases} 0 & A \text{ and } B \text{ have the same } M\text{-type} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Use this trail as $P_k(\beta(A), \beta)$ in (4.2). Define

$$(4.3) \quad j = (k + i) \pmod{2}.$$

The trail $P_j(v, \beta(A))$ exists by induction. Using it in (4.2) gives an alternating $v\beta$ -trail. (Note the special case $v = \beta(A), j = 0, P_j(v, \beta(A)) = (v)$.) The trail's length is congruent to $j+k \equiv i \pmod{2}$. Hence it qualifies as $P_i(v, \beta)$. \square

Paths P_i are not simple in general. However it is easy to see the above proof implies any trail $P_i(v, \beta)$ passes through any $A \in \mathcal{A}^*$ at most once, and if so it traverses some trail $P_j(v, \beta(A))$, $v \in V(A)$ (possibly in the reverse direction).

The blossoms B in our algorithm have a bit more structure than Definition 4.2. (Most of the following properties are the same as ordinary matching.) As already mentioned a light blossom will always have $d(\beta, \gamma(V(B), M)) < b(\beta)$. (In contrast a general blossom may have $d(v, \gamma(V(B), M)) = b(v)$ for every $v \in V(B)$.) Furthermore $C = C(B)$ will always be a cycle. Thus P_i -trails have a path-like structure, more precisely: For any $v \in V(B)$, $P_i(v, \beta) \cap C$ is a path in \overline{G} (i.e., no repeated vertex) with one exception: When α is atomic (so $\alpha = \beta$), $P_1(\beta, \beta) \cap C$ repeats vertex β . Repeated vertices present a difficulty for expanding a blossom – an expanded blossom must be replaced in the search forest $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ by a path, not a trail. The special structure of blossoms allows this to be done, as shown in the Section 4.2.

Augmenting trails




Figure 7: Rematching a trail.

The algorithm enlarges a b -matching using a generalization of the augmenting paths of ordinary matching. Throughout this subsection let M be a partial b -matching. An *augmenting trail* for M is an alternating trail A such that $M \oplus A$ is a b -matching with one more edge than M . To *augment* M we replace it by $M \oplus A$. Our algorithm finds augmenting trails in blossoms as follows.

A vertex $v \in V(G)$ is *free* if $d(v, M) \leq b(v) - 1$. Consider a multiset $\{v, v'\}$ of two free vertices, where $v = v'$ only if $d(v, M) \leq b(v) - 2$. We will specify an augmenting trail with ends v and v' . Start by creating an artificial vertex ε . Add an artificial matched edge from ε to each of v, v' . (So $v = v'$ implies the 2 matched edges are parallel.) An *augmenting blossom* for v, v' is a blossom AB with base vertex ε ; furthermore each of v, v' is either an atom or the base of a light blossom in $A(AB)$.

The corresponding augmenting trail A is $P_0(v, \varepsilon)$ with its last edge (ε, v') deleted. Clearly A is an alternating vv' -trail. The two possibilities for each end v, v' both ensure the first and last edges of A are unmatched, i.e., $M \oplus A$ is a valid partial b -matching with greater cardinality than M . An *augment step* starts with an augmenting blossom and replaces rematches the trail $P_0(v, \varepsilon)$ as above.

This definition allows an end v with $d(v, M) \leq b(v) - 2$ to be the base of a light blossom B . In this case B itself gives an augmenting blossom and there is no need for a larger blossom AB . Our algorithm will always use B , not a larger blossom.

In Fig.7 an augment rematches the trail $P_0(v, \beta)$ through blossom B . Blossom A changes from light to heavy while B remains light. The next lemma shows that in general blossoms are preserved by the rematching of an augment step.

Lemma 4.3 *Consider a graph with partial b -matching M . Let B be a blossom (not necessarily maximal) with base vertex β . Suppose a trail $P_i(v, \beta)$ through B ($v \in V(B)$) is rematched. The new matching $M' = M \oplus P_i(v, \beta)$ has a blossom B' with the same subgraph as B and base vertex $\beta(B') = v$. The M -type of B' is that of the first edge of $P_i(v, \beta)$ in M' , unless $M' = M$.*

Remarks: $M' = M$ only for the trail $P_0(\beta, \beta)$. Obviously B' is identical to B in this case.

Also note that the lemma implies B and B' have the same M -type for $i = 0$ (since $P_0(v, \beta)$ begins with an edge of opposite M -type from B). Similarly B and B' have the opposite M -types for $i = 1$.

Proof: By induction assume the lemma holds for blossoms smaller than B .

We will use the following notation. $C(B)$ contains its end vertex α and a vertex ζ that is either the atom v or a blossom containing v . We will show the new blossom B' has $\alpha(B') = \zeta$. Thus α is an interior vertex of $C(B')$, unless $\zeta = \alpha$. The other vertices of $C(B)$ remain interior vertices in $C(B')$.

For the main argument consider a vertex $x \in V(\overline{G})$ on $C(B)$. Assume x is on the portion of $C(B)$ that gets rematched else there is nothing to prove. We will show that in M' , x satisfies all the relevant conditions in Definition 4.2 for B' as well as the relevant conditions of the lemma.

First suppose x is an atom. Consider an occurrence of x in $C(B)$. Two edges e, f are associated with this occurrence – e and f are either consecutive in $C(B)$ or the two ends of $C(B)$ when $x = \beta$. The following two cases refer to the role x plays in this occurrence.

Case $x = \beta$:

Subcase $x = v$: If $P_0(\beta, \beta)$ gets rematched then nothing changes in B . If $P_1(\beta, \beta)$ gets rematched then B' has the M-type of the rematched e and f . In both cases $x = \beta(B')$ and all claims of the lemma hold.

Subcase $x \neq v$: e and f have the same M-type in M . Since $\beta = x \neq v$, $P_i(v, \beta)$ contains exactly one of e, f . So these edges alternate in M' .

Case $x \neq \beta$: e and f alternate in M . If $x \neq v$ then both edges are in $P_i(v, \beta)$ and so they alternate in M' .

The remaining case is $x = v$. Exactly one edge of the pair e, f is on $P_i(v, \beta)$, say e . So e gets rematched but f does not. Thus e and f have the same M-type in M' , x is the base of the blossom B' , and its M-type is that of the rematched e .

Now assume x is a contracted blossom. The inductive assumption shows x is a blossom in M' , call it x' .

Case $x \neq \zeta$: Let $P_i(v, \beta)$ traverse x along the trail $P_j(u, \beta(x))$. So there is an edge $f \in C(B) \cap P_i(v, \beta)$ ending at u , where j and f satisfy (4.1).

First suppose $P_j(u, \beta(x))$ has at least one edge of x . Its first edge e has opposite M-type from f . The inductive assertion shows x' has M-type that of the rematched e , which is opposite that of the rematched f . Since f is incident to $u = \beta(x')$ Definition 4.2 is satisfied for x' .

In the remaining case no edge of subgraph x is rematched, i.e., f is incident to $u = \beta(x')$ and has the same M-type as x (in this case (4.1) gives the trail $P_0(\beta(x'), \beta(x'))$). The rematched f has opposite M-type from $x = x'$. As before Definition 4.2 is satisfied for x' .

Case $x = \zeta$: This implies $x' = \alpha(B')$. Let e and f be the two edges of $C(B)$ incident to x . In B' there is no constraint on the M-types of e and f . B' has the same M-type as x' .

Suppose x contains an edge of $P_i(v, \beta)$. The inductive assertion for x shows B' has the M-type of the rematched first edge of $P_i(v, \beta)$.

Suppose x does not contain an edge of $P_i(v, \beta)$. Then $v = \beta(x)$ and $P_i(v, \beta)$ uses the trail $P_0(v, v)$ through x . If $x \neq \alpha$ then before rematching the first edge of $P_i(v, \beta)$ has opposite M-type from x . So after rematching this edge has the same M-type as $x = x'$, as claimed in the lemma. If $x = \alpha$ then no edge of B is rematched, and again the lemma holds. \square

Mature blossoms

We turn to the completeness property for blossoms. Like ordinary matching the linear programming z -values will be positive only on blossoms. However complementary slackness requires that a blossom B with $z(B) > 0$ has precisely one incident matched edge,

$$(4.4) \quad b(V(B)) = 2|\gamma(V(B), M)| + 1.$$

(This principle is reviewed in Appendix B.) For B a light blossom this matched edge will be incident to $\beta(B)$. (This is required by the definition of blossom if B is not maximal. More generally as previously mentioned our search algorithm always works with light blossoms that are either free or have this matched edge.) A heavy blossom B may have exactly one incident matched edge, but this is irrelevant in our algorithm. (Heavy blossoms created in a search are immediately absorbed into a light blossom (lines 1–2 of Fig. 8 and line 5 of Fig. 9). Heavy blossoms created in an augment as in Fig.7 are “hidden”, as shown below.) This motivates the following definition.

For any vertex v with $b(v) \geq 1$ define the function b_v by decreasing $b(v)$ by 1, keeping all other values the same. A blossom based at β is *mature* if $\gamma(V(B), M)$ is a b_β -matching.

Our search algorithm will extend a blossom to make it mature before any dual adjustment makes its z -value positive (see Lemma 4.9).

Now consider the transition from one search to the next. First consider an augment step. Blossoms with positive dual values must remain mature. This is guaranteed by the next lemma, illustrated by B in Fig.7 assuming it is mature.

Lemma 4.4 *Let B be a blossom B , not necessarily maximal. If B starts out light and mature and gets rematched in an augmentation, it remains light and mature.*

Proof: Let A be the augmenting trail and consider the trail $A' = A + (\varepsilon, v) + (\varepsilon, v')$. A' contains exactly two edges incident to B , at least one of which is incident to $\beta(B)$ and matched. (If B contains v then $v = \beta(B)$, since B is mature, so (ε, v) is the claimed edge. Similarly for v' .) Let f be the other edge. Since B is mature f is unmatched. Thus Lemma 4.3 shows the rematched blossom is light and mature. \square

Now consider the contracted graph \overline{G} immediately after the matching is augmented. Some maximal blossoms may be immature (discovery of the augmenting path prevents these blossoms from growing to maturity). Such immature blossoms B should be discarded. (The contracted blossom B is incident to > 1 matched edge and complicates the growth of a search tree, as discussed in Fig.10(a) below.) To discard B , we replace its contraction in the current graph \overline{G} by the atoms and contracted blossoms of $C(B)$ and their incident edges. So after augmenting the matching and before proceeding to the next search, the algorithm does the following *discard* step:

Repeatedly discard a maximal blossom unless it is light and mature.

At the end of the discard step every maximal blossom is light and mature (and still contracted). There can still be blossoms that are immature and/or heavy, like A and A' in Fig.7, but they are not maximal and so they are “hidden”, essentially irrelevant to the algorithm.

Data structure for blossoms

Blossoms are represented using a data structure similar to ordinary matching, with two new additions. First we review the previous data structure: Each maximal blossom B^* has a tree $T(B^*)$.

Every blossom $B \subseteq B^*$ has an interior node in $T(B^*)$; each vertex of $V(B)$ has a leaf. The children of an interior node B are the nodes for the vertices of $C(B)$ ordered as in that trail; there is only one node for $\alpha(B)$, even though it occurs both first and last in the trail. The children are doubly linked. Each link records the corresponding edge of $C(B)$, represented by its ends in $V(G)$. The tree $T(B^*)$ has parent pointers.

We add two new values to facilitate construction of the P_i trails: Each blossom B records its base vertex $\beta(B)$. Also any vertex $\beta \neq \beta(B^*)$ that is the base vertex of one or more blossoms B records an edge denoted $\eta(B)$. $\eta(B)$ is the edge incident to the base of B required by Definition 4.2. Specifically $\eta(B)$ is the edge of $\delta(\beta, C(A))$ of opposite M-type from B , for A the first ancestor of β where $\beta(A) \neq \beta$. (The notation $\eta(B)$ comes from our discussion of f -factors, Definition 5.1.)

As with ordinary matching this data structure has size $O(|V(B^*)|)$. The proof is similar: The leaves of $T(B^*)$ form the set $V(B^*)$. Any interior node has at least 2 children unless it is the parent of a leaf (i.e., it represents a loop blossom). So there are $\leq 2|V(B^*)|$ interior nodes. Note that for general blossoms B where atoms may occur multiple times in closed trails $C(B)$ this quantity is $|V(B^*)| = O(b(V))$. For our algorithm where atoms occur just once, $|V(B^*)| = O(n)$.

The M-type of a blossom B can be determined in $O(1)$ time: Any B with $\beta(B) \neq \beta(B^*)$ has M-type the opposite that of $\eta(B)$. More generally any B has M-type that of the two edges of $\delta(\beta(B), B_0)$, for B_0 the minimal blossom containing $\beta(B)$. These edges are found as the two edges incident to the node for the parent of leaf $\beta(B)$ in $T(B^*)$.

The P_i trails are computed by the algorithm for ordinary matching extended to allow two types of trails (P_0, P_1) and two types of blossoms (heavy and light). We will describe the extension, relying on the original description (Section 2.1) and its notation as much as possible. The extended routine to compute $P_i(x, \beta(B))$ uses the original 4 arguments plus the value $i \in \{0, 1\}$. As before let the blossoms/atoms on the trail $P_i(x, \beta(B)) \cap C(B)$ be $B_j, 0 \leq j \leq k$. We will describe the case $r = 0$ and $B_0 \neq B_k$. The other cases are similar.

As before we follow links starting at B_0 to get the desired edges of $C(B)$. The edge leaving B_0 is determined as follows: If B_0 is an atom, choose it to have opposite M-type from B iff $i = 0$. (Note the M-type of B is available using its base, the argument $\beta(B)$.) If B_0 is a blossom choose edge $\eta(B_0)$. The last blossom/atom B_k is determined as either the blossom with base vertex $\beta(B)$ or the atom $\beta(B)$.

If B_j is a blossom it engenders a recursive call (there is no such call for an atom). To specify it let the link traversal enter B_j on the link for edge e and leave it on f ($e = \emptyset$ for $j = 0$, $f = \emptyset$ for $j = k$). Define edges e', f' so $\{e', f'\} = \{e, f\}$ and $f' = \eta(B_j)$. (For $j = 0$, only define $f' = \eta(B_j)$.) For $j = k$ only define $e' = e$.) The recursive call for B_j finds the trail $P_{i'}(x', \beta(B_j))$ with reversal bit r' , where i', x' , and r' are determined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 i' &= \begin{cases} i & j = 0, B_0 \text{ and } B \text{ have the same M-type} \\ 1 - i & j = 0, B_0 \text{ and } B \text{ have opposite M-types} \\ 0 & e' \text{ and } B_j \text{ have the same M-type} \\ 1 & e' \text{ and } B_j \text{ have opposite M-types} \end{cases} \\
 x' &= \begin{cases} x & j = 0 \\ e' \cap V(B_j) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
 r' &= \begin{cases} 0 & j \in \{0, k\} \text{ or } f' = f \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
 \end{aligned}$$

As before the time for this procedure is $O(|V(B)|)$, which we have noted is $O(n)$ in our algorithm. As before this bound can be improved to the output size $O(|P_i(x, \beta(B))|)$ by careful path-tracing.

Specifically we augment the data structure so each edge $\eta(B)$ has a pointer to the corresponding link in $T(B^*)$. If x is the base vertex $\beta(B)$ of one or more blossoms B the path-tracing for x starts at the link for $\eta(B)$.

4.2 b -matching algorithm

The most important differences of the b -matching algorithm from ordinary matching are that the search forest need not alternate at outer blossoms, a blossom step may create 2 blossoms (to hide a heavy blossom), and the Expand Step is more involved (to keep the search forest acyclic). We begin with terminology for the algorithm.

\overline{G} denotes the graph with all blossoms contracted; \overline{E} denotes its edge set. \mathcal{S} denotes the search structure and $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ is that structure in \overline{G} . Recall that in b -matching a vertex of V is not a blossom, so each vertex of \overline{G} is an atom or a contracted blossom but not both. The notation B_x denotes the vertex of \overline{G} containing $x \in V$; if x is atomic then $B_x = x$. If $d(x, M) < b(x)$ then B_x is *free*. (If B_x is a blossom we shall see that $d(x, M) < b(x)$ implies x is the base vertex of B_x .) The roots of the forest $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ are the free atoms and free blossoms.

Let v be a node of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$. v is *inner* if it is joined to its parent by an unmatched edge. Otherwise (i.e., v is joined to its parent by a matched edge, or v is a search tree root) v is *outer*. We refrain from classifying vertices contained in a blossom. (A vertex in an outer blossom can function as both inner and outer, because of its P_i -trails.)

As before an edge is *tight* if it satisfies the LP complementary slackness conditions with equality (see Appendix B). Again as before we shall see that every matched edge is tight. The following notion identifies the edges that can be used to modify the search forest when they are tight. An edge $e = xy \in \overline{E} - \overline{\mathcal{S}}$ is *eligible for B_x* if any of the following conditions holds:

- x is an outer atom and $e \notin M$;
- B_x is an outer blossom;
- B_x is an inner node and $e \in M$.

The algorithm uses the following conventions:

M denotes the current matching on G .

For any edge e , e' denotes a new unmatched copy of e . e' always exists in b -matching.

For related nodes x, y in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ (i.e., one of x, y descends from the other) $\overline{\mathcal{S}}(x, y)$ denotes the $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ -path from x to y .

The algorithm is presented in Fig.8–9. The next three subsections clarify how it works as follows. First we give some simple remarks. Then we state the invariants of the algorithm (which are proved in the analysis). Lastly we give examples of the execution. These three subsections should be regarded as commentary – the formal proof of correctness and time bound is presented in Section 4.3.

Remarks The grow step adds only one edge, unlike ordinary matching. One reason is that an inner vertex may have an arbitrary number of children: The possibility of > 1 child comes from an inner atom on many matched edges. The possibility of no children arises when a new inner vertex has all its matched edges leading to vertices that are already outer.

A second reason comes from the definition of eligibility. It allows an outer vertex to have a child using a matched edge. So an outer vertex may have an arbitrary number of children, using matched or unmatched edges. This also shows that the search forest need not alternate the same way as ordinary matching.

In the blossom step the test $e \in \overline{E}$ is equivalent to the condition $B_x \neq B_y$ or $B_x = B_y$ is atomic. The second alternative allows a blossom whose circuit is a loop. This can occur for an atom that

```

make every free atom or blossom an (outer) root of  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ 
loop
  if  $\exists$  tight edge  $e = xy \in \bar{E}$  eligible for  $B_x$  with  $y \notin \mathcal{S}$  then
    /* grow step */
    add  $e, B_y$  to  $\mathcal{S}$ 
  else if  $\exists$  tight edge  $e = xy \in \bar{E}$ , eligible for both  $B_x$  and  $B_y$  then
    /* blossom step */
    if  $B_x$  and  $B_y$  are in different search trees then
      /*  $e$  plus the  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ -paths to  $B_x$  and  $B_y$  give an augmenting blossom  $B$  */
      augment  $M$  using  $B$ , and end the search
1    $\alpha \leftarrow$  the nca of  $B_x$  and  $B_y$  in  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ 
    $C \leftarrow$  the cycle  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}(\alpha, B_x), e, \bar{\mathcal{S}}(B_y, \alpha)$ 
   if  $\alpha$  is an inner node of  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$  then /*  $\alpha$  is atomic */
2   contract  $C$  to a heavy blossom /*  $C$  is the new  $B_x$  */
    $f \leftarrow$  the unmatched edge of  $\mathcal{S}$  incident to  $\alpha$ 
    $\alpha \leftarrow$  the outer node of  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$  on  $f$ 
    $C \leftarrow$  the closed cycle  $f, B_x, f'$ 
   if  $\alpha$  is atomic and  $d(\alpha, M) \leq b(\alpha) - 2$  then /*  $\alpha$  is a search tree root */
     augment  $M$  using blossom  $C$ , and end the search
3   contract  $C$  to an outer blossom /*  $C$  is the new  $B_x$  */
  else if  $\exists$  inner blossom  $B$  with  $z(B) = 0$  /*  $B$  is mature */ then
    /* expand step */
    define edges  $e \in \delta(B, \bar{\mathcal{S}} - M)$ ,  $f \in \delta(B, M)$  /*  $f$  needn't be in  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$  */
    let  $P_0$  be the trail  $e, P_0(v, \beta(B)), f$ , where  $v = e \cap V(B)$ ,  $\beta(B) = f \cap V(B)$ 
    remove  $B$  from  $\mathcal{S}$  /*  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$  is now invalid */
    Expand  $(B, e, f)$  /* enlarge  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$  by a path through  $B$  to  $f$  */
  else adjust duals

```

Figure 8: Pseudocode for a b -matching search.

Procedure Expand(B, e, f)

/ B: a blossom formed in a previous search, or an atom.*

B is a mature blossom in the initial invocation

but may later be immature

e: edge entering B, already in \overline{S}

f: edge leaving B

β : base vertex of B if B is a blossom

Expand enlarges \overline{S} by adding a path of edges of B that joins e to f

**/*

if *B a blossom with $z(B) > 0$ or B an atom* */* e & f alternate */* **then**

4 **make** *B a node of \overline{S}*

else if *B light and $e \in \delta(\beta, M)$* */* e.g., B light and P_0 contains $P_1(\beta, \beta)$ */* **then**

5 **make** *B an outer node of \overline{S}*

else if *$e, f \in \delta(\beta, E - M)$* **then**

/ B is heavy and P_0 contains trail $P_1(\beta, \beta)$ */*

let $e = u\beta$

let C be the length 2 cycle B_u, e, B, e', B_u

if *$d(u, M) \leq b(u) - 2$* */* u is a search tree root */* **then**

augment M along C and end the search

let B' be the blossom defined by $C(B') = C$

6 **replace** *e in \overline{S} by outer node B'*

else

7 **let** *$P = (e_1, B_1, e_2, B_2, \dots, e_k, B_k, e_{k+1})$ be the trail $E(P_0) \cap (C(B) \cup \{e, f\})$*

/ $e_1 = e, e_{k+1} = f, B_i$ a contracted blossom or an atom*

P is a path

**/*

for *$i = 1$ to k* **do**

if *$i > 1$* **then** *add e_i to \overline{S} ; Expand (B_i, e_i, e_{i+1})*

for every blossom B' of $C(B) - P$ **do**

repeatedly discard a maximal blossom in $V(B')$ unless it is light and mature

Figure 9: Expand(B, e, f) for b -matching blossoms B .

is either inner with a matched loop or outer with a tight loop. (Loop blossoms do not occur for blossoms B_x since our contraction operation discards loops.)

The contraction of line 3 creates an outer blossom that is light. When a heavy blossom is created in line 2 it gets absorbed in the light blossom of line 3. We shall see this is the only way a heavy blossom occurs in the search algorithm.

In the expand step note that edge f may or may not be in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ (as mentioned above for the grow step). This motivates the structure of $\text{Expand}(B, e, f)$, which assumes on entry that e is an edge of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ but makes no assumption on f . Also the trail P_0 is used for succinctness. An efficient implementation is described in the last subsection of Section 4.3.

If the duals are adjusted (last line of Fig.8) our assumption that the graph has a (perfect) b -matching guarantees the new duals allow further progress (i.e., a grow, blossom, or expand step can be done; this is proved in Lemma 4.11 and the discussion following it).

A tight edge xy with $B_x \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}$ is ignored by the algorithm in 2 cases: B_x an outer atom with $xy \in M$, and B_x inner with $xy \notin M$.

In procedure Expand the last case (starting at line 7) corresponds roughly to the expand step for ordinary matching. The purpose of the preceding cases is to eliminate repeated vertices in P_0 , which of course cannot be added to the search forest \mathcal{S} .

Invariants The first several invariants describe the topology of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$. As before say that $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ *alternates* at an $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ -node v if any edge to a child of v has opposite M -type from the edge to the parent of v ; if v is a root then any edge to a child is unmatched. We can treat a root v as in the general case by using an artificial vertex AV as its parent (as done for augmenting trails): AV has an artificial matched edge to each atomic root as well as the base vertex of each blossom root.

(I1) $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ alternates at any node that is not an outer blossom.

(I2) Let B be a maximal blossom with base vertex β . B is light.

If B is inner or not in \mathcal{S} then it is mature, and β is on a matched edge incident to B .

If B is outer then every vertex $x \in V(B)$ has $d(x, M) = b(x)$ unless B is a root of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$, $x = \beta$, and $d(x, M) = b(x) - 1$. If B is a nonroot of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ then β is on the matched edge leading to the parent of B .

(I3) For every blossom B (maximal or not) $C(B)$ is a cycle.

In detail (I1) means the following: Any child of an inner $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ -node is outer. Any child of an outer atom is inner (this includes the case of an atomic search tree root). A child of an outer blossom may be outer or inner. Note that the first of these properties implies the parent of an inner node is outer. Equivalently, $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ alternates at both ends of an unmatched edge in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$.

Note that (I2) holds for a blossom that is maximal at any point in time.

The remaining invariants deal with the dual variables. (The duals for b -matching are reviewed in Appendix B.)

(I4) An edge is tight if it is matched, or it is an edge of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$, or it is an edge of a contracted blossom.

(I5) A blossom with $z(B) > 0$ is light and mature.

Note that in (I5) blossom B need not be maximal.




Figure 10: Algorithm examples.

Examples *Grow Step:* In Fig.10(a) the triangular blossom B_x is inner. Its incident matched edge e leads to a node that is already outer. So unlike ordinary matching B_x has no corresponding grow step. B_x also illustrates the possibility of an expand step where the inner blossom is a leaf (unlike ordinary matching).

(I2) requires the inner blossom B_x to be mature. Suppose it was immature. A matched edge like f incident to B_x might exist. A grow step for f would be invalid, since \mathcal{S} does not contain an alternating trail from f to a free vertex. Requiring inner blossoms to be mature avoids this complication.

Blossom Step: In Fig.10(b) v is an outer vertex. An atomic v is the root of the alternating subtree of edges e, f, g, h . If v is a blossom a blossom step can be done for the matched copy of e , as well as the matched copy of g . The unmatched copy of h is necessarily tight so a blossom step can be done for it. These blossom steps illustrate how outer blossoms can be enlarged to become mature. (Edge e of Fig.10(g) illustrates another case.)

In Fig.10(c) the unmatched loop e may not be tight. If it becomes tight it forms an augmenting blossom if the free vertex v lacks at least 2 matched edges. The algorithm can repeatedly match copies of e as long as this condition holds. If eventually v lacks 1 matched edge another copy of e forms a light blossom.

Fig.10(d) shows a search tree when a blossom step for e is discovered. The triangle is made a heavy blossom. If v lacks at least two edges the matching is augmented as in Fig.10(e). The discard step then abandons the triangle blossom. (Edges f, f' show the blossom is immature.) If v lacks only one edge the light blossom A of Fig.10(f) is formed. This illustrates that the algorithm never creates heavy blossoms that are maximal.

In Fig.10(g) a blossom step creates the loop blossom B_x . Edge e is a matched copy of the search tree edge d . A blossom step may be done for e, B_x and y . (y is necessarily an atom because of d, e .) The unmatched edges f, f' give an augmenting trail or blossom as in Fig.10(e)–(f).

Expand Step: In Fig.10(h) blossom B is inner and mature. (As an example of how this occurs, blossom B and atom B_2 may be, respectively, blossom A of Fig.10(f) and its base vertex v . In Fig.10(f) blossom A gets positive z when duals are adjusted. An augment is done using an un-

matched edge of $\delta(v) \cap \delta(A)$, so A does not change. v is no longer free. A then becomes inner in a grow step from the free vertex w of Fig.10(h).) A dual adjustment makes $z(B) = 0$ and B is expanded. Line 7 generates two recursive calls, with arguments e, B_1, e_2 and e_2, B_2, f . The first recursive call either augments the matching as in Fig.10(e) or forms a blossom as in Fig.10(f). In the second case Fig.10(i) gives the result of the entire expand step.

Finally suppose in Fig.10(h) blossom B is not maximal: It is included in a blossom B_3 where $\alpha(B_3) = B$, $C(B_3)$ is a length 2 closed trail containing B and an atom x , with 2 copies of edge vx , say h and i where $h \in M$, $i \notin M$. The initial call to Expand issues one recursive call with arguments e, B, f . The rest of the expand step is as before. It results in Fig.10(i) with x no longer in a blossom. A grow step for x is now possible using the matched edge h . Such grow steps – involving vertices contained in a blossom that has been expanded – are not possible in ordinary matching. They motivate the structure of the grow step in Fig.8.

4.3 Analysis

The analysis is presented in three subsections. First we prove the invariants. Then we prove the algorithm is correct, adding some details about initialization and termination. Lastly we prove the desired time bound, adding some implementation details for dual variables.

Proof of invariants

We show that all the invariants are preserved by every step of the algorithm. The first four lemmas treat grow steps, blossom steps, augment steps, and expand steps, respectively. (The lemmas for the blossom step and the expand step assume any augment is done correctly; the augment step lemma treats the detailed augment and discard steps of Section 4.1.) Then we check dual adjustment. Many details are straightforward so we discuss just the most interesting and representative cases.

Lemma 4.5 *The grow step preserves all the invariants.*

Proof: We will verify the case $e \in M$ and B_y a blossom.

B_y starts out not in \mathcal{S} , so (I2) shows it is mature and β is on its unique incident matched edge. Thus (I2) holds when B_y becomes an outer blossom. (I4) shows e is tight, so adding it to $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ preserves (I4). (I3) and (I5) are unchanged. \square

Lemma 4.6 *The blossom step preserves all the invariants.*

Proof: We will verify the case of a blossom step that starts by making α in line 1 an outer node. Line 3 makes C an outer blossom. (The other cases are similar to this one.)

(I1) clearly holds trivially, as do (I4) and (I5). We check (I2), (I3), and the fact that C is a valid outer blossom, as follows:

(I3): C is the fundamental cycle of e in the forest $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$.

(I2): We check (I2) for the outer blossom C .

Case α is an atom: This makes α the base vertex β of the blossom C . To show C is light observe that at least one of the two edges of $\delta(\alpha, C)$ goes to a child of α . (I1) shows the edges at α alternate, so that edge is unmatched. Thus C is light.

Since α is outer, so is C . The test preceding line 3 ensures $d(x, M) \geq b(x) - 1$ for $x = \alpha = \beta$; $d(x, M) = b(x)$ for the remaining vertices of $V(C)$ since no atom or blossom of $C - \alpha$ is free. If α is a root of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ clearly it has $d(x, M) = b(x) - 1$. If α is not a root it gives the desired matched edge to the parent of C .

Case α is a blossom: (I2) shows α is light, so C is light. The other properties follow the atomic case.

C satisfies Definition 4.2 of a blossom: Note that α and C of the definition are the same as α and C of the algorithm. The conditions to verify are for the 3 types of vertices v of cycle C :

Case v is an atom and $v = \alpha$: An edge $e \in \delta(\alpha, C)$ either goes to a child of α or e is the blossom edge joining B_x and B_y . In both cases e is eligible for the outer atom α , so $e \notin M$. Thus the first and last edges of C have the same M-type.

Case v is an atom, $v \neq \alpha$: If $v \notin \{B_x, B_y\}$ then (I1) shows the 2 edges of $\delta(v, C)$ alternate. If $v \in \{B_x, B_y\}$ then one edge of $\delta(v, C)$ goes to its parent and the other is eligible for v . The two cases of eligibility for an atom show the edges of $\delta(v, C)$ alternate.

Case v is a contracted blossom: C is a cycle so $d(v, C) = 2$. The rest of the verification concerns the case $v \neq \alpha$. Let β be the base vertex of v . (I2) shows v is light, so we must show β is on a matched edge of C . If v is outer (I2) shows the matched edge f going to v 's parent is incident to β . Furthermore $f \in C$.

If v is inner first assume $v \notin \{B_x, B_y\}$. (I2) implies β is on a matched edge f going to v 's unique child, and $f \in C$. Now suppose $v \in \{B_x, B_y\}$. Edge e of the blossom step is eligible for v , so by definition $e \in M$. (I2) shows e is incident to β , so e is the desired matched edge for blossom v . \square

In the next two lemmas some invariants are explicitly violated during the execution of a step. However we only require that all the invariants are satisfied at the end of the step, assuming they hold at the start of the step.

Lemma 4.7 *The augment and discard steps preserve all the invariants.*

Proof: Consider the rematching of the augment step. It preserves (I5) by Lemma 4.4. (I4) holds since the rematching is done along the trail $P_0(v, \epsilon)$ of the augmenting blossom. (I3) is unchanged. (I1) becomes irrelevant after the rematching, since $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ is empty for the next search.

The rematching can violate (I2), since a maximal blossom that is incident to 2 matched edges on the augmenting trail becomes heavy. But this violation is only temporary since the discard step eliminates any maximal blossom that is not light and mature. Thus (I2) holds at the start of the next search. The discard preserves (I4), since (I5) shows no blossom with positive z is eliminated, and thus the set of tight edges does not change. \square

We turn to the expand step of Fig.8. Let $\text{Expand}(B, \dot{e}, \dot{f})$ denote the call made in the expand step. Recall that $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ is defined as a forest rooted at the free atoms and blossoms. When the expand step removes B from \mathcal{S} , this definition and (I1) will be violated if $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ has a nonempty subtree descending from \dot{f} . (Unlike ordinary matching this subtree needn't exist, e.g., Fig.10(a).)

To remedy this we modify (I1) to a condition (I1') defined as follows. Define $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$ to be the set of edges of the trail P_0 (defined in the expand step) that have been added to $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ so far. Say that a trail in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ has *permissible alternation* if it alternates at any node that is not an outer blossom.

(II') If on entry to $\text{Expand}(B, e, f)$ \overline{P} is a trail that has permissible alternation and has e as its last edge, then on exit $\overline{P} + f$ has permissible alternation and has f as its last edge.

Note that in general the exit trail \overline{P} is an extension of the entry trail. The exit condition does not mean that f belongs to \overline{P} .

Call $\text{Expand}(B, e, f)$ a *base case execution* if it executes line 4, 5, or 6 without recursing in line 7.

Claim: *If (II') holds for every base case execution of Expand then the expand step ends with \overline{P} having permissible alternation and joining \dot{e} to the end of f in $V(B)$.*

Remark: Note that if \dot{f} was an edge of \overline{S} at the start of the expand step, the claim implies \dot{f} and its descendants are once again connected to a root of \overline{S} .

Proof: Suppose $\text{Expand}(B, e, f)$ is a base case execution and $\text{Expand}(B, e', f')$ is the next base case execution. Observe that when $\text{Expand}(B, e', f')$ is entered f is the last edge added to \overline{S} and $e' = f$. This observation follows by a simple induction using the structure of the recursive calls when line 7 is executed. The observation implies that if the call to $\text{Expand}(B, e, f)$ satisfies the exit condition of (II') then the entry condition of (II') holds for $\text{Expand}(B, e', f')$.

The initial call $\text{Expand}(B, \dot{e}, \dot{f})$ starts with $\overline{P} = \dot{e}$. So stringing together all the base case executions shows that when $\text{Expand}(B, \dot{e}, \dot{f})$ exits, $\overline{P} + \dot{f}$ has permissible alternation and has \dot{f} as its last edge. This gives the claim. \diamond

Lemma 4.8 *The expand step preserves all the invariants.*

Proof: We examine the four possibilities for an execution of Expand , lines 4 – 7. We will show the three base cases satisfy (II') and also preserve invariants (I2)–(I5). In the recursive case line 7 we will verify that \overline{P} is a path, i.e., no repeated vertices. This will complete the verification of (II). (By definition \overline{S} is a forest and so it must be acyclic.)

Case line 4 is executed: First we show that e and f alternate (as in the comment). The test guarding line 4 ensures B is atomic or mature, by (I5). Line 4 is not executed in the initial call $\text{Expand}(B, \dot{e}, \dot{f})$. So the current invocation was made from line 7, as $\text{Expand}(B_i, e_i, e_{i+1})$ for some $i \leq k$. The rest of the argument switches to this parent invocation. We must show that e_i and e_{i+1} alternate when B_i is atomic or mature.

When $i \neq 1, k$, e_i and e_{i+1} are the edges of $\delta(B_i, C(B))$. The edges alternate for atomic B_i by the definition of blossom. For mature B_i we use that definition and the definition of maturity. When i is 1 or k (i.e., $e_i = e$ or $e_{i+1} = f$, or both) a similar inspection, using the definitions of P and P_0 , shows e_i and e_{i+1} alternate.

The alternation of e and f implies (II'). For (I2) a blossom B is light by (I5). The properties of (I2) for inner and outer B follow easily. (I3)–(I5) are unchanged.

Case line 5 is executed: $e \in M$ makes B outer. So (II') holds trivially for f and B . The other invariants hold trivially.

Case line 6 is executed: It is easy to see B' is a valid blossom. To establish (I2) first observe that B' is light: If u is atomic then $e \notin M$ makes B' light. If B_u is a contracted blossom it is light by (I2). So again B' is light.

Next observe B' is outer: e is unmatched and in $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ when (this invocation of) **Expand** starts. So B_u is outer by the permissible alternation of e . This makes B' outer. The other properties of (I2) as well as (I3)–(I5) follow easily. (I1') holds as in the previous case.

Case line 7 is executed: P is a path since (I3) implies the only P_i -trail that repeats a node of $C(B)$ is $P_1(\beta, \beta)$. Such blossoms B are processed in line 5 or line 6 (see the comments). So the recursive calls for line 7 keep $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ acyclic.

The discard step of this case ensures (I2). The remaining invariants hold by induction. \square

We turn to the dual adjustment step. The following lemma and its corollary describe $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ when duals are adjusted.

Lemma 4.9 *When duals are adjusted, $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ alternates at every node and every maximal blossom is light and mature.*

Proof: $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ alternates at every node when every blossom is mature. This follows from (I1) plus the observation that (I2) prohibits a mature outer blossom being joined to a child by a matched edge. (I2) also shows that every maximal blossom is light. Thus to prove the lemma we need only show that every maximal blossom is mature when duals are adjusted. (I2) shows this for inner and non- \mathcal{S} blossoms. So we need only consider outer blossoms.

Let B be an immature outer blossom. We will show that a grow or blossom step can be done for B . This proves the lemma, since duals are adjusted only when no such step can be done.

Let β be the base vertex of B . Let $f \in \delta(\beta, M)$ be the edge leading to the parent of B in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$; f is undefined if B is free. (I2) implies either B is free and every $x \in V(B)$ has $d(x, M) = b_\beta(x)$ or f exists and every $x \in V(B)$ has $d(x, M) = b(x)$. In both cases, B immature implies there is an edge $e = xy \in \delta(B, M - f)$ with $x \in V(B)$. Clearly e is tight.

Case $B_y \notin \overline{\mathcal{S}}$: Since B_x is an outer blossom, e is eligible for B_x . Thus a grow step can be done to add B_y to \mathcal{S} .

Case $B_y \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}$: Suppose B_y is inner. Then $e \notin \overline{\mathcal{S}}$. ($e \in \overline{\mathcal{S}} - f$ makes B_y a child of B_x , so B_y is outer.) As before e is eligible for B_x , and $e \in M$ shows it is eligible for B_y . So a blossom step can be done for e .

Suppose B_y is outer. Any matched edge is tight, so the unmatched copy e' of e is tight. $e' \notin M$ is eligible for both outer vertices B_x, B_y . So a blossom step can be done for e' . \square

In contrast to ordinary matching, duals may be adjusted with matched edges xy not in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ but incident to nodes of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$: x and y can be atoms with x inner and y outer. This possibility is governed by the following lemma.

Corollary 4.10 *When duals are adjusted, any matched edge incident to a node of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ joins an inner node to an outer node.*

Proof: Take $e = xy \in M$ with B_x a node of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$.

Case B_x is inner: Since no grow step can be done, $y \in \mathcal{S}$. If $e \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}$ it goes to a child of B_x , which is outer as desired. If $e \notin \overline{\mathcal{S}}$, since no blossom step can be done B_y is an outer atom, as desired.

Case B_x is outer: An unmatched copy e' of e is tight and not in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$. Since no grow step can be done for e' , $y \in \mathcal{S}$. Since no blossom step can be done for e' , B_y is inner, as claimed. \square

Let us check that the invariants are preserved when duals are adjusted. (I1)–(I3) are unaffected by the adjustment. For (I4)–(I5) recall the dual adjustment step (Fig.16 of Appendix B).

(I4): Edges of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ remain tight when duals are adjusted, by the alternation of the lemma. Matched edges incident to $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ remain tight, by the corollary. Edges in contracted blossoms remain tight by definition of the dual adjustment. Thus (I4) is preserved.

(I5): A dual adjustment only increases the duals of maximal blossoms (that are outer). So the lemma implies (I5) for the blossoms whose z value increases from 0 to positive.

We have shown the dual adjustment preserves all the invariants. Furthermore the dual variables continue to be valid, i.e., they are feasible for the b -matching linear program (reviewed in Appendix B). We have verified this for all cases except unmatched edges not in a blossom subgraph. This case follows by exactly the same argument as ordinary matching.

Termination, correctness, and initialization

As in ordinary matching each step of the algorithm makes progress – it either finds an augmenting path or modifies the graph in a way that the current search will not undo. (Each step creates a new node of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$. Obviously the number of new outer atoms, outer blossoms, or inner atoms is limited. The number of new inner blossoms is also limited – a given blossom from a previous search can become an inner blossom only once.) Thus the algorithm does not loop, it eventually halts.

Next we show the algorithm halts with a perfect matching. We prove this using the fact that the maximum size of a b -matching is

$$(4.5) \quad \min_{I \subseteq V} b(I) + \sum_C [b(C)/2]$$

where C ranges over all nontrivial connected components of $G - I$ (a component is trivial if it consists of one vertex x but no loop, i.e., $xx \notin E$) [34, Theorem 31.1]. In fact it is straightforward to see that the above quantity upper-bounds the size of a b -matching (a matched edge either contains a vertex of I or has both vertices in a component C). Our derivation gives an alternate proof that the bound is tight.

Consider a search that *fails*, i.e., no grow, blossom, or expand step is possible, and duals cannot be adjusted to remedy this.

Lemma 4.11 *In a failed search, any edge $e \in E$ incident to an \mathcal{S} -vertex is either spanned by a blossom or incident to an inner atom.*

Proof: A dual adjustment decreases the z -value of any inner blossom, and lowering it to 0 allows an expand step to be done. So there are no inner blossoms.

We can assume $e \notin M \cup \overline{\mathcal{S}}$ by using an unmatched copy. Let $e = uv$. If the lemma does not hold we can assume at least one of B_u, B_v is outer, say B_u . Furthermore either $B_v \notin \overline{\mathcal{S}}$ or B_v is outer with either $B_u \neq B_v$ or $B_u = B_v$ atomic (since e is not spanned by a blossom). Since no grow or blossom step can be done, e is not tight, in each of these cases. A dual adjustment decreases the y -value of any vertex in an outer node. So duals can be adjusted to make e tight. This makes

a grow or blossom step possible, contradiction. \square

Consider a failed search. Let I be the set of inner atoms. The lemma shows that deleting I gives a collection of connected components, each of which is either (a) an outer blossom, (b) an outer atom that has no loop, or (c) a set of non- \mathcal{S} vertices. (For (b) note that the existence of a loop ensures the vertex is in a blossom, by the lemma.) Corollary 4.10 shows no matched edge joins two vertices of I . Observe that

$$|M| = b(I) + \sum_C \lfloor b(C)/2 \rfloor$$

where the sum ranges over the components of type (a) or (c). (For (a) Lemma 4.9 shows the blossom is mature. For (c) note that the non- \mathcal{S} -vertices are perfectly matched, i.e., each $v \notin \mathcal{S}$ is on $b(v)$ matched edges leading to other non- \mathcal{S} -vertices.) This shows the upper bound (4.5) is tight. It also shows that our algorithm, executed on an arbitrary input graph, halts with a maximum cardinality b -matching.

When a perfect b -matching exists our algorithm finds such a matching of maximum weight. This follows simply from the LP formulation of maximum b -matching of Appendix B. The argument is the same as ordinary matching, so we just summarize it as follows.

The primal LP is satisfied by any (perfect) b -matching. The dual LP requires every edge to be dual-feasible, i.e.,

$$\widehat{yz}(e) = y(e) + z\{B : e \subseteq B\} \geq w(e).$$

The dual adjustment step enforces this. Complementary slackness requires tightness in the above inequality for every $e \in M$. Complementary slackness also requires every blossom with positive z to be mature. These two complementary slackness conditions are guaranteed by (I4) and (I5) respectively. We conclude the final b -matching has maximum weight, and our algorithm is correct. In fact the algorithm provides an alternate proof that the LP of Appendix B is a correct formulation of maximum b -matching.

As in ordinary matching, the algorithm can be advantageously initialized to use any information at hand. The initialization must specify a partial b -matching M , dual functions y, z , and a collection of blossoms \mathcal{B} . The requirements are that the duals must be feasible on every edge, tight on every edge of M or a blossom subgraph, and invariants (I2), (I3) and (I5) must hold. The simplest choice is a function y on vertices where $y(e) \geq w(e)$ for every edge e , $z \equiv 0$, $\mathcal{B} = \emptyset$, and M a partial b -matching consisting of tight edges. (Here and elsewhere $z \equiv 0$ means z is the function that is 0 everywhere.) This initialization is used in Section 4.4. A handy special case is when every vertex is assigned the same initial y -value. This gives the invariant that every free vertex has the same y -value, which is the minimum y -value. Using this initialization when the input graph does not have a perfect b -matching, our algorithm finds a *maximum cardinality maximum weight b -matching*, i.e., a partial b -matching that has the greatest number of edges possible, and subject to that constraint, has the greatest weight possible. This is shown in Appendix B, along with other maximum weight variants. Other choices for initialization allow various forms of sensitivity analysis to be accomplished in $O(1)$ searches after finding a maximum b -matching (as in ordinary matching).

Dual variables and efficiency analysis

The numerical computations of the algorithm are organized around a parameter Δ maintained as the total of all dual adjustment quantities δ in the current search. (δ is computed by the dual

adjustment algorithm of Fig.16, Appendix B.) We use Δ as an offset to compute dual variables as they change, and in a data structure to adjust duals and determine the next step to execute. The details are as follows.

The data structure records values $Y(v), Z(B)$ that are used to find the current value of any dual $y(v), z(B)$ ($v \in V, B$ a blossom) in $O(1)$ time. For example let v be a vertex currently in an outer node of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$, with Δ_0 the smallest value of Δ for which this is true, and $y_0(v)$ the value of $y(v)$ at that point. (Δ_0 may be less than the value of Δ when the current blossom B_v was formed.) Then

$$\begin{aligned} Y(v) &= y_0(v) + \Delta_0, \\ y(v) &= Y(v) - \Delta, \end{aligned}$$

since $y(v)$ decreases by δ in every dual adjustment where it is outer. Similarly a blossom B that is currently an outer node of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ has

$$\begin{aligned} Z(B) &= z_0(B) - 2\Delta_0, \\ z(B) &= Z(B) + 2\Delta, \end{aligned}$$

for Δ_0 the value of Δ when B became outer and $z_0(B)$ the value of $z(B)$ at that point. ($z_0(B)$ is the value of $z(B)$ at the start of the search if B was formed prior to that, or 0 if B was formed in the current search.) Modulo changes of sign, similar equations are used to compute $y(v)$ for v currently an inner atom and $z(B)$ for B currently a maximal inner blossom. Other y and z values are computed as described in Appendix C.

To adjust duals and determine the next step of the algorithm to be executed we use a Fibonacci heap \mathcal{F} . \mathcal{F} contains a node for each grow, blossom, and expand step that is a candidate for the next step to execute. The key of each such node is the (future) value of Δ when the step can be done. Specifically when a blossom B becomes inner in a grow or expand step, a node for expanding B is inserted in \mathcal{F} with key equal to the current value of Δ plus $z(B)/2$. (This node may get deleted before the expansion, in a blossom step.) Theorem 3.4 provides the node of \mathcal{F} for the next candidate blossom step. Gabow [14] gives an algorithm for future grow steps that uses total time $O(m\alpha(m, n))$. For completeness Appendix C gives a simpler algorithm for grow steps. It uses total time $O(m + n \log n)$ and so suffices for our purposes. The algorithm is also valid for a pointer machine.

The algorithms of Fig.8–9 use linear time. We use the data structure for blossoms of Section 4.1. Note that in the expand step of Fig.8 P_0 should not be computed:⁷ The path P in line 7 of Fig.9 is easily computed without P_0 by following appropriate links in the representation of $C(B)$. The details are as described for the procedure that computes P_i trails (given at the end of Section 4) except no recursive calls are made.

Blossom steps are implemented using the tree-blossom-merging algorithm of Section 3.1. This algorithm is unchanged from ordinary matching, assuming the supporting forest is maintained correctly. (A new case is that matched edges can cause blossom steps, and such edges may be incident to inner vertices. Such blossom steps are handled seamlessly by the tree-blossom merging algorithm. Alternatively they can be easily handled outside that algorithm, since matched edges are always tight.)

Now consider the supporting forest. We modify Definition 3.1 of the supporting forest, which uses the paths $P(x, \beta)$ of ordinary matching for inner blossoms B . The corresponding trail for

⁷The pseudocode uses P_0 to facilitate specification of P . Explicitly computing P_0 could lead to quadratic time when there is a nesting of blossoms that get expanded, i.e., we have $B = B_0 \supset B_1 \supset B_2 \supset \dots$ where each B_i becomes inner when B_{i-1} gets expanded.

b -matching is $P_0(x, \beta)$. To keep the supporting forest acyclic we modify this trail as follows. Let $P_0^-(x, \beta)$ be $P_0(x, \beta)$ with every maximal subtrail of the form $P_1(\beta(A), \beta(A))$ replaced by the vertex $\beta(A)$. We modify Definition 3.1 so that inner blossoms B use $P_0^-(x, \beta)$ as T_B rather than $P(x, \beta)$.

Note that an inner blossom B still has $\beta(B)$ a vertex of the supporting forest. This allows a blossom step for the matched edge incident to $\beta(B)$ to be handled correctly.

The algorithm for maintaining T is essentially unchanged for grow and blossom steps. For expand steps suppose **Expand** is executed for a blossom A which as above is represented only by the vertex $\beta(A)$. We cannot have $z(A) > 0$. (That would make A mature, by (I5). But maturity implies a subtrail $P_i(\beta(A), \beta(A))$ of $P_0(x, \beta)$ has $i = 0$, contradiction.) So line 5 or 6 is executed, making A a new outer vertex. $\beta(A)$ is already in the supporting tree, and the remaining vertices of A are added to T using *addLeaf* operations.

We conclude that our algorithm finds a maximum b -matching in total time $O(b(V)(m+n \log n))$.

4.4 Strongly polynomial algorithm

The algorithm easily extends to a strongly polynomial version. We follow previous approaches that use bipartite matching (i.e., network flow) to reduce the size of the problem solved on the given nonbipartite graph [3, 17, 34]. The high-level algorithm is as follows:

Set $b' = 2\lfloor b/2 \rfloor$. Let M be a maximum cardinality maximum weight b' -matching with corresponding optimal dual function y . Using M, y (and $z \equiv 0, \mathcal{B} = \emptyset$) as the initial solution, execute the b -matching algorithm of Section 4.2.

This is a straightforward combination of previous algorithms [3, 17, 34]. For completeness we give the analysis.

Correctness of this algorithm – that an optimum M, y actually exists – may not be immediately clear. We establish correctness below as part of the efficiency analysis.

Since we assume G has a perfect b -matching it has a partial b' -matching with $\geq \frac{b(V)}{2} - n$ edges. So our b -matching algorithm performs $\leq n$ augmentations. Thus the time for the entire algorithm is $O(n(m+n \log n))$ plus the time to find M, y . We will see the latter strictly dominates the time.

We find M, y as follows. Extend the given graph G to G^+ by adding a vertex s with $b'(s) = b'(V)$, edges $vs, v \in V$ of weight 0 and edge ss of weight $Wb'(s)$ for

$$W = \max\{1, |w(e)| : e \in E(G)\}.$$

It is easy to see there is a 1-1 correspondence between partial b' -matchings of G and (perfect) b' -matchings of G^+ , wherein a cardinality c partial matching corresponds to a perfect matching with c loops ss . Furthermore a maximum cardinality maximum weight b' -matching of G corresponds to a maximum b' -matching of G^+ . To verify this last assertion it suffices to show any b' -matching of G^+ with c loops ss , say M_c , weighs more than any such matching with $d < c$ loops, say M_d . This follows since the relation $b'(s)/2 \geq c \geq d + 1$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} w(M_c) &\geq (Wb'(s) - W)c \geq (Wb'(s)d + Wb'(s)) - Wb'(s)/2 \\ &= Wb'(s)d + Wb'(s)/2 > (Wb'(s) + W)d \geq w(M_d). \end{aligned}$$

We find a maximum b' -matching of G^+ by reducing to a bipartite graph BG . BG has vertex set $\{v_1, v_2 : v \in V(G^+)\}$, edge set $\{u_1v_2, u_2v_1 : uv \in E(G^+)\}$, and edge weights and degree constraints given respectively by

$$w(u_1v_2) = w(u_2v_1) = w(uv) \text{ and } b'(v_1) = b'(v_2) = b'(v)/2.$$

(Note s has even b' value. Also a loop uu of G^+ gives one edge u_1u_2 in BG .) Let x be a maximum b' -matching on BG with optimum dual function y (we show x and y exist below). Define a b' -matching M on G^+ by taking $x\{u_1v_2, u_2v_1\}$ copies of each edge $uv \in E(G^+)$ (by our summing convention this means a loop uu has $x(u_1u_2)$ copies). Define a dual function y by

$$(4.6) \quad y(v) = y\{v_1, v_2\}/2.$$

We will show that restricting M and y to G gives the optimum values desired for the main algorithm.

We first prove that the b' -matching x exists, and M is a maximum b' -matching on G^+ . These properties follow from the facts that

- (a) any b' -matching x on BG gives a b' -matching M on G^+ of the same weight;
- (b) any b' -matching M on G^+ gives a b' -matching x on BG of the same weight.

Recall that G^+ has a b' -matching. So (b) implies x exists. Also (a) is obvious from the above construction of M on G^+ . So we need only prove (b).

We prove (b) using the Euler tour technique: Let M be a b' -matching on G^+ . Since b' is even on G^+ , the edges of M form a collection of closed trails. Traverse each trail, and for each edge uv traversed from u to v match edge u_1v_2 . This applies to loops uu too. For each vertex v , the BG -matching has exactly $b'(v)/2$ edges incident to each of v_1, v_2 . Clearly we have the desired matching on BG .

Applying complementary slackness to the definition of the dual function for bipartite b -matching [34, Ch.21] we get that a b' -matching x on BG and a dual function y are both optimum iff

$$(4.7) \quad y(e) \geq w(e) \text{ for all edges } e \text{ of } BG, \text{ with equality when } x(e) > 0.$$

(Recall our summing convention means that if $e = uv$ then $y(e) = y(u) + y(v)$.) Thus for every edge $e = uv$ of G^+ ,

$$y(e) = (y(u_1) + y(u_2) + y(v_1) + y(v_2))/2 \geq (w(u_1v_2) + w(u_2v_1))/2 = w(e).$$

Furthermore equality holds for $e \in M$. This follows because the matching x on BG has a mirror image x' defined by $x'(a_1b_2) = x(b_1a_2)$. Thus $x(u_1v_2) > 0$ implies $y(u_1v_2) = w(e)$ as well as $y(v_1u_2) = w(e)$. This calculation remains valid when e is a loop uu (i.e., $u = v$). So the functions $y, 0$ are optimum duals for b' -matching on G^+ . Restricting M and y to G , and taking $z \equiv 0$, $\mathcal{B} = \emptyset$, gives permissible initial values for the b -matching algorithm of Section 4.2. (Recall the discussion of initialization at the end of Section 4.2.) We have proved the main algorithm is correct.

We find x, y on BG using an algorithm for minimum cost network flow. Specifically the problem on BG is a transportation problem, where x is an optimum integral solution and y is an optimum dual function [34, Ch.21]. The optimality conditions (4.7) are precisely those for the transportation problem (assuming the trivial sign flip to convert our maximum weight problem to a minimum cost problem). Orlin solves the transportation problem (more generally the transshipment problem) in time $O(n \log n(m + n \log n))$ [28]. It gives both x and y . Using this we obtain our strongly polynomial bound:

Theorem 4.12 *A maximum b -matching can be found in time $O(\min\{b(V), n \log n\}(m + n \log n))$.*
□

5 f -factors

The fundamental difference between f -factors and b -matching is illustrated in Fig.11, which shows a search structure for f -factors. Recall that f -factors are defined on arbitrary multigraphs – unlike

B shows the edge of opposite M-type from A exists. Note that $\eta(A) = \emptyset$ only if $\beta(A)$ is the base of a maximal blossom. Using \emptyset as a base edge is handy notation below, e.g., (5.1).

As before we abbreviate $\beta(B)$ to β when possible, and similarly for $\eta(B)$. *Heavy* and *light* blossoms are defined as before. In Fig.11 the 2 free loop blossoms have \emptyset base edges. B and B_1 are light blossoms and have base edge η_1 . In Fig.5(a) the triangle blossom has η arbitrarily chosen as one of 2 matched edges incident to its base; similarly the heavy blossom has η as one of the 2 unmatched edges incident to its base.

The family of blossoms \mathcal{A}^* constructing B is defined as before. The trails $P_i(v, \beta)$ for f -factor blossoms are the same as before. As before any trail $P_i(v, \beta(B))$ passes through any $A \in \mathcal{A}^*(B)$ at most once, and if so it traverses a trail $P_j(v, \beta(A))$, $v \in V(A)$ (possibly in the reverse direction).

Furthermore for such blossoms A , $\eta(A)$ is an edge in $P_i(v, \beta(B))$ unless $\beta(A) = \beta(B)$. To prove this we can assume A is a maximal blossom with base $\beta(A) \neq \beta(B)$. Let D be the blossom with $A \in \mathcal{A}(D)$ ($D \in \mathcal{A}^*(B) \cup \{B\}$). $P_i(v, \beta(B))$ traverses the blossom trail $C(D)$ on a subtrail, denoted \overline{P} in the proof of Lemma 4.2. For blossom A on \overline{P} with $A \neq \alpha(D)$, \overline{P} either contains both edges of $\delta(A, C(D))$ or, when A is the first vertex of \overline{P} , the edge of $\delta(\beta(A), C(D))$ of opposite M-type from A . Both alternatives have $\eta(A)$ in \overline{P} .

Mature blossoms

As in b -matching complementary slackness dictates the sets that may have positive dual variables, and we use this to define which blossoms are mature. Dual variables are associated with blossom/incident-edge-set pairs (see the review in Appendix B) but the blossoms must satisfy the following ‘‘completeness’’ property. A blossom B with base vertex β and base edge η is *mature* if

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{every } x \in V(B) - \beta \text{ has } d(x, M) = f(x), \text{ and furthermore,} \\ &\text{either } d(\beta, M) = f(\beta) \text{ and } \eta \text{ is an edge, or } d(\beta, M) = f(\beta) - 1 \text{ and } \eta = \emptyset. \end{aligned}$$

We shall see that in contrast to b -matching the algorithm never creates immature blossoms. Thus the f -factor algorithm does not use a discard step.

Augmenting trails

Augmenting trails, augmenting blossoms, and the augment step are defined exactly as in b -matching. Any blossom B on the augmenting trail, maximal or not, remains a blossom after rematching. Lemma 4.3 shows this except for exhibiting the base edges of blossoms. We define base edges for rematched blossoms as follows.

Let AT denote the augmenting trail $P_0(v, \varepsilon) - (v', \varepsilon)$. To be consistent with Lemma 4.3 we use primes to denote blossoms after rematching, e.g., B' is the rematched blossom B .

Lemma 5.1 *For any mature blossom B with $\delta(B, AT) \neq \emptyset$, $\eta(B')$ is the unique edge satisfying*

$$\delta(B, AT) - \eta(B) = \{\eta(B')\}.$$

Remark: The lemma applies to all blossoms of our algorithm since they are mature. The lemma also shows that after augmenting every blossom remains mature – even a free blossom that occurs at an end of AT .

Proof: For some $x \in V(B)$ let xx' be the edge of $\delta(B, AT) - \eta(B)$. To show this edge is uniquely defined first note the definition of AT implies $d(B, AT)$ is 1 or 2, so consider two cases: If $d(B, AT) =$

2 then $\eta(B) \in E(AT)$, by the definition of augmenting blossom. If $d(B, AT) = 1$ then B contains a free vertex v or v' so $\eta(B) = \emptyset$, by the definition of maturity. In both cases $\delta(B, AT) - \eta(B)$ has exactly 1 edge.

Next note that $AT = P_0(v, \varepsilon) - (v', \varepsilon)$ passes through B on a trail $P_j(x, \beta(B))$ (possibly in the reverse direction). Suppose $P_j(x, \beta(B))$ starts with an edge e . Lemma 4.3 shows $\beta(B') = x$ and the M-type of B' is that of the rematched e . This is the opposite of the M-type of the rematched xx' . So we can take $\eta(B') = xx'$.

The remaining possibility is that $P_j(x, \beta(B))$ has no edges. So $x = \beta(B)$ and $B' = B$. There are two possibilities.

Case B is not free: xx' alternates with $\eta(B)$. So the rematched xx' has the original M-type of $\eta(B)$. The M-type of B does not change so we can again take $\eta(B') = xx'$.

Case B is free: B is a light blossom (even if it is not maximal, by the definition of augmenting blossom). This makes xx' unmatched before rematching ($j = 0$). So the augment makes xx' matched and we can take $\eta(B') = xx'$. □

For any mature blossom B define

$$(5.1) \quad I(B) = \delta(B, M) \oplus \eta(B).$$

The algorithm will assign positive values to dual variables of blossom/incident-edge-set pairs of the form $B, I(B)$ (recall Appendix B). As an example note this is consistent with ordinary matching and b -matching: Duals are associated with blossoms only because any blossom has $I(B) = \emptyset$. The latter follows since $\eta(B)$ is either the unique matched edge incident to B , or \emptyset when this edge does not exist.

The following lemma will be used to show that an augment step maintains validity of the dual variables (see Lemma 5.6).

Lemma 5.2 *An augment step does not change $I(B)$ for any mature blossom B (maximal or not), i.e., $I(B) = I(B')$.*

Proof: Let M' be the augmented matching $M' = M \oplus AT$. Thus

$$\delta(B, M') = \delta(B, M) \oplus \delta(B, AT).$$

Lemma 5.1 shows

$$\{\eta(B')\} = \delta(B, AT) \oplus \eta(B).$$

By definition $I(B') = \delta(B, M') \oplus \eta(B')$. Substituting the displayed equations transforms this to $\delta(B, M) \oplus \eta(B) = I(B)$. □

Data structure for blossoms

The data structure is the one used in b -matching with one minor extension: The base edge $\eta(B)$ is stored even for maximal blossoms, if it exists. This edge is not needed in b -matching, but it is required for f -factors. For instance it defines $I(B)$ -sets (via (5.1)) which in turn defines the dual variables.

5.2 f -factor algorithm

Compared to b -matching an f -factor algorithm has more restrictions on grow and blossom steps, since edges have a limited number of copies. This necessitates assigning z dual variables to blossom/incident-edge-set pairs, and introduces the case of matched edges that are not tight. It also simplifies the algorithm by making matched and unmatched edges more symmetric. Similarly heavy blossoms are required in both the linear programming formulation and the algorithm.

We present both the search algorithm and the dual adjustment step – the latter differs enough from ordinary matching and b -matching to merit detailed discussion.

```

make every free atom or blossom an (outer) root of  $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ 
loop
  if  $\exists$  tight edge  $e = xy \in \overline{E}$  eligible for  $B_x$  with  $y \notin \mathcal{S}$  then
    /* grow step */
    add  $e, B_y$  to  $\mathcal{S}$ 
  else if  $\exists$  tight edge  $e = xy \in \overline{E}$  eligible for both  $B_x$  and  $B_y$  then
    /* blossom step */
    if  $B_x$  and  $B_y$  are in different search trees then
      /*  $e$  plus the  $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ -paths to  $B_x$  and  $B_y$  give an augmenting blossom  $B$  */
      augment  $M$  using  $B$  and end the search
       $\alpha \leftarrow$  the nca of  $B_x$  and  $B_y$  in  $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ 
    8  $C \leftarrow$  the cycle  $\overline{\mathcal{S}}(\alpha, B_x), e, \overline{\mathcal{S}}(B_y, \alpha)$ 
    if  $\alpha$  is atomic and  $d(\alpha, M) \leq f(\alpha) - 2$  then /*  $\alpha$  is a search tree root */
      augment  $M$  using blossom  $C$  and end the search
      contract  $C$  to an outer blossom with  $\eta(C) = \tau(\alpha)$  /*  $C$  is the new  $B_x$  */
    else if  $\exists$  inner blossom  $B$  with  $z(B) = 0$  then
      /* expand step */
      let  $e = \tau(B)$ ,  $f = \eta(B)$ ,  $v = e \cap V(B)$ ,  $\beta(B) = f \cap V(B)$ 
      let  $C_e$  be the subtrail of  $C(B)$  traversed by the alternating trail  $P_i(v, \beta(B))$ ,
        where  $i \in \{0, 1\}$  is chosen so  $P_i(v, \beta(B))$  alternates with  $e$  at  $v$ 
      if  $C_e = C(B)$  then make  $B$  an outer blossom by assigning  $\eta(B) \leftarrow e$ 
    9 else replace  $B$  by  $C_e$  /* the blossoms of  $C - C_e$  leave  $\mathcal{S}$  */
  else adjust duals

```

Figure 12: Pseudocode for an f -factor search.

The search algorithm is presented in Fig.12. The definitions of the contracted graph \overline{G} its edge set \overline{E} , the search structure \mathcal{S} , its contraction $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$, the B_x sets denoting blossoms or atoms, and free nodes are the same as b -matching. To define inner/outer classification let v be a node of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$. If v is not a search tree root let $\tau(v)$ be the edge to its parent.

Node v of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ is *outer* if any of the following conditions holds:

- v is a search tree root;
- v is an atom with $\tau(v) \in M$;
- v is a blossom with $\tau(v) = \eta(v)$.

Otherwise v is *inner*, i.e., $\tau(v)$ exists but either of the following holds:

- v is an atom with $\tau(v) \notin M$;
- v is a blossom with $\tau(v) \neq \eta(v)$.

In contrast with b -matching, an outer blossom can have $\tau(v) \notin M$ (i.e., when it is heavy) and an inner blossom can have $\tau(v) \in M$. These possibilities are illustrated by B_2 and B_3 respectively in Fig.11.

Eligibility is defined as follows. The motivation is to ensure that paths in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ have the same structure as trails in blossoms:

An edge $e = xy \in \overline{E} - \overline{\mathcal{S}}$ is *eligible* for B_x if any of the following conditions holds:

- x is an outer atom and $e \notin M$;
- x is an inner atom and $e \in M$;
- B_x is an outer blossom;
- B_x is an inner blossom and $e = \eta(B_x)$.

In the algorithm statement the current matching M and the paths $\overline{\mathcal{S}}(x, y)$ are as before.

```

 $\delta_1 \leftarrow \min\{|\widehat{yz}(e) - w(e)| : e = xy \in E \text{ eligible for } B_x \text{ with } y \notin \mathcal{S}\}$ 
 $\delta_2 \leftarrow \min\{|\widehat{yz}(e) - w(e)|/2 : e = xy \in \overline{E} \text{ eligible for both } B_x \text{ and } B_y\}$ 
 $\delta_3 \leftarrow \min\{z(B)/2 : B \text{ an inner blossom of } \overline{\mathcal{S}}\}$ 
 $\delta \leftarrow \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\}$ 
for every vertex  $v \in \mathcal{S}$  do
  if  $B_v$  is inner then  $y(v) \leftarrow y(v) + \delta$  else  $y(v) \leftarrow y(v) - \delta$ 
for every blossom  $B$  in  $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$  do
  if  $B$  is inner then  $z(B) \leftarrow z(B) - 2\delta$  else  $z(B) \leftarrow z(B) + 2\delta$ 

```

Figure 13: Dual adjustment step for f -factors.

We turn to the dual adjustment step, Fig.13. We first recall terminology explained in detail in Appendix B. Similar to b -matching the function $\widehat{yz} : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$(5.2) \quad \widehat{yz}(e) = y(e) + z\{B : e \in \gamma(B) \cup I(B)\}.$$

Say edge e is *dominated*, *tight*, or *underrated* depending on whether $\widehat{yz}(e)$ is $\geq w(e)$, $= w(e)$, or $\leq w(e)$, respectively; *strictly dominated* and *strictly underrated* designate the possibilities $> w(e)$ and $< w(e)$ respectively. The complementary slackness conditions for optimality require e to be dominated if it is unmatched, as in b -matching. The new requirement is that e must be underrated if it is matched.

As usual our algorithm maintains duals to satisfy these requirements. As in b -matching there may be strictly dominated unmatched edges; symmetrically there may be strictly underrated matched edges. (This is expected since our algorithm has minimum cost network flow as a special case.) The absolute values in the definitions of δ_1 and δ_2 reflect these possibilities, as $\widehat{yz}(e) - w(e)$ may have arbitrary sign. The use of $\widehat{yz}(e)$ rather than $y(e)$ (as in ordinary matching and b -matching, Figs. 15–16) reflects the possibility that eligible edges can be in $I(B)$ sets and so have positive z contributions in $\widehat{yz}(e)$.

The rest of this section follows the same organization as before, giving clarifying remarks, invariants, examples, and then the formal proof of correctness.

Remarks Many remarks for b -matching still apply, the exceptions being the simplifications in the blossom and expand steps.

In the blossom step consider the cycle C , which is constructed in line 8 and then processed as either an augmenting blossom or an outer blossom. When the augment step is executed, C is not considered an ordinary blossom (since it is not mature). When C is processed as an outer blossom, the definition $\eta(C) = \tau(\alpha)$ assumes $\tau(\alpha) = \emptyset$ when α is the root of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$.

The expand step is simpler than b -matching since all blossoms of $C(B)$ are mature. As in ordinary matching a new blossom in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ may have z -value 0.

The algorithm maintains η values in blossom, augment and expand steps. In line 9 η -values of blossoms in C_e are unchanged, so new blossoms of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ may be inner or outer.

As before when duals are modified, our assumption that the graph has an f -factor guarantees the new duals allow further progress (see the remark at the end of the proof of Lemma)

Invariants The definition of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ *alternating* at node v is unchanged.

(I1) $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ alternates at any atomic node. Any root blossom is light.

(I2) Every blossom B (maximal or not) is mature.

If B is inner then it is either a leaf of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ or its base edge leads to its unique child.

(I3) For every blossom B (maximal or not) $C(B)$ is a cycle.

(I4) An edge is tight if it is an edge of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ or an edge of a contracted blossom. Any nontight edge is dominated if it is unmatched and underrated if matched.




Figure 14: f -factor algorithm examples.

Examples *Strictly Underrated Edges:* Fig.11 illustrates how matched edges can become underrated. Suppose a dual adjustment is done. (This requires α_3 to be strictly underrated. Alternatively we can assume α_3 does not exist.) Since α_5 is incident to an outer atom a dual adjustment decreases $\widehat{yz}(\alpha_5)$ by δ . Since α_2 is incident to an inner blossom and belongs to its I set, a dual adjustment increases $\widehat{yz}(\alpha_2)$ by $\delta - 2\delta = -\delta$. These adjustments exemplify the two main cases where strictly underrated matched edges are created. (Note also that α_2 or α_5 may be the base edge of a blossom not in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$. So even η edges need not be tight.) The underrated edge α_3 may become tight in the dual adjustment since $\widehat{yz}(\alpha_3)$ increases by $(-\delta + 2\delta) + \delta = 2\delta$.

Eligibility: Consider Fig.11. No grow step can be done for the ineligible edge α_2 . No augment step can be done for α_1 or α_4 since they are ineligible at one end.

Grow Step: In Fig.11 the grow step that added the inner blossom B_3 used a matched edge. This is not possible in b -matching.

Blossom Step: In Fig.14(a) a blossom step can be done for e if $e = \eta(A) = \eta(B)$ and e is tight. Such a blossom step – for two inner vertices joined by an unmatched edge – cannot be done in b -matching. If $e \neq \eta(A)$ then a blossom step cannot be done for e . In this case e may even complete an augmenting trail (when e is tight and $d(v, M) \leq f(v) - 2$) yet the algorithm does not augment. The same holds if $e \neq \eta(B)$, assuming B remains inner. This situation is further discussed in the Dual Adjustment Step example below.

Augment Step: If an augment step is done for α_3 in Fig.11, the edge joining blossom B_3 to the free root blossom becomes the (unmatched) base edge of both blossoms.

Expand Step: In Fig.14(b) an expand step is done for blossom B . B is made an outer node, with base edge $\tau(B)$. So unlike b -matching an expand step may preserve B as a maximal contracted blossom. If a similar expand step is done for B in Fig.14(c) A is made an inner blossom in \mathcal{S} and u and v become atoms not in \mathcal{S} . Blossom A may not get expanded in this search even if $z(A) = 0$. If it does get expanded then A becomes an outer blossom.

Dual Adjustment Step: Returning to Fig.14(a) suppose e is not the base edge of either blossom A, B and B remains inner. A dual adjustment increases $\widehat{yz}(e)$ by $\delta + \delta = 2\delta$. e becomes strictly dominated, and the topologically valid blossom or augment step for e has been destroyed. Subsequent dual adjustments take e even further from being tight. However this cannot continue forever: Eventually one of the inner blossoms gets expanded, and dual adjustments now increase $\widehat{yz}(e)$ by $-\delta + \delta = 0$. When the other blossom gets expanded e becomes an unmatched edge joining two outer blossoms/vertices. Now dual adjustments decrease the slack ($\widehat{yz}(e)$ decreases by 2δ) and eventually a blossom step can be done for e .

5.3 Analysis

We follow the same organization as before: The first subsection proves the invariants. The second subsection proves correctness and adds details on initialization and termination. The last subsection proves the desired time bound.

Proof of invariants

As before we show all the invariants are preserved by every step of the algorithm. Again our discussion of grow, blossom, augment and expand steps just treats the most interesting cases. Start by noting that when a search begins any free blossom is light, by (I1) from the previous search. So (I1) is preserved when $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ is initialized.

Lemma 5.3 *The grow step preserves all the invariants.*

Proof: If B_x is inner then the definition of eligibility implies $e = \eta(B_x)$ and B_y will be the unique child of B_x . So (I2) holds for B_x . (I4) continues to hold. \square

Lemma 5.4 *The blossom step preserves all the invariants.*

Proof: Using the algorithm's notation, $e = xy$ is the edge triggering the blossom step and C is the new outer blossom. We will verify that C satisfies Definition 4.2 as well as the definition of outer. Furthermore since (I2) requires every blossom to be mature, we will verify the base edges satisfy Definition 5.1. We first verify the conditions on α . There are 4 possibilities for α .

If α is an outer atom then (I1) shows all edges to its children are unmatched. Also if e is incident to α then eligibility implies e is unmatched. So blossom C is light. This preserves (I1) if α is a search tree root. If α is not a root then $\tau(\alpha)$ is matched, so it is a valid choice for $\eta(C)$. Contracting C makes $\eta(C) = \tau(C)$ so C is outer.

Similarly if α is an inner atom then C is heavy, $\tau(\alpha)$ is unmatched, and $\eta(C) = \tau(C)$ makes C a valid outer blossom.

If α is an outer blossom then so is C , by definition.

Finally α cannot be an inner blossom B : $\eta(B)$ is the only edge of $\delta(B)$ that can lead to a child of B or be e (by (I2) and the definition of eligibility). So B cannot be the nca of B_x and B_y .

Next consider a node $v \neq \alpha$ that is a blossom in C . Definition 5.1 requires $\eta(v)$ to be an edge of C . If v is outer this holds since $\eta(v) = \tau(v)$. If v is inner then as before $\tau(v)$ and $\eta(v)$ must be the two edges of $\delta(v, C)$. \square

Lemma 5.5 *The expand step preserves all the invariants.*

Proof: If $C_e = C(B)$ then $i = 1$ in $P_i(v, \beta(B))$. Thus e and f are both incident to $\beta(B)$ and both have the same M-type. So changing $\eta(B)$ to e preserves Definition 5.1. Since $z(B) = 0$ the change also preserves \widehat{yz} values.

If $C_e \neq C(B)$ then replacing B by C_e implicitly classifies the new maximal blossoms as inner or outer, so the definition of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ is maintained. \square

Lemma 5.6 *The augment step preserves all the invariants.*

Proof: Recall that an augment step is given a valid augmenting blossom – in particular a nonatomic end v or v' is a light blossom by (I1). Lemma 5.2 shows no $I(B)$ set changes in the augment. Thus (5.2) shows every $\widehat{yz}(e)$ value remains the same and (I4) is preserved. \square

Lemma 5.7 *A dual adjustment preserves (I4) unless $\delta = \infty$.*

Proof: Any dual adjustment step has $\delta > 0$. Let $e = uv$. If $B_u = B_v$ is a blossom then clearly $\widehat{yz}(e)$ does not change. Thus suppose $e \in \overline{E}$. Assume e is not a loop – loops are covered in the second case below, $e \notin \overline{\mathcal{S}}$.

The quantities in $\widehat{yz}(e) = y(e) + z\{B : e \in \gamma(B) \cup I(B)\}$ that may change in a dual adjustment are limited to $y(x)$ and $z(B_x)$ for $x \in \{u, v\}$. Clearly these quantities do not change if $B_x \notin \overline{\mathcal{S}}$. From now on assume $x \in \{u, v\}$ with $B_x \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}$. Then $y(x)$ changes by $\pm\delta$ and, if B_x is a blossom, $z(B_x)$ changes by $\mp 2\delta$, but this contributes to $\widehat{yz}(e)$ iff $e \in I(B_x)$. Define $\Delta(B_x)$ to be the total change in $\widehat{yz}(e)$ at the x end. It is easy to see that $\Delta(B_x) = \pm\delta$, more precisely,

$$(5.3) \quad \Delta(B_x) = \begin{cases} -\delta & \text{if } B_x \text{ is an outer atom, or an outer blossom with } e \notin I(B_x), \\ & \text{or an inner blossom with } e \in I(B_x) \\ +\delta & \text{if } B_x \text{ is an inner atom, or an outer blossom with } e \in I(B_x), \\ & \text{or an inner blossom with } e \notin I(B_x). \end{cases}$$

Define a sign σ by

$$\sigma = \begin{cases} +1 & e \notin M \\ -1 & e \in M. \end{cases}$$

Case $e \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}$: We claim

$$(5.4) \quad \Delta(B_x) = \begin{cases} +\sigma\delta & e = \tau(B_x) \\ -\sigma\delta & e \neq \tau(B_x). \end{cases}$$

The claim implies $\Delta(B_u) + \Delta(B_v) = 0$ since one of B_u, B_v is the child of the other. Hence $\widehat{yz}(e)$ does not change and (I4) holds.

To prove the claim consider the value of $\Delta(B_x)$ in two symmetric cases.

Subcase $\Delta(B_x) = -\delta$: Suppose $e \neq \tau(B_x)$, i.e., e goes to a child of B_x . In all three cases of (5.3) e is unmatched. Thus $\Delta(B_x) = -\sigma\delta$ as claimed.

Suppose $e = \tau(B_x)$, i.e., e goes to the parent of B_x . In all three cases of (5.3) e is matched. Thus $\Delta(B_x) = \sigma\delta$ as claimed.

Subcase $\Delta(B_x) = \delta$: Suppose $e \neq \tau(B_x)$. In all three cases of (5.3) e is matched. Thus $\Delta(B_x) = -\sigma\delta$ as claimed.

Suppose $e = \tau(B_x)$. In all three cases of (5.3) e is unmatched. Thus $\Delta(B_x) = \sigma\delta$ as claimed.

Case $e \notin \overline{\mathcal{S}}$: Let B_x be a node of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$. We claim

$$(5.5) \quad \Delta(B_x) = \begin{cases} -\sigma\delta & e \text{ eligible for } B_x \\ +\sigma\delta & e \text{ ineligible for } B_x. \end{cases}$$

To prove the claim consider the value of $\Delta(B_x)$.

Subcase $\Delta(B_x) = -\delta$: Suppose e is eligible. In all three cases of (5.3) e is unmatched. Thus $\Delta(B_x) = -\sigma\delta$ as claimed.

Suppose e is ineligible. This is impossible in the middle case, i.e., B_x outer with $e \notin I(B_x)$. In the other two cases of (5.3) e is matched. Thus $\Delta(B_x) = \sigma\delta$ as claimed.

Subcase $\Delta(B_x) = \delta$: Suppose e is eligible. In all three cases of (5.3) e is matched. Thus $\Delta(B_x) = -\sigma\delta$ as claimed.

Suppose e is ineligible. This is impossible in the middle case. In the other two cases of (5.3) e is unmatched. Thus $\Delta(B_x) = \sigma\delta$ as claimed.

Now we show (I4). For every edge e define

$$\text{slack}(e) = \sigma(\widehat{yz} - w(e)).$$

(I4) requires every edge to have nonnegative slack. A dual adjustment changes $\text{slack}(e)$ by $\sigma\Delta(B_x)$. (5.5) shows $\text{slack}(e)$ decreases iff e is eligible for B_x .

At least one of B_u, B_v is a node of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$, so assume $B_u \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}$. If B_v is also in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ we can assume $\Delta(B_u) = \Delta(B_v)$, since otherwise $\widehat{yz}(e)$ does not change and the lemma holds. So in the two cases below, when B_v is a node of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ either e is eligible for both B_u and B_v or ineligible for both.

This characterization also holds if e is a loop, i.e., $u = v = x$. In this case (5.5) still applies, so $\Delta(B_u) = \Delta(B_v)$. Also the total change to $\widehat{yz}(e)$ is $\Delta(B_u) + \Delta(B_v)$ as before, since x is an atom.

Subcase e ineligible for B_u : The dual adjustment increases the slack. Clearly (I4) continues to hold.

Subcase e eligible for B_u : When the dual adjustment starts any edge has nonnegative slack, i.e., $slack(e) = |\widehat{yz}(e) - w(e)|$. If $B_v \notin \overline{\mathcal{S}}$ then initially we have $|\widehat{yz}(e) - w(e)| \geq \delta_1 \geq \delta$. Since $slack(e)$ decreases by δ , $slack(e) \geq 0$ after the dual adjustment and (I4) holds. Similarly if $B_v \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}$ initially $slack(e) = |\widehat{yz}(e) - w(e)| \geq 2\delta_2 \geq 2\delta$. $slack(e)$ decreases by 2δ so after the dual adjustment $slack(e) \geq 0$ and (I4) holds.

Remark: In this last subcase note that when $\delta = \delta_1$ the corresponding minimizing edge becomes tight. Thus a grow step can be done in the next iteration. Similarly when $\delta = \delta_2$ a blossom step has become possible. Taking δ_3 into account we see that for any $\delta < \infty$, the dual adjustment step makes at least one grow, blossom, or expand step possible, just like ordinary matching and b -matching.

□

We conclude that all the invariants are preserved throughout the algorithm.

Termination, correctness, and initialization

The algorithm does not loop, by exactly the same argument as b -matching. Next we show the algorithm halts with an f -factor, i.e., no free vertices. We shall prove this using the fact that the maximum size of a partial f -factor is

$$(5.6) \quad \min \left\{ f(I) + |\gamma(O)| + \sum_C \left\lfloor \frac{f(C) + |E[C, O]|}{2} \right\rfloor \right\}$$

where the set is formed by letting I and O range over all pairs of disjoint vertex sets, and in the summation C ranges over all connected components of $G - I - O$ [34, Theorem 32.1]. Our derivation gives an alternate proof of this min-max relation.

We first observe that (5.6) upper-bounds the size of any partial f -factor. In proof note that any edge e of G satisfies exactly one of these conditions:

- (i) e is incident to an I vertex;
- (ii) e joins 2 O vertices;
- (iii) e joins a vertex in some component C to another vertex of C or an O -vertex.

We call e type (i), (ii), or (iii) accordingly. We shall see these three types correspond respectively to the three terms of (5.6). Note that a loop e may have any of the three types.

Clearly the number of matched edges of type (i) and (ii) is bounded by the first two terms of (5.6) respectively. For type (iii) consider any component C . Counting edge ends shows the number of matched edges of type (iii), $|E[C, C \cup O] \cap M|$, satisfies

$$(5.7) \quad 2|E[C, C \cup O] \cap M| = \sum_{x \in C} d(x, M) - |E[C, I] \cap M| + |E[C, O] \cap M|.$$

Obviously this implies

$$(5.8) \quad 2|E[C, C \cup O] \cap M| \leq f(C) + |E[C, O]|.$$

The third term of (5.6) follows. So (5.6) is a valid upper bound. Now we prove this bound is tight.

Consider a search that *fails*, i.e., no grow, blossom, or expand step can be done and the dual adjustment step gives $\delta = \infty$. Since $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = \infty$, no vertex of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ has an eligible edge. Since $\delta_3 = \infty$ there are no inner blossoms.

In a failed search let I be the set of inner atoms and O the set of outer atoms. Deleting $I \cup O$ gives a collection of connected components C . There are exactly $f(I)$ matched edges of type (i). This follows since an inner atom is not free, and a matched edge joining two inner atoms is eligible (for both ends). There are exactly $|\gamma(O)|$ matched edges of type (ii), since an unmatched edge joining two outer atoms is eligible. For the type (iii) edges we will prove that any component C has a value $\Delta \in \{0, 1\}$ with

$$(5.9) \quad \sum_{x \in C} d(x, M) - |E[C, I] \cap M| + |E[C, O] \cap M| = f(C) + |E[C, O]| - \Delta.$$

With (5.7) this shows the left-hand side of (5.8) is within 1 of the right. So $|E[C, C \cup O] \cap M| = \lfloor \frac{f(C) + |E[C, O]|}{2} \rfloor$. This shows the number of type (iii) matched edges equals the third term of (5.6). Thus (5.6) is a tight upper bound on the size of a partial f -factor.

To prove (5.9) consider 2 types of components C :

Case $C \subseteq V - \mathcal{S}$: Since no vertex of C is free the first term on the left of (5.9) is $f(C)$. Take any $e \in \delta(C)$. e goes to a node v of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ but e is not eligible. So v is an inner or outer atom (not a blossom). $e \in M$ iff $e \in E[C, O]$. Thus the second term on the left of (5.9) is 0 and the third term is $|E[C, O]|$. So $\Delta = 0$ as desired.

Case C contains an $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ -node: We first show that C is a collection of blossoms forming a subtree of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$, with no other edges (i.e., $\gamma(C, \overline{\mathcal{S}}) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{S}}$). Any $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ -node B_x of C is an outer blossom ($x \notin I \cup O$). Consider an edge $e = xy \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}$ with B_x a blossom of C and B_y a node of C . e is not eligible for B_x , so B_y is an $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ -node. Hence B_y is an outer blossom. e is not eligible for at least one of B_x, B_y , so e is an edge of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$, as claimed.

Let B_r be the root of subtree C . Let $e = rs$ be the edge of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ from B_r to its parent B_s , if such parent exists; $e = \emptyset$ if B_r is a free blossom. We claim

$$(5.10) \quad \delta(C, M) - e = E[C, O] - e.$$

Take any edge $xy \in \delta(C) - e$, $B_x \in C$. $B_y = y \in I \cup O$ since C is a connected component of $G - I - O$. So the claim (5.10) is equivalent to $xy \in M$ iff $y \in O$. This follows from two cases: If xy is an edge of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ then y is a child of B_x . Thus $xy \in M$ iff y is outer. If xy is not an edge of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ then it is not eligible for y . Again $xy \in M$ iff y is outer.

Now we show (5.9) holds with $\Delta = 1$ in each of 3 possibilities for e .

If $e = \emptyset$ then B_r contains the unique free vertex of C . Using (5.10), the 3 terms on the left of (5.9) are $f(C) - 1$, 0 and $|E[C, O]|$.

If e is an edge then $B_s = s$ is atomic. If s is inner then $e \in M$. Using (5.10) the 3 terms on the left of (5.9) are $f(C)$, 1 and $|E[C, O]|$. If s is outer then $e \notin M$. Using (5.10) the terms are $f(C)$, 0 and $|E[C, O]| - 1$.

We conclude the upper bound (5.6) is tight.

We have also shown that our algorithm, executed on an arbitrary input graph, halts with a partial f -factor of maximum cardinality. In proof the analysis of a failed search shows if the algorithm halts because $\delta = \infty$, the current matching has size (5.6), so its cardinality is maximum.

Now we verify that our algorithm is correct, i.e., assuming an f -factor exists the algorithm finds a maximum weight f -factor. We have just verified the algorithm's final matching is an f -factor. It remains to verify the LP conditions for optimality (Appendix B). (I4) gives the complementary slackness conditions for matched and unmatched edges. We need only discuss the primal inequalities for blossoms and the corresponding complementary slackness conditions.

The blossom inequalities state that every pair B, I ($B \subseteq V$, $I \subseteq \delta(B)$) satisfies

$$(5.11) \quad |(\gamma(B) \cup I) \cap M| \leq \lfloor \frac{f(B) + |I|}{2} \rfloor.$$

It is easy to see this holds for any f -factor: The degree constraints imply $2|\gamma(B) \cap M| + |I \cap M| \leq f(B)$ so arithmetic gives $2(|\gamma(B) \cap M| + |I \cap M|) \leq f(B) + |I \cap M| \leq f(B) + |I|$ and integrality gives (5.11).

Complementary slackness requires tightness in (5.11) for every blossom B and its set $I(B)$. We will show

$$(5.12) \quad 2(|\gamma(B) \cap M| + |I(B) \cap M|) = f(B) + |I(B)| - 1.$$

It is easy to see that arithmetic and integrality imply this makes (5.11) tight. A light blossom B has $\eta(B) \in M - I(B)$, so counting degrees gives $f(B) = 2|\gamma(B) \cap M| + |I(B) \cap M| + 1$. Since $I(B) \cap M = I(B)$ arithmetic gives (5.12). A heavy blossom B has $\eta(B) \in I(B) - M$, so counting degrees gives $f(B) = 2|\gamma(B) \cap M| + |I(B) \cap M|$. Since $I(B) \cap M = I(B) - \eta(B)$ arithmetic gives (5.12). We conclude the algorithm is correct.

The algorithm can be initialized with any partial f -factor F , collection of blossoms \mathcal{B} , and dual functions y, z that satisfies the invariants:

Every blossom is mature. Every free blossom is light.

Every blossom B has $C(B)$ a cycle.

Every edge of a blossom subgraph is tight. Every nontight edge is dominated (underrated) if it is unmatched (matched), respectively.

In addition z can be nonzero only on pairs $(B, I(B))$, $B \in \mathcal{B}$.

As before the simplest choice is any partial f -factor, no blossoms, $z \equiv 0$, and a function y on vertices with $y(e) \geq w(e)$ ($y(e) \leq w(e)$) for every edge e that is unmatched (matched), respectively. This and other initializations are used in Section 5.4. As with b -matching, appropriate initialization shows that for arbitrary input graphs our algorithm finds a *maximum cardinality maximum weight f -factor*, i.e., a partial f -factor that has the greatest number of edges possible, and subject to that constraint, has the greatest weight possible. See Appendix B.

Efficiency analysis

The time to find a maximum f -factor is $O(f(V)(m + n \log n))$. The analysis is essentially identical to b -matching. The biggest difference is interpretation of the parameter m . In the simplest case every copy of a fixed edge xy has the same weight. Then as in b -matching, m denotes the number of nonparallel edges in the given multigraph G . If G has parallel edges with possibly different weights, the same interpretation of m holds if we assume the copies of xy are given together with their multiplicities and weights, and sorted by decreasing weight. This follows since a given search refers to at most 2 copies of any fixed edge xy , and a new edge xy is chosen with the greatest weight possible. If G is not given in this required form we assume a preprocessing step does the sort.

As in b -matching the algorithms of Fig. 12–13 use linear time. In the expand step C_e is easily computed from the blossom data structure, which represents $C(B)$ by links joining the children of the root of $T(B)$. For tree-blossom-merging the supporting tree T has minor changes from b -matching. In the definition, an f -factor inner blossom is traversed by a trail $P_i(x, \beta)$, $i \in \{0, 1\}$ ($i = 0$ for b -matching). Analogous to b -matching we define $P_i^-(x, \beta)$ to be $P_i(x, \beta)$ with every

maximal subtrail of the form $P_1(\beta(A), \beta(A))$ replaced by the vertex $\beta(A)$. In the new Definition 3.1 an inner blossom B is represented by $P_i^-(x, \beta)$ in T_B . (This trail may actually be the single vertex $\beta(B)$, as illustrated in Fig.14(b)–(c). In the latter note that $P_i(x, \beta)$ does not pass through u or v .)

The supporting tree is maintained similar to b -matching. A minor difference is that line 9 can add a blossom A represented by $\beta(A)$ to $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$. If this makes A outer the remaining vertices of $A - \beta(A)$ are added to the supporting tree. Otherwise A is inner and the supporting tree is unchanged. A may become outer in a subsequent expand step (when $z(A) = 0$) or in a blossom step. In both cases the vertices of $A - \beta(A)$ are added as above.

The tree-blossom-merging algorithm is used to track blossom steps for both unmatched and matched edges. No modifications are needed. To justify this observe that (5.5) shows once xy becomes eligible at both ends, every dual adjustment decreases its slack by 2δ . Thus the numerical key used in the blossom-tree merging algorithm is correct, i.e., it gives the value of total dual adjustment when xy becomes tight.

This argument depends on the simple fact that once an edge becomes eligible it remains so. This property was also used in ordinary matching and b -matching, but we give a formal proof for f -factors here. Say that an edge uv is *eligible at u* if it is eligible for B_u . The new term avoids referring to the time-varying B_u . This term and the next lemma come in handy in Appendix C.

Lemma 5.8 *Once an edge $e = uv$ becomes eligible at u it remains so, until it leaves $\overline{E} - \overline{\mathcal{S}}$.*

Proof: Once B_u becomes an outer node, it may get absorbed in larger blossoms but they are always outer. So e remains eligible at u as long as it belongs to $\delta(B_u) - \overline{\mathcal{S}}$.

Suppose B_u transitions from being not in \mathcal{S} to an inner node. The unique eligible edge is $uv = \eta(B_u)$. If B_u gets expanded vertex u remains in \mathcal{S} . Let B'_u be the new maximal blossom containing u , $B'_u \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}$. We have the following possibilities.

B'_u an outer blossom: Clearly uv is eligible for B'_u .

B'_u an inner blossom: uv is the base edge of B'_u , so it remains eligible.

B'_u an atom: The P_i trail used to expand B_u is alternating. So either u is outer and $uv \notin M$ or u is inner and $uv \in M$. In both cases uv is eligible at u .

Finally note there is nothing to verify for new nodes of $\overline{\mathcal{S}} - B'_u$ created in the expansion. \square

Theorem 5.9 *A maximum f -factor can be found in time $O(f(V)(m + n \log n))$.* \square

5.4 Related algorithms

We start by generalizing f -factors to degree-bounded subgraphs. For functions $\ell, h : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ a subgraph H of G is an (ℓ, h) -subgraph if its degree function d_H satisfies $\ell \leq d_H \leq h$.

We convert such subgraphs into f -factors as follows. Starting with the given graph G form graph G_s by adding a vertex s , with edges vs of multiplicity $h(v) - \ell(v)$, $v \in V$, and the loop ss of multiplicity $\lfloor h(V)/2 \rfloor$. Every new edge weighs 0. Define a degree requirement function f by

$$f(v) = \begin{cases} h(v) & v \in V \\ h(V) & v = s. \end{cases}$$

The (ℓ, h) -subgraphs H of G correspond to the f -factors F of G_s , and corresponding subgraphs have the same weight. In proof starting with an H , construct F by adding $h(v) - d_H(v)$ copies of vs for every vertex $v \in V$, and $|E(H)|$ copies of ss . This gives s degree exactly $(h(V) - 2|E(H)|) +$

$2|E(H)| = h(V) = f(s)$. Obviously every $v \in V$ has degree $f(v)$, and $w(H) = w(F)$. Similarly starting with an F , let $H = F - s$. Clearly H is an (ℓ, h) -subgraph and $w(H) = w(F)$.

Corollary 5.10 *A maximum or minimum weight (ℓ, h) -subgraph can be found in time $O(h(V)(m + n \log n))$. For a minimum weight (ℓ, h) -subgraph the bound improves to $O(\ell(V)(m + n \log n))$ if the weight function is nonnegative or if $h \equiv d_G$ (i.e., we seek a minimum weight ℓ -edge cover [34, Ch.34]).*

Proof: To achieve the first time bound execute the f -factor algorithm on G_s , using the given weight function w for maximization and $-w$ for minimization. Since $f(V + s) = O(h(V))$ and G_s has $O(m)$ distinct edges, Theorem 5.9 gives the desired bound.

Next consider minimum weight (ℓ, h) -subgraphs with nonnegative w . Use the f -factor algorithm on G_s with weight function $-w$, and initial dual functions $y \equiv 0$ and $z \equiv 0$ with no blossoms. These duals are feasible for $-w$. To define the initial matching let $\delta = \ell(V) \bmod 2$. Match every copy of every edge vs , $v \in V$, and $(\ell(V) - \delta)/2$ copies of ss . To show this matching is valid first note the degree of s in the matching is $(h(V) - \ell(V)) + (\ell(V) - \delta) = h(V) - \delta \leq f(s)$. Also every matched edge is tight since $y \equiv 0$.

The number of searches of the f -factor algorithm is $(\ell(V) + \delta)/2 = O(\ell(V))$. The time bound for nonnegative w follows.

Finally suppose w is arbitrary but $h \equiv d_G$. Let $N = \{e : w(e) < 0\}$ and let G' be the graph $G - N$. The minimum weight (ℓ, h) -subgraph consists of N plus a minimum weight (ℓ', h') -subgraph on G' , where $\ell' \equiv \max\{\ell - d_N, 0\}$ and $h' \equiv d_{G'}$. Since G' has a nonnegative weight function the previous case shows the time is $O(\ell(V)(m + n \log n))$. \square

Next we present a strongly polynomial version of the f -factor algorithm. We use essentially the same reduction to bipartite matching as b -matching. Assume the multigraph G is specified by a function $c : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ that gives the number of parallel copies of each edge. The algorithm below rounds c up to ensure that edges do not disappear.

Define graph G' by setting $f' = 2\lfloor f/2 \rfloor$ and $c' = 2\lceil c/2 \rceil$. Let M' be a maximum cardinality maximum weight f' -factor on G' with corresponding optimal dual function y . For every edge e with $c'(e) > c(e)$ copies of e in M' , remove 1 copy of e from M' . Let M be the resulting partial f -factor on G . Using M, y (and $z \equiv 0$, $\mathcal{B} = \emptyset$) as the initial solution, execute the f -factor algorithm of Section 5.2 on G .

The analysis is similar to b -matching. Since we assume G has an f -factor, G' has a partial f' -factor with $\geq \frac{f(V)}{2} - n$ edges. At most m matched edges are deleted to form M . So our f -factor algorithm performs $\leq m + n$ augmentations. Thus the time for the entire algorithm is $O(m(m + n \log n))$ plus the time to find M', y . As before the latter strictly dominates the time.

We find M', y using a graph G^+ similar to b -matching: Extend graph G' to G^+ by adding a vertex s with degree constraint

$$f'(s) = f'(V)$$

and edges vs ($v \in V$) and ss with multiplicities and weights given respectively by

$$c'(vs) = f'(v), \quad c'(ss) = f'(V), \quad w(vs) = 0, \quad w(ss) = W f'(s) \text{ for } W = \max\{1, |w(e)| : e \in E(G)\}.$$

Note that f' and c' remain even-valued functions. A maximum cardinality maximum weight f' -factor of G' corresponds to a maximum f' -factor of G^+ . The proof is exactly the same as b -matching.

As before we find a maximum f' -factor of G^+ by reducing to a bipartite graph BG . BG has vertices v_1, v_2 ($v \in V(G^+)$) and edges u_1v_2, v_1u_2 ($uv \in E(G^+)$) with degree constraints, multiplicities, and edge weights given respectively by

$$f'(v_1) = f'(v_2) = f'(v)/2, \quad c'(u_1v_2) = c'(v_1u_2) = c'(uv)/2, \quad w(u_1v_2) = w(v_1u_2) = w(uv).$$

A loop uu of G^+ gives edge u_1u_2 with multiplicity $c'(uu)$ in BG . Let x be a maximum f' -factor on BG with optimum dual function y . Define an f' -factor M' on G^+ by taking $x\{u_1v_2, u_2v_1\}$ copies of each edge $uv \in E(G^+)$ (by our summing convention this means $x(u_1u_2)$ copies of a loop uu). x exists and M' is a maximum f' -factor on G^+ , by exactly the same proof as b -matching. Define a dual function y by $y(v) = y\{v_1, v_2\}/2$. Applying complementary slackness to the definition of the dual function for bipartite f -factors [34, Ch.21] we get that an f' -factor x on BG and a dual function y are both optimum iff for every edge e of BG ,

$$(5.13) \quad x(e) = 0 \implies y(e) \geq w(e); \quad x(e) = 1 \implies y(e) \leq w(e).$$

Now consider an edge $e = uv$ of G^+ (e may be a loop). The matching x on BG has a mirror image x' defined by $x'(a_1b_2) = x(b_1a_2)$. Suppose some copy of e in BG is unmatched, say $x(u_1v_2) = 0$. (5.13) implies $y(u_1v_2) \geq w(uv)$ as well as $y(v_1u_2) \geq w(uv)$. Thus

$$y(e) = ((y(u_1) + y(u_2)) + (y(v_1) + y(v_2)))/2 \geq 2w(uv)/2 = w(e).$$

Similarly if some copy of e in BG is matched then $y(e) \leq w(e)$. So the functions $y, 0$ are optimum duals for an f' -factor on (the non-bipartite graph) G^+ .

The matching M defined from M' is clearly valid on G (i.e., nonexistent matched edges are deleted). y is also optimum on G (an unmatched edge of G is present in G^+ since c' rounds up). We conclude that restricting M and y to G , along with $z \equiv 0$, $\mathcal{B} = \emptyset$, gives permissible initial values for our f -factor algorithm. In conclusion the main algorithm is correct.

The problem on BG is a capacitated transportation problem, where x is an optimum integral solution and y is an optimum dual function [34, Ch.21]. We solve it using Orlin's algorithm [28]. It reduces the capacitated transportation problem to the uncapacitated case. The reduction modifies the graph, but it is easy to see that the optimum dual function y on the modified graph gives an optimum dual on the given graph. (Alternatively an optimum dual function can be found from x itself using a shortest path computation, in time $O(nm)$ [2].)

Orlin solves the capacitated transportation problem (more generally capacitated transshipment) in time $O(m \log n(m + n \log n))$ [28]. It gives both x and y . Using this we obtain our strongly polynomial bound:

Theorem 5.11 *A maximum f -factor can be found in time $O(\min\{f(V), m \log n\}(m + n \log n))$.*
□

Next recall that for any set of vertices T of even cardinality, a T -join is a subgraph of G that has T as its set of odd-degree vertices. For any edge cost function c it is of interest to find a minimum cost T -join. We proceed as follows.

Let N be the set of edges of negative cost. Define $t = |T| + 2|N|$. Let G' be the graph G enlarged by adding $t/2$ loops at every vertex, where each loop has cost 0. Define a degree-constraint function

$$f(v) = \begin{cases} t-1 & v \in T, \\ t & v \notin T. \end{cases}$$

A minimum cost f -factor is a minimum cost T -join augmented by enough loops to exactly satisfy the degree constraints. In proof, let J be a minimum T -join and F a minimum f -factor. $c(F) \geq c(J)$, since F with all loops deleted gives a T -join of the same cost.

For the the opposite inequality note that $wlog J$ consists of $|T|/2$ paths, each joining two vertices of T , and $\leq |N|$ cycles. The latter holds since we can assume each cycle contains a negative edge. Thus any vertex has degree $d(v, J) \leq |T| + 2|N| = t$, with strict inequality if v is a terminal. Furthermore $d(v, J)$ and $f(v)$ have the same parity. Hence we can add loops at each vertex to make J an f -factor. We conclude $c(J) \geq c(F)$.

For our algorithm define edge weights to be the negatives of edge costs. So we seek a maximum weight f -factor of G' . Initialize the algorithm with a matching M consisting of every negative edge, and enough loops at each vertex to make $f(v) \geq d(v, M) \geq f(v) - 1$. Furthermore $y \equiv 0$ and there are no blossoms. (This initialization is valid since every loop is tight and for edges of G , every matched edge is underrated and every other edge is dominated.) Then execute the f -factor algorithm.

The f -factor algorithm performs $\leq n/2$ searches. A search uses time $O(m + n \log n)$ – although the graph has many loops, only 2 loops at each vertex are processed in any given search. Also note these special cases: When there are no negative edges there are $|T|/2$ searches. When there are no terminals there are $\leq |N|$ searches.

Theorem 5.12 *A minimum cost T -join can be found in time $O(n(m + n \log n))$. If costs are nonnegative the time is $O(|T|(m + n \log n))$. If there are no terminals the time is $O(\min\{|N|, n\}(m + n \log n))$.*

We turn to the shortest path problem on a connected undirected graph G with a conservative cost function c , i.e., negative edge costs are allowed but any cycle has nonnegative cost. We are interested in the single source shortest path problem, i.e., given a source vertex s , we wish to find a shortest path from each vertex v to s . We will show how the blossom tree provides a shortest path tree that specifies all these paths. The discussion is organized into four parts as follows.

- We present a “base algorithm” that accomplishes all our goals for a subfamily of cost functions. The goals are to show the existence of a succinct representation of all shortest paths to s , and to give an efficient algorithm to construct the representation.

- We extend the base algorithm to show existence of the representation for arbitrary conservative real-valued cost functions.

- For readers familiar with the generalized shortest path tree (the “gsp structure”) introduced by Gabow and Sankowski [21], we give a simple verification that our representation is precisely that structure.

- We extend the base algorithm to construct the representation efficiently for arbitrary conservative integral-valued cost functions. The time is $O(n(m + n \log n))$, the best-known time bound to find a shortest sv -path for two given vertices s, v .

We will use the f -factor algorithm to find a search structure $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ that handles shortest path queries – given any vertex v , a shortest vs -path P is composed of P_i trails and can be found in time proportional to the length of P . The *base algorithm* accomplishes this assuming every cycle of the given graph has positive cost (rather than nonnegative cost). The base algorithm is as follows.

Base Algorithm. Define edge weights as the negatives of edge costs. Let G' be the graph G with a loop of weight 0 added at every vertex except s . Define a degree-constraint function

$$f(v) = \begin{cases} 0 & v = s, \\ 2 & v \neq s. \end{cases}$$

Execute the f -factor algorithm to find a maximum f -factor M and corresponding duals. Increase $f(s)$ to 1. Perform a search of the f -factor algorithm, initialized with M and its duals, halting when $\delta = \infty$. (M remains the matching but the duals and blossoms may change. Let y denote the final dual function.)

A query algorithm outputs a shortest vs -path, for given v , as follows. The shortest distance from v to s is $d(v) = y(v) - y(s)$. A shortest vs -path consists of the nonloop edges in these sets: the path P in \overline{S} from B_v to B_s , plus for each blossom B in P , the path $P_i(x, \beta(B))$ with i and x chosen as follows:

Case $B = B_v$: $x = v$ and i is chosen so the first edge of $P_i(v, \beta(B_v))$ is matched.

Case $B \neq B_v$: Let $f = xy \in \delta(B, P) - \eta(B)$ with $x \in V(B)$. Choose i according to (4.1), i.e., $i = 0$ iff f and B have the same M-type.

Now we prove the base algorithm is correct. Note that M is the set of all the loops since every cycle of G has negative weight. The rest of the proof is in 3 claims.

Fix an arbitrary vertex $v \neq s$. Define the graph G'_v to be G' enlarged with a vertex v' that has $f(v') = 1$ and a weight 0 edge vv' . Set $y(v') = -y(v)$. The new graph satisfies all the invariants of the f -factor algorithm, so we can imagine a hypothetical search of that algorithm.

Claim 1 *The hypothetical search executes a blossom step for edge vv' and augments the matching.*

Proof: vv' is tight and eligible for v' . The claim follows if vv' is eligible for B_v . So suppose it is ineligible. This causes the hypothetical search to immediately halt with $\delta = \infty$. But G'_v is connected so it has an sv -path, i.e., an f -factor, contradiction. \diamond

The next claim actually holds for arbitrary augmenting paths in the f -factor algorithm, generalizing a property of Edmonds' algorithm. For notational simplicity we only prove the special case needed for our shortest path algorithm.

Claim 2 *The augment step in the hypothetical algorithm changes the weight of the matching by $y(s) + y(v')$.*

Proof: Every edge of the augmenting trail A is tight, by (I4). Thus the weight of the matching changes by $\widehat{yz}(A - M) - \widehat{yz}(A \cap M)$. The y terms make a net contribution of $y(s) + y(v')$, since A alternates at every interior vertex. The z terms make no net contribution. In proof let AZ be the set of all edges with a $z(B)$ contribution, i.e., $AZ = A \cap (\gamma(B) \cup I(B))$. We claim AZ is an alternating trail of even length. Clearly this implies the $z(B)$ terms make a net contribution of 0. To prove the claim assume $AZ \cap \gamma(B)$ is nonempty and denote it as $P_i(x, \beta(B))$. If B is a maximal blossom we are using the same notation as the algorithm. Although B need not be maximal i and x are still chosen according to the algorithm: If $v \in B$ the case $B = B_v$ holds. If $v \notin B$ the case $B \neq B_v$ holds (with the obvious modification that we require $f \in A$ rather than $f \in P$).

If B is light then $AZ = P_0(x, \beta(B))$. This follows since a light blossom has $i = 0$ (in both cases); also $I(B) = \emptyset$ since M consists of loops. This shows AZ has even length. If B is heavy then $AZ = P_1(x, \beta(B)) + \eta(B)$. This follows since a heavy blossom has $i = 1$ (in both cases); also $I(B) = \eta(B)$ since M consists of loops. Again this shows AZ has even length. \diamond

Claim 3 *The base algorithm computes correct distances and shortest paths.*

Proof: Since $w(M) = 0$, Claim 2 shows the augmented matching weighs $y(s) + y(v') = y(s) - y(v)$. The definition of G'_v shows this f -factor weighs the same as a maximum weight sv -path. Thus $y(v) - y(s)$ is the cost of a shortest sv -path.

The algorithm outputs the nonloops in the augmenting path of the hypothetical search. These edges are exactly the nonloops of the optimum f -factor, since M consists of loops. \diamond

Our second goal is to extend this representation to arbitrary conservative real-valued cost functions. We accomplish this using a symbolic execution of the base algorithm, as follows.

Conceptually increase each edge cost $c(e)$ by the same unknown positive quantity ϵ . The algorithm will maintain all numeric quantities as expressions of the form $r + s\epsilon$, where r and s are known real-valued quantities and ϵ is a symbol. The algorithm maintains the invariant that the same sequence of grow, blossom, expand, and dual adjustment steps is executed for all sufficiently small positive values of ϵ . (The execution for these sufficiently small values uses real-valued quantities as usual, i.e., no symbolic quantities. We assume that any ties are broken the same way in every execution.)

The invariant implies that the same sequence of grow, blossom, and expand steps can be done when $\epsilon = 0$. In proof observe that at any point in the algorithm an edge has slack $s\epsilon$ (for arbitrary s) iff setting $\epsilon = 0$ makes the slack 0, i.e., the edge is tight. These tight edges can be processed in any order when $\epsilon = 0$, but they must all be processed before any others become tight. The algorithm does this, i.e., all edges with slack $s\epsilon$ become tight and are processed before any others with slack having $r > 0$. Thus the same sequence of steps is executed for $\epsilon = 0$.

To illustrate the workings of the base algorithm consider the computation of δ_1 in a dual adjustment step. Each quantity $|\widehat{yz}(e) - w(e)|$ in the set defining δ_1 is a linear combination of quantities $y(e)$, $z(B)$, and $w(e)$, all of the form $r + s\epsilon$. Hence it too has that form. To find δ_1 , the minimum quantity, the algorithm declares $r + s\epsilon < r' + s'\epsilon$ exactly when (r, s) precedes (r', s') in lexicographic order. If $r = r'$ this is true for any $\epsilon > 0$. This also holds if $r < r'$ and $s \leq s'$. In the remaining case $r < r'$ and $s > s'$, it holds for sufficiently small ϵ , i.e., $0 < \epsilon < (r' - r)/(s - s')$. Clearly δ_1 , as well as δ and the updated expressions for y and z , all have the desired form $r + s\epsilon$.

When the algorithm halts, setting ϵ to 0 gives valid duals y, z with matching M the set of all loops and corresponding blossoms. This gives the desired representation.

As mentioned the final search structure \mathcal{S} is a succinct representation of all shortest paths from a fixed source s . Our third goal is to verify this is the gsp-structure.

To do this we will use two additional properties of \mathcal{S} . Every loop vv is tight and belongs to \mathcal{S} , since $vv \in M$ yet $vv \notin P_v$ implies vv is in the augmenting path of the hypothetical search for v . Furthermore wlog vv is a blossom. In proof v is not an atom, since $\tau(v)$ unmatched would make v inner. If the minimal blossom B containing v has v atomic in $C(B)$ we can declare vv a loop blossom with $z(vv) = 0$. $\eta(vv)$ can be chosen as either of the unmatched edges of $\delta(v, C(B))$.

A formal definition of the “generalized shortest path structure” is presented in Gabow and Sankowski [21]. The structure is simply the search structure \mathcal{S} with the matched loops removed. To give a brief verification, the overall structure $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ is a tree whose nodes are contracted blossoms that collectively contain all the vertices of G . (Note that a node may consist of a single vertex of G , i.e., a contracted loop. When all edge costs are nonnegative every node is such a vertex, and the gsp-structure is the usual shortest-path tree.) The rest of \mathcal{S} is represented as a collection of cycles, corresponding to Definitions 4.2 and 5.1 of blossom and the blossom tree $T(\mathcal{B})$. The base edges of blossoms are used as pointers to follow shortest paths, as in our definition of the P_i trails. (These pointers are called edge $\tau(N)$ for blossom N in [21]; the base vertex of N is called t_N .)

The gsp-structure also has numeric labels that prove its validity. To describe these first note

that every edge of G is unmatched and so satisfies $\widehat{yz}(uv) \geq w(uv)$, with equality for every edge of \mathcal{S} (this includes loops). Equivalently

$$d(u) + d(v) + c(uv) = y(u) + y(v) - 2y(s) - w(uv) \geq -z\{B : uv \in \gamma(B) \cup \eta(B)\} - 2y(s)$$

with equality on \mathcal{S} . Define $z' : 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $z'(B) = -z(B)$, $z'(V) = -2y(s)$ to get

$$d(u) + d(v) + c(uv) \geq z'\{B : uv \in \gamma(B) \cup \eta(B)\}$$

with equality for every edge of the representation (including loops). This is the exact relation satisfied by the labels of the gsp-structure, where d labels each vertex, z' labels each node as well as V with $z'(B) \leq 0$ for every $B \neq V$.

For the last goal assume the given cost function c is integral-valued, as is the case in algorithms. We will simply execute the base algorithm using an integral blow-up of c . Another approach would be symbolic execution as given above. We prefer using integral values, since we have given a complete efficiency analysis of this case. (For instance Appendix B shows the numbers computed by the algorithm are acceptably small. We have not analyzed the size of the s coefficients in the symbolic execution.)

Define the cost function

$$c' = 4nc + 1.$$

c' has no 0-cost cycles. For any v , a shortest sv -path wrt c' is a shortest sv -path wrt c that in addition has the smallest length possible. We execute the base algorithm using c' . Clearly this algorithm can answer shortest path queries for c . (Also the base algorithm verifies that c is conservative – if not it returns a matching with negative cost.) However we wish to find the complete gsp-representation, which uses the optimum dual functions y, z for its numerical labels. (These labels complete the representation since they provide a simple check that c is conservative.) So our algorithm for general cost functions requires one more step, to transform the duals given by the algorithm for c' to those for c .

The extra step uses the following terminology. For any duals y, z and corresponding blossom structure, define the function Z on blossoms B by

$$Z(B) = z\{A : A \supseteq B, A \text{ a blossom}\}.$$

Obviously Z uniquely defines the dual function z via the relations $z(B) = Z(B) - Z(p(B))$ for $p(B)$ the parent of B in the blossom tree, with the convention $Z(p(B)) = 0$ for every maximal blossom B .

Also call any edge e a *witness* for blossom B if $e \in C(B)$ and $Z(B) = w(e) - y(e)$. Any edge of $e \in C(B)$ is tight, i.e., $w(e) = \widehat{yz}(e) = y(e) + z\{A : e \in \gamma(A) \cup I(A)\}$. So e is a witness for B if B is the minimal blossom containing both ends of e and $e \notin I(A)$ for any blossom $A \subset B$. In general B may not have a witness. But a blossom at the end of our algorithm does have a witness. In proof first note this is clear if $C(B)$ is just a loop. So assume $C(B)$ contains r nodes, $r > 1$. The node $\alpha(B)$ does not have its base edge in $C(B)$ (this base edge may not even exist). So the r nodes collectively have at most $r - 1$ base edges in $C(B)$. $C(B)$ has r edges that are not loops. So at least one of these edges, say e , is not the base edge of either of its ends. Since e is unmatched this implies $e \notin I(A)$ for any blossom A . Since B is the minimal blossom containing both ends of e , e is a witness for B .

The algorithm defines the desired duals as follows. Let y', z' be the given duals for c' , and y, z the desired duals for c . To construct y, z first do an extra dual adjustment step to make $y'(s)$ a multiple of $4n$. (In other words use $\delta = y'(s) - 4n \lfloor y'(s)/4n \rfloor$ in a dual adjustment step. Let y', z', Z'

now denote these adjusted duals.) The base algorithm provides the optimum f -factor for v , call it P_v . The new algorithm defines

$$\begin{aligned} y(v) &= -w(P_v) + y'(s)/4n && \text{for every vertex } v \in V \\ Z(B) &= w(e) - y(e) && \text{for every blossom } B \text{ and } e \text{ a witness for } B \end{aligned}$$

Also z is the dual function corresponding to Z .

Lemma 5.13 *The above functions y, z are valid optimum duals. Specifically they satisfy (I4) for the unmodified weight function $w = -c$ and the f -factor M and blossoms found by the algorithm.*

Proof: Let w' denote the modified weight function used in the algorithm, i.e.,

$$w'(e) = 4nw(e) - \mu(e) \text{ where } \mu(e) = \begin{cases} 1 & e \text{ an edge of } G \\ 0 & e \text{ a loop.} \end{cases}$$

(Recall $w(e) = 0$ for e a loop.) Let $\ell(P_v)$ be the length of the sv -path contained in P_v . So $y'(v) = -w'(P_v) + y'(s) = -4nw(P_v) + \ell(P_v) + y'(s)$. Thus

$$y'(v) = 4ny(v) + \ell(P_v).$$

Take any blossom B and any witness $e = uv \in C(B)$. So

$$\begin{aligned} (5.14) \quad Z'(B) &= w'(e) - y'(e) = (4nw(e) - \mu(e)) - 4ny(e) - \ell(P_u) - \ell(P_v) \\ &= 4nZ(B) - r(B) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$0 \leq r(B) \leq 2n - 1.$$

Although there may be several choices for e , (5.14) shows $Z(B)$ is uniquely defined, since the interval $[Z'(B), Z'(B) + 2n - 1]$ contains a unique multiple of $4n$.

Next observe that $z(B)$ is nonnegative:

$$\begin{aligned} 4nz(B) &= 4n(Z(B) - Z(p(B))) = Z'(B) + r(B) - Z'(p(B)) - r(p(B)) \\ &= z'(B) + r(B) - r(p(B)) \geq -(2n - 1). \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows since $z'(B) \geq 0$ and $r(p(B)) \leq 2n - 1$ (even if B is maximal). Clearly $4nz(B) \geq -(2n - 1)$ implies $z(B) \geq 0$.

Finally we show (I4) for any edge $e = uv$ (including loops). Let $\sigma' = w'(e) - \widehat{y'z'}(e)$ and $\sigma = 4n(w(e) - \widehat{yz}(e))$. We claim

$$|\sigma' - \sigma| \leq 4n - 2.$$

The claim gives the desired conclusion (I4). In proof consider two cases. If e is tight wrt y', z' then $\sigma' = 0$. Since σ is a multiple of $4n$ the claim shows it must be 0, so e is tight wrt y, z . If e is not tight then σ is not uniquely determined, but the claim shows σ cannot have opposite sign from σ' . Thus either e is dominated wrt both pairs of duals or underrated wrt both.

To prove the claim let B_u be the minimal blossom containing u and similarly for B_v . Consider two cases.

Case e is not the base edge of both B_u and B_v : This case implies there is a blossom B such that $\{A : e \in \gamma(A) \cup I(A)\} = \{A : A \supseteq B, A \text{ a blossom}\}$. In proof, if e is a loop then clearly we can

take B as $B_u = B_v$. If e is a nonloop witness for a blossom B then B is the desired blossom. If $e = \eta(B_u) \neq \eta(B_v)$ then $B = B_u$.

Using blossom B we have

$$\sigma' = w'(e) - y'(e) - Z'(B) = 4n(w(e) - y(e) - Z(B)) - \mu(e) - \ell(P_u) - \ell(P_v) + r(B) = \sigma \pm r$$

where $0 \leq r \leq 2n - 1$. The claim follows since $2n - 1 \leq 4n - 2$.

Case $e = \eta(B_u) = \eta(B_v)$: Let B be the minimal blossom containing both u and v . Thus $e = \eta(A)$ for every blossom A with $u \in A \subset B$ or $v \in A \subset B$. Clearly $\{A : e \in \gamma(A) \cup I(A)\} = \{A : A \text{ a blossom containing } B_u \text{ or } B_v\}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma' &= w'(e) - y'(e) - Z'(B_u) - Z'(B_v) + Z'(B) \\ &= 4n(w(e) - y(e) - Z(B_u) - Z(B_v) + Z(B)) - 1 - \ell(P_u) - \ell(P_v) + r(B_u) + r(B_v) - r(B) \\ &= \sigma \pm r \end{aligned}$$

where $0 \leq r \leq 4n - 2$. The claim follows. \square

We conclude that the general algorithm is correct.

Regarding efficiency since $f(V) < 2n$ the complete execution of the f -factor algorithm runs in time $O(n(m + n \log n))$. This dominates the total time. For a more precise estimate, the set N of negative edges for a conservative cost function is acyclic, so $|N| < n$. Let W be the largest magnitude of a given cost. Initialize the dual functions by $z \equiv 0$ with no blossoms and

$$y(v) = \begin{cases} W & d(v, N) > 0 \\ 0 & d(v, N) = 0 \end{cases}$$

Match every loop vv where $y(v) = 0$. Now the f -factor algorithm performs $O(|N|)$ searches, using time $O(|N|(m + n \log n))$ assuming $N \neq \emptyset$. This again dominates the time.

Theorem 5.14 *The generalized shortest path structure representing all shortest paths from s is the f -factor algorithm search structure \mathcal{S} . It can be constructed in time $O(n(m + n \log n))$. More generally if $N \neq \emptyset$ is the set of negative cost edges the time is $O(|N|(m + n \log n))$.*

The first time bound is given in Gabow and Sankowski [21]. The second bound shows how the time increases with more negative edges. For example in a graph with $O(1)$ negative edges the algorithm is as fast as Dijkstra's algorithm, which allows no negative edges.

A similar dependence on negative edges holds for conservative directed graphs: The single source shortest path problem can be solved in time $O(n_N(m + n \log n))$, for n_N the number of vertices incident to a negative edge. In contrast the Bellman-Ford algorithm runs in time $O(nm)$ with no dependence on N . To achieve our time bound we model the digraph G as an undirected graph: The vertex set is $\{v_1, v_2 : v \in V(G) - s\} + s_2$; the edge set is $\{v_1 v_2 : v \in V(G) - s\} \cup \{u_2 v_1 : uv \in E(G)\}$, with $c(v_1 v_2) = 0, c(u_2 v_1) = c(uv), f(v) = 1$ for every vertex. The initialization sets y to W (the largest magnitude of a given cost) if v is on a negative edge else 0. The initial matching consists of the edges $v_1 v_2$ where v is not on a negative edge.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Bob Tarjan for some fruitful early conversations, as well as Jim Driscoll. Also thanks to an anonymous referee for a careful reading and many suggestions.

References

- [1] A.V. Aho, J.E. Hopcroft, and J.D. Ullman, *The Design and Analysis of Computer Algorithms*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass., 1974.
- [2] R.K. Ahuja, T.L. Magnanti, and J.B. Orlin, *Network Flows: Theory, Algorithms, and Applications*, Prentice-Hall, Saddle River, New Jersey, 1993.
- [3] R.P. Anstee, “A polynomial algorithm for b -matchings: an alternative approach”, *Information Processing Letters*, 24, 1987, pp. 153–157.
- [4] M.O. Ball and U. Derigs, “An analysis of alternative strategies for implementing matching algorithms”, *Networks* 13, 4, 1983, pp. 517–549.
- [5] W.J. Cook, W.H. Cunningham, W.R. Pulleyblank, and A. Schrijver, *Combinatorial Optimization*, Wiley and Sons, NY, 1998.
- [6] R. Cole and R. Hariharan, “Dynamic LCA queries on trees”, *SIAM J. Comput.*, 34, 4, 2005, pp. 894–923.
- [7] T.H. Cormen, C.E. Leiserson, R.L. Rivest and C. Stein, *Introduction to Algorithms*, 2nd Ed., McGraw-Hill, NY, 2001.
- [8] W.H. Cunningham and A.B. Marsh, III, “A primal algorithm for optimum matching”, *Math. Programming Study* 8, 1978, pp. 50–72.
- [9] J. Edmonds, “Maximum matching and a polyhedron with 0,1-vertices”, *J. Res. Nat. Bur. Standards* 69B, 1965, pp. 125–130.
- [10] M.L. Fredman and R.E. Tarjan, “Fibonacci heaps and their uses in improved network optimization algorithms”, *J. ACM*, 34, 3, 1987, pp. 596–615.
- [11] H.N. Gabow, “Implementations of algorithms for maximum matching on nonbipartite graphs”, Ph. D. Dissertation, Comp. Sci. Dept., Stanford Univ., Stanford, Calif., 1973.
- [12] H.N. Gabow, “An efficient implementation of Edmonds algorithm for maximum matching on graphs”, *J. ACM*, 23, 2, 1976, pp. 221–234.
- [13] H.N. Gabow, “An efficient reduction technique for degree-constrained subgraph and bidirected network flow problems”, *Proc. 15th Annual ACM Symp. on Theory of Comp.*, 1983, pp. 448–456.
- [14] H.N. Gabow, “A scaling algorithm for weighted matching on general graphs”, *Proc. 26th Annual Symp. on Found. of Comp. Sci.*, 1985, pp. 90–100.
- [15] H.N. Gabow, “Data structures for weighted matching and nearest common ancestors with linking”, *Proc. 1st Annual ACM-SIAM Symp. on Disc. Algorithms*, 1990, pp. 434–443.
- [16] H.N. Gabow, “A data structures for nearest common ancestors with linking”, in preparation.
- [17] A.M.H. Gerards, “Matching”, in *Network Models* (M.O. Ball, T.L. Magnanti, C.L. Monma, G.L. Nemhauser, eds.), Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1995, pp. 135–224.

- [18] H.N. Gabow, Z. Galil and T.H. Spencer, “Efficient implementation of graph algorithms using contraction”, *J. ACM*, 36, 3, 1989, pp. 540–572.
- [19] H.N. Gabow, Z. Galil, T.H. Spencer and R.E. Tarjan, “Efficient algorithms for finding minimum spanning trees in undirected and directed graphs”, *Combinatorica* 6, 2, 1986, pp. 109–122.
- [20] Z. Galil, S. Micali and H.N. Gabow, “An $O(EV \log V)$ algorithm for finding a maximal weighted matching in general graphs”, *SIAM J. Comput.*, 15, 1, 1986, pp. 120–130.
- [21] H.N. Gabow and P. Sankowski, “Algebraic algorithms for b -matching, shortest undirected paths, and f -factors,” *Proc. 54th Annual Symp. on Found. of Comp. Sci.*, 2013, pp. 137–146. Revised version, 2016: “Algorithms for weighted matching generalizations I: Bipartite graphs, b -matching, and unweighted f -factors”; “Algorithms for weighted matching generalizations II: f -factors and the special case of shortest paths”.
- [22] H.N. Gabow and R.E. Tarjan, “A linear-time algorithm for a special case of disjoint set union”, *J. Comp. and System Sci.*, 30, 2, 1985, pp. 209–221.
- [23] H.N. Gabow and R.E. Tarjan, “Faster scaling algorithms for general graph matching problems”, *J. ACM* 38, 4, 1991, pp. 815–853.
- [24] D. Harel and R.E. Tarjan, “Fast algorithms for finding nearest common ancestors”, *SIAM J. Comput.*, 13, 2, 1984, pp. 338–355.
- [25] H.W. Kuhn, “The Hungarian method for the assignment problem”, *Naval Res. Logist. Quart.*, 2, 1955, pp. 83–97.
- [26] H.W. Kuhn, “Variants of the Hungarian method for assignment problems”, *Naval Res. Logist. Quart.*, 3, 1956, pp. 253–258.
- [27] E.L. Lawler, *Combinatorial Optimization: Networks and Matroids*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1976.
- [28] J.B. Orlin, “A faster strongly polynomial minimum cost flow algorithm”, *Operations Research*, 41, 1993, pp. 338–350.
- [29] L. Lovász and M.D. Plummer, *Matching Theory*, North-Holland Mathematic Studies 121, North-Holland, New York, 1986.
- [30] S. Pettie, “Sensitivity analysis of minimum spanning trees in sub-inverse-Ackermann time”, *Proc. 16th Int. Symp. on Algorithms and Comp.*, 2005, X. Deng and D. Du eds., Springer-Verlag LNCS 3827, pp. 964–973.
- [31] W.R. Pulleyblank, *Faces of matching polyhedra*, Ph.D. Diss., Department of Combinatorics and Optimization, Univ. of Waterloo, 1973.
- [32] W.R. Pulleyblank, “Edmonds, matching and the birth of polyhedral combinatorics”, *Documenta Mathematica*, 2012, pp. 181–197.
- [33] C.H. Papadimitriou and K. Steiglitz, *Combinatorial Optimization: Algorithms and Complexity*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1982.
- [34] A. Schrijver, *Combinatorial Optimization: Polyhedra and Efficiency*, Springer, NY, 2003.

- [35] R.E. Tarjan, “Applications of path compression on balanced trees”, *J. ACM*, 26, 4, 1979, pp. 690–715.
- [36] R.E. Tarjan, *Data Structures and Network Algorithms*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA., 1983.
- [37] M. Thorup, “Undirected single-source shortest paths with positive integer weights in linear time”, *J. ACM*, 46, 3, 1999, pp. 362–394.
- [38] G.M. Weber, “Sensitivity analysis of optimal matchings”, *Networks* 11, 1981, pp. 41–56.

A Dual adjustment step for Edmonds' algorithm

To state the dual adjustment step we first review the linear program for perfect matching. Its variables are given by the function $x : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ which indicates whether or not an edge is matched. The following linear program for maximum matching uses our summing convention, e.g., $x(\delta(v)) = \sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x(e)$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize } \sum_{e \in E} w(e)x(e) \text{ subject to} \\ & x(\delta(v)) = 1 \quad \text{for every } v \in V \\ & x(\gamma(B)) \leq \lfloor \frac{|B|}{2} \rfloor \quad \text{for every } B \subseteq V \\ & x(e) \geq 0 \quad \text{for every } e \in E \end{aligned}$$

The dual LP uses dual functions $y : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $z : 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. Define $\widehat{yz} : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(A.1) \quad \widehat{yz}(e) = y(e) + z\{B : e \subseteq B\}.$$

(Note for $e = vw$, $y(e)$ denotes $y(v) + y(w)$ and $z\{B : e \subseteq B\}$ denotes $\sum_{e \subseteq B} z(B)$.)

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize } y(V) + \sum_{B \subseteq V} \lfloor \frac{|B|}{2} \rfloor z(B) \text{ subject to} \\ & \widehat{yz}(e) \geq w(e) \quad \text{for every } e \in E \\ & z(B) \geq 0 \quad \text{for every } B \subseteq V \end{aligned}$$

e is *tight* when equality holds in its constraint, i.e., $\widehat{yz}(e) = w(e)$. The algorithm maintains the complementary slackness conditions:

$$x(e) > 0 \implies e \text{ is tight.}$$

$$z(B) > 0 \implies x(\gamma(B)) = \lfloor \frac{|B|}{2} \rfloor.$$

In addition every edge in a blossom subgraph is tight (so blossoms can be rematched). It is easy to see the following dual adjustment step maintains these conditions.

```

 $\delta_1 \leftarrow \min\{y(e) - w(e) : e = uv \text{ with } u \text{ outer, } v \notin \mathcal{S}\}$ 
 $\delta_2 \leftarrow \min\{(y(e) - w(e))/2 : e = uv \text{ with } u, v \text{ in distinct outer blossoms}\}$ 
 $\delta_3 \leftarrow \min\{(z(B))/2 : B \text{ an inner blossom of } \overline{\mathcal{S}}\}$ 
 $\delta \leftarrow \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\}$ 
for every vertex } v \in \mathcal{S} \text{ do}
  if } v \text{ is inner then } y(v) \leftarrow y(v) + \delta \text{ else } y(v) \leftarrow y(v) - \delta
for every blossom } B \text{ in } \overline{\mathcal{S}} \text{ do}
  if } B \text{ is inner then } z(B) \leftarrow z(B) - 2\delta \text{ else } z(B) \leftarrow z(B) + 2\delta

```

Figure 15: Dual adjustment step in Edmonds' algorithm.

B Details for b -matching and f -factor algorithms

The LPs for b -matching are the obvious generalizations of ordinary matching:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize } \sum_{e \in E} w(e)x(e) \text{ subject to} \\ & x(\delta(v)) + 2x(\gamma(v)) = b(v) \quad \text{for every } v \in V \\ & x(\gamma(B)) \leq \lfloor \frac{b(B)}{2} \rfloor \quad \text{for every } B \subseteq V \\ & x(e) \geq 0 \quad \text{for every } e \in E \end{aligned}$$

minimize $\sum_{v \in V} b(v)y(v) + \sum_{B \subseteq V} \lfloor \frac{b(B)}{2} \rfloor z(B)$ subject to

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{yz}(e) &\geq w(e) && \text{for every } e \in E \\ z(B) &\geq 0 && \text{for every } B \subseteq V \end{aligned}$$

The complementary slackness conditions are essentially the same as ordinary matching:

$x(e) > 0 \implies e$ is tight.

$z(B) > 0 \implies x(\gamma(B)) = \lfloor \frac{b(B)}{2} \rfloor$.

As mentioned in Section 4.1 complementary slackness requires that a blossom B with $z(B) > 0$ has precisely one incident matched edge, i.e., (4.4) holds. Let us review this fact. Our LP constraint $x(\gamma(B)) \leq \lfloor b(B)/2 \rfloor$ is redundant if $b(B)$ is even (since $2x(\gamma(B)) \leq x\{\delta(v) : v \in B\} + 2x\{\gamma(v) : v \in B\} = b(B)$). So we can assume $b(B)$ is odd. Now equality in the constraint amounts to (4.4).

The dual adjustment step differs from ordinary matching only in allowing a loop to cause a blossom (Fig.16). Like ordinary matching, the numerical quantities in our algorithm are always half-integers. More precisely assume all given weights $w(e)$ are integral. Assume either every initial y -value is integral or every initial y -value is integral plus $1/2$; furthermore every initial z -value is integral. This assumption holds for common initializations, e.g., $y \equiv \max_{e \in E} w(e)/2$ and $z \equiv 0$. It also holds for the initialization in our strongly polynomial algorithm, Section 4.4. (Note the y -values for BG , i.e., the transportation problem, are integral-valued. So (4.6) gives integral y -values for our algorithm assuming we double the given weight function.) We will show that throughout the algorithm

$$(B.1) \quad (\forall v \in V)(y(v) \in \mathbb{Z}/2) \text{ and } (\forall B \subseteq V)(z(B) \in \mathbb{Z}).$$

To prove (B.1) assume it holds before a dual adjustment. Examining the changes of Fig.16 shows it suffices to prove δ is a half-integer. Clearly δ_1 and δ_3 are half-integers. We will show any edge joining two vertices of \mathcal{S} has integral y -value. This makes δ_2 half-integral and completes the proof.

Any tight edge has $\widehat{yz}(e) = w(e)$. So (B.1) (specifically the integrality of z) implies $y(e) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Any vertex v in \mathcal{S} is joined to a free vertex x by a path P of tight edges. Thus $y(v) + 2y\{u : u \in P - v - x\} + y(x) \in \mathbb{Z}$, i.e., $y(v) + y(x) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Taking any other vertex v' of \mathcal{S} with similar relation $y(v') + y(x') \in \mathbb{Z}$ gives $y(v) + y(v') + y(x) + y(x') \in \mathbb{Z}$. A free vertex is always outer, so its y -value always decreases by δ . So the initialization implies $y(x) + y(x') \in \mathbb{Z}$. Thus $y(v) + y(v') \in \mathbb{Z}$ as desired.

The magnitude of numbers computed by the algorithm can be bounded as follows. Let W be the largest magnitude of an edge weight. Assume all initial y values are $\leq W$ and $z \equiv 0$. We claim the largest value of Δ is $\leq Wb(V)$. Clearly this implies every y and z value is $\leq 2Wb(V)$.

To prove the claim consider any point in the algorithm. Let $b'(v)$ be the remaining degree requirement at v , i.e., $b'(v) = b(v) - d(v, M)$ for M the current matching. Since every matched edge is tight,

$$(B.2) \quad w(M) = \sum_{e \in M} \widehat{yz}(e) = \sum_{v \in V} d(v, M)y(v) + \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \lfloor |B|/2 \rfloor z(B).$$

Thus we can rewrite the current value of the dual objective function as $\sum_{v \in V} b'(v)y(v) + w(M)$. The dual adjustment preserves tightness of the edges of M . So (B.2) holds and the updated dual objective can be rewritten the same way. Thus the dual adjustment decreases the dual objective value by $b'(V)\delta \geq 2\delta$. The initial dual objective is $\leq b(V)W$. The final objective is the weight of a maximum b -matching, which is $\geq -Wb(V)/2 \geq -Wb(V)$. So we always have $\Delta = \sum \delta \leq b(V)W$.

As with ordinary matching, other versions of weighted b -matching have LPs that are minor modifications of the original. Correspondingly, minor modifications of our algorithm find such

$\delta_1 \leftarrow \min\{y(e) - w(e) : e = uv \notin M \text{ with } B_u \text{ outer, } B_v \notin \mathcal{S}\}$
 $\delta_2 = \min\{(y(e) - w(e))/2 : e = uv \notin M \text{ with } B_u, B_v \text{ outer, either } B_u \neq B_v \text{ or } u = v \text{ atomic}\}$
 $\delta_3 = \min\{z(B)/2 : B \text{ an inner blossom of } \overline{\mathcal{S}}\}$
 $\delta = \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\}$
for every vertex $v \in \mathcal{S}$ **do**
 if B_v **is inner** **then** $y(v) \leftarrow y(v) + \delta$ **else** $y(v) \leftarrow y(v) - \delta$
for every blossom B **in** $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ **do**
 if B **is inner** **then** $z(B) \leftarrow z(B) - 2\delta$ **else** $z(B) \leftarrow z(B) + 2\delta$

Figure 16: Dual adjustment step for b -matching.

matchings. We illustrate with maximum cardinality maximum weight b -matching (defined in Section 4.3). It is convenient to treat the more general problem of finding a b -matching of maximum weight subject to the constraint that it contains exactly k edges.

The primal LP relaxes the vertex degree constraint to

$$x(\delta(v)) + 2x(\gamma(v)) \leq b(v) \quad \text{for every } v \in V$$

and adds the cardinality constraint

$$x(E) = k.$$

The dual problem has a variable c for the cardinality constraint, the left-hand side of the dual edge constraint changes from $\widehat{yz}(e)$ to $\widehat{yz}(e) + c$, and the nonnegativity constraint $y(v) \geq 0$ is added. The additional complementary slackness constraint is

$$y(v) > 0 \implies x(\delta(v)) + 2x(\gamma(v)) = b(v) \quad \text{for every } v \in V.$$

To find such a matching we initialize our algorithm using a common value for every $y(v)$. The algorithm halts after the search that increases the matching size to k . For maximum cardinality maximum weight b -matching, this is the first time a search fails. To get an optimal LP solution, let Y be the common final value for $y(v)$, v free, or 0 if no such vertex exists. (Fig.16 implies that throughout the algorithm all free vertices have the same y -value, and this value is the minimum y -value.) Decrease all y values by Y and set $c = 2Y$. This solves the new LP. (In the dual edge constraint the new y -values decrease $\widehat{yz}(e)$ by $2Y$, which is balanced by the new LP term $c = 2Y$.) We conclude that our algorithm is correct. It also proves the LP formulation is correct.

The LPs for f -factors incorporate limits on the number of copies of an edge as well as $I(B)$ sets of blossoms. (The graph may have parallel edges, so wlog we allow only 1 version of each copy to be in the f -factor.)

maximize $\sum_{e \in E} w(e)x(e)$ subject to

$$\begin{aligned}
x(\delta(v)) + 2x(\gamma(v)) &= f(v) && \text{for every } v \in V \\
x(\gamma(B) \cup I) &\leq \lfloor \frac{f(B) + |I|}{2} \rfloor && \text{for every } B \subseteq V, I \subseteq \delta(B) \\
x(e) &\leq 1 && \text{for every } e \in E \\
x(e) &\geq 0 && \text{for every } e \in E
\end{aligned}$$

The dual LP uses dual functions $y : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $z : 2^V \times 2^E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. Define $\widehat{yz} : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(B.3) \quad \widehat{yz}(e) = y(e) + z\{(B, I) : e \in \gamma(B) \cup I\}.$$

minimize $\sum_{v \in V} f(v)y(v) + \sum_{B \subseteq V, I \subseteq \delta(B)} \lfloor \frac{f(B)+|I|}{2} \rfloor z(B, I) + u(E)$ subject to

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{y}z(e) + u(e) &\geq w(e) && \text{for every } e \in E \\ u(e) &\geq 0 && \text{for every } e \in E \\ z(B, I) &\geq 0 && \text{for every } B \subseteq V, I \subseteq \delta(B) \end{aligned}$$

In our algorithm every nonzero z value has the form $z(B, I(B))$ for B a mature blossom. So we use the notation $z(B)$ as a shorthand for $z(B, I(B))$.

Say that e is *dominated*, *tight*, or *underrated* depending on whether $\widehat{y}z(e)$ is $\geq w(e)$, $= w(e)$, or $\leq w(e)$, respectively; *strictly dominated* and *strictly underrated* refer to the possibilities $> w(e)$ and $< w(e)$ respectively. The complementary slackness conditions for optimality can be written with u eliminated as

$$\begin{aligned} x(e) > 0 &\implies e \text{ is underrated} \\ x(e) = 0 &\implies e \text{ is dominated} \\ z(B) > 0 &\implies x(\gamma(B) \cup I(B)) = \lfloor \frac{f(B)+|I(B)|}{2} \rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

The numbers computed by the algorithm are analyzed similar to b -matching. The same argument applies to show the algorithm always works with half-integers. The same bound holds for the magnitude of numbers. The only addition to the analysis is to account for the term $u(E)$ in the dual objective function. Clearly the optimum u function is defined by setting $u(e)$ equal to the slack in e , $w(e) - \widehat{y}z(e)$, for every edge $e \in M$. So (B.2) has the analog, $w(M) = \sum_{e \in M} \widehat{y}z(e) + u(e) = \sum_{v \in V} d(v, M)y(v) + \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \lfloor \frac{f(B)+|I(B)|}{2} \rfloor z(B) + u(E)$. This equation holds both before and after the dual adjustment. (Note the dual adjustment will change u values also, and each $u(e)$ may increase.) The dual objective function can be rewritten just as before, as $\sum_{v \in V} f'(v)y(v) + w(M)$, both before and after the adjustment step. The rest of the analysis is identical to b -matching.

Similar to b -matching our algorithm extends to variants of the maximum f -factor problem. We again illustrate with maximum cardinality maximum weight partial f -factors. The LP is modified exactly as in b -matching. Our modified algorithm and the definition of new LP variables is exactly the same. The only difference in the analysis is that the new complementary slackness conditions for edges are

$$\begin{aligned} x(e) > 0 &\implies \widehat{y}z(e) + c \leq w(e) \\ x(e) = 0 &\implies \widehat{y}z(e) + c \geq w(e). \end{aligned}$$

As before the quantity $\widehat{y}z(e) + c$ equals the algorithm's value of $\widehat{y}z(e)$, so these conditions are equivalent to the original ones.

C Grow/Expand steps

We give a simple data structure to handle grow and expand steps. First consider ordinary matching. At any point in a search, for any vertex $v \in V$ define $slack(v)$ to be the smallest slack in an unmatched edge from an outer node to v . If $v \notin \mathcal{S}$ and $slack(v) < \infty$, dual adjustments reduce $slack(v)$. When $slack(v)$ becomes 0 a grow step can be performed to make B_v inner. But if B_v is a blossom, it may become inner before $slack(v)$ becomes 0. This blossom may later get expanded, and v may leave \mathcal{S} . If not some smaller blossom containing v may get expanded causing v to leave \mathcal{S} . Continuing in this fashion v may oscillate in and out of \mathcal{S} , becoming eligible and ineligible for grow steps. This makes tracking potential grow steps nontrivial. Note there is no such complication for grow steps using a matched edge to add a new outer node, since matched edges are always tight and outer nodes never leave \mathcal{S} .

The same overview applies to b -matching. f -factors are more general, since matched edges need not be tight. We first present the algorithm that applies to ordinary matching and b -matching.

Then we extend the algorithm to f -factors.

Data structures As in Section 2.2 for ordinary matching and 4.1 for b -matching and f -factors, we use a tree representing the laminar structure of blossoms. Specifically at the start of a search the current blossoms (from previous searches) form a tree \mathcal{B} . The root of \mathcal{B} corresponds to V , and each leaf corresponds to a vertex of G . The children of B in \mathcal{B} are the blossoms and atoms in the cycle $C(B)$ forming B . The subtree of a blossom B has size $O(|V(B)|)$, as in Sections 2.2 and 4.1.

Recall (Section 3.1) the rank of a \mathcal{B} -node B is $r(B) = \lfloor \log |V(B)| \rfloor$. A \mathcal{B} -child of B is *small* if it has rank $< r(B)$, else *big*. Clearly B has at most one big child. So the rank $r(B)$ descendants of B form a path P starting at B . Each node on P except B is the big child of its parent.⁸ The data structure marks each node as big or small.

We also use this notion: A child of a node on the above path P is a *small component* of B . Clearly a small component of B is a small child of its parent. If B is a blossom then $V(B) = \cup\{V(A) : A \text{ a small component of } B\}$. (This fails if B is a leaf of \mathcal{B} . Such a B has no children or components.)

The main task for the data structure is tracking $slack(v)$ values. Obviously this requires tracking B_v (as usual B_v denotes the currently maximal blossom or atom containing v). The values $node(v)$ defined below allow identifying B_v in $O(1)$ time. $node(v)$ values are also used in blossom and augment steps to compute paths in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$.

Recall the data structure for numerical quantities given in the last subsection of Section 4.3, in particular these definitions: Δ is the sum of all dual adjustment quantities δ in the current search. Any outer vertex v has a quantity $Y(v)$, such that the current value of $y(v)$ is $Y(v) - \Delta$. A global Fibonacci heap \mathcal{F} has entries for candidate grow, blossom, and expand steps, with key equal to the value of Δ when the corresponding edge becomes tight.

To compute current y and z values for nonouter nodes, we use an auxiliary quantity $DEL(B)$ that tracks z -values of expanded blossoms that have been converted into y -values. To define this quantity let y_0 and z_0 denote the dual functions at the start of the current search. The algorithm stores the quantity

$$Y(v) = y_0(v).$$

Every node B of \mathcal{B} is labelled with the quantity

$$(C.1) \quad DEL(B) = \frac{1}{2} z_0\{A : A \text{ a proper ancestor of } B \text{ in } \mathcal{B}\}.$$

Observe that when B is a maximal blossom, $DEL(B)$ is equal to the total of all dual adjustments made while B was properly contained in an inner blossom. At any point in time current y values are computed by

$$(C.2) \quad y(v) = \begin{cases} Y(v) + DEL(B_v) & B_v \text{ not in } \overline{\mathcal{S}} \\ Y(v) + DEL(B_v) + \Delta - \Delta_0(B_v) & B_v \text{ an inner node} \end{cases}$$

where $\Delta_0(B)$ denotes the value of Δ when blossom B became an inner node (blossom or atom). We will compute $y(v)$ in $O(1)$ time when it is needed. To do this we must identify B_v in $O(1)$ time. This is done using the pointer $node(v)$, as we will describe below.

We track the best candidate edges for grow steps from outer nodes using a system of Fibonacci heaps. At any point in the algorithm every maximal nonouter blossom B has a Fibonacci heap \mathcal{F}_B . The nodes of \mathcal{F}_B are the small components of B . Thus if B is not a node of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$, the smallest

⁸ P is a slight variant of the “heavy path” of [24, 35].

slack of an unmatched edge for a grow step to B is the smallest value $slack(v)$, v a vertex in $V(A)$, A a blossom or atom with a node in \mathcal{F}_B .

The data structure must also handle maximal nonouter atoms B . For uniformity we assume atoms are handled like blossoms – they have a Fibonacci heap of one node, the atom itself. We will not dwell on this case, the reader can make the obvious adjustments for maximal nonouter atoms.

Returning to the general case, the data structure does not explicitly store values $slack(v)$, since they change with every dual adjustment. Instead we store offsetted versions of related quantities as follows.

Observe that whenever B_v is not in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$, the slack in an unmatched edge uv with B_u outer is

$$y(u) + y(v) - w(uv) = (Y(u) - \Delta) + (Y(v) + DEL(B_v)) - w(uv).$$

(Note this relation holds regardless of prior history, i.e., when u was first in an outer node or the pattern of v 's movement in and out of \mathcal{S} .) So the data structure stores the quantity

$$SLACK(v) = \min\{Y(u) + Y(v) - w(uv) : B_u \text{ outer}, uv \in E - M\}$$

for every vertex v where B_v is not outer. Note that the expression for a given edge uv never changes in value, even as B_u changes. The data structure also records the minimizing edge uv . $SLACK(v)$ and its minimizing edge are updated as new outer nodes are created. At any point in time when v is not in \mathcal{S} , the current value of $slack(v)$ is

$$(C.3) \quad slack(v) = SLACK(v) - \Delta + DEL(B_v).$$

The key of a node A in \mathcal{F}_B is

$$(C.4) \quad key(A, \mathcal{F}_B) = \min\{SLACK(v) : v \in V(A)\}.$$

At any point in time when B is not in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$, the current smallest slack of an unmatched grow step edge to B is $find_min(\mathcal{F}_B) - \Delta + DEL(B)$. Thus a grow step for B can be done when $\Delta = find_min(\mathcal{F}_B) + DEL(B)$. So the key of B in the global heap \mathcal{F} is $find_min(\mathcal{F}_B) + DEL(B)$, if B is not a node of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$.

For every vertex $v \in V$, $node(v)$ is the unique ancestor of v that is currently a node of some heap \mathcal{F}_B . $node(v)$ is used in (C.4) to maintain keys in \mathcal{F}_B (i.e., $node(v)$ gives A in (C.4)). $node(v)$ is also used in (C.2) to determine the current blossom B_v . Specifically $node(v)$ is in the heap \mathcal{F}_{B_v} .

Algorithms When a new outer node B is created, every unmatched edge uv ($u \in B$) is examined. $SLACK(v)$ is decreased if appropriate. This may trigger a *decrease_key* for $node(v)$ in \mathcal{F}_{B_v} . This may in turn trigger a *decrease_key* for B_v in \mathcal{F} , if B_v is currently not in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$.

When a grow step adds a blossom B to $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$, the node for B in \mathcal{F} is deleted. Note that whether B becomes inner or outer, it never gets reinserted in \mathcal{F} in this search. If B becomes inner the value $\Delta_0(B)$ is recorded. If B becomes outer, the values $y(v), v \in V(B)$ are required to redefine $Y(v)$ (recall from Section 4.3). This is done using the first alternative of (C.2). If B becomes inner and later becomes outer in a blossom step, $Y(v)$ is redefined using the second alternative of (C.2).

Consider an expand step for an inner blossom B . The \mathcal{B} -children of B (i.e., the nodes of $C(B)$) become maximal blossoms or atomic, and we must update the data structure for them. Let B' be the big \mathcal{B} -child of B , if it exists. For every \mathcal{B} -child $A \neq B'$ of B , delete the node A of \mathcal{F}_B . Initialize a new F-heap \mathcal{F}_A as follows (modifying appropriately if A is atomic):

For each small component D of A , create a node in \mathcal{F}_A . For every $v \in V(D)$ update $node(v)$ to D . Assign $key(D, \mathcal{F}_A) \leftarrow \min\{SLACK(v) : v \in V(D)\}$.

Let the new heap $\mathcal{F}_{B'}$ be the (updated) heap \mathcal{F}_B . Insert the \mathcal{B} -children of B that are no longer in \mathcal{S} as entries in \mathcal{F} . For the \mathcal{B} -children that are inner nodes of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ record their Δ_0 value. Process \mathcal{B} -children that are outer nodes of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ as above.

The main observation for correctness of the expand procedure is that $\mathcal{F}_{B'}$ is the desired heap for B' . This follows since the small components of B' are those of B minus the small children of B .

It is easy to see the total time used in the course of an entire search is $O(m + n \log n)$. When a small child A becomes maximal it is charged $O(\log n)$ to account for its deletion from \mathcal{F}_B . For D a small component of A , each vertex $v \in V(A)$ is charged $O(1)$ for resetting $node(v)$ and examining $SLACK(v)$. (The new $node(v)$ values are easily found by traversing the subtree of A in the blossom tree \mathcal{B} . The traversal uses time proportional to the number of leaves, i.e., $O(1)$ time for each vertex v .) v moves to a new small component $O(\log n)$ times so this charge totals $O(n \log n)$. Finally and most importantly, *decrease_key* uses $O(1)$ amortized time in a Fibonacci tree.

***f*-factors** Two new aspects of *f*-factors are that matched edges needn't be tight and edges can be in *I*-sets. We will use some simple facts about *I*-sets.

Lemma C.1 *Consider blossoms A, B with $V(A) \subseteq V(B)$, and edge $e \in \delta(A) \cap \delta(B)$.*

- (i) $e = \eta(A) \iff e = \eta(B)$.
- (ii) $e \in I(A) \iff e \in I(B)$.

Proof: (i) Consider three cases for A .

Case $A \not\subseteq \alpha(B)$: This makes $\eta(A) \in \gamma(B)$. So $e \in \delta(B)$ implies $e \neq \eta(A)$. Also $e \in \delta(A)$ implies $e \neq \eta(B)$.

Case $A = \alpha(B)$: This makes $\eta(A) = \eta(B)$. Hence $e = \eta(A)$ iff $e = \eta(B)$.

Case $A \subset \alpha(B)$: Edge e of the hypothesis is in $\delta(A) \cap \delta(\alpha(B))$. By induction $e = \eta(A) \iff e = \eta(\alpha(B))$. Since $\eta(\alpha(B)) = \eta(B)$ this implies (i).

(ii) By (i) there are two possibilities:

Case $e \neq \eta(A), \eta(B)$: $e \in I(A) \iff e \in M \iff e \in I(B)$.

Case $e = \eta(A) = \eta(B)$: $e \in I(A) \iff e \notin M \iff e \in I(B)$. □

Now observe an edge $e = uv \in I(B_v)$ has

$$(C.5) \quad z_0\{A : V(A) \subseteq V(B_v), e \in I(A)\} = z_0\{A : v \in V(A) \subseteq V(B_v)\} = 2(DEL(v) - DEL(B_v)).$$

The second equation is trivial and the first follows immediately part (ii) of the lemma.

The analog of the previous definition of *slack* is

$$(C.6) \quad slack(v) = \min\{|\widehat{yz}(uv) - w(uv)| : uv \in E \text{ eligible at } u\}.$$

(Recall Lemma 5.8 and its terminology.) As in Lemma 5.7 define a sign σ as -1 if $uv \in M$ else $+1$, so any edge uv has $|\widehat{yz}(uv) - w(uv)| = \sigma(\widehat{yz}(uv) - w(uv))$.

The highest level outline of the data structure is as before: We track *slack* by maintaining the invariant (C.3), where the stored quantity $SLACK(v)$ will be defined below. We define keys in

\mathcal{F}_B and \mathcal{F} exactly as before, e.g., (C.4). The invariant implies that for any blossom B not in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$, the current smallest *slack* of a grow step edge to B is $find_min(\mathcal{F}_B) - \Delta + DEL(B)$. So the data structure gives the correct value for the next dual adjustment.

Our definition of $SLACK(v)$ involves two quantities $IU(uv)$ and $IV(uv)$ that account for the contributions of I -edges to the slack of uv , IU at the u end and IV at the v end. We will define IU and IV to be fixed, stored quantities so the following relations hold. At any time when $v \notin \mathcal{S}$, and B_v is the maximal blossom/vertex currently containing v ,

$$(C.7) \quad y(v) + z\{A : v \in V(A), uv \in I(A)\} = Y(v) + IV(uv) + \sigma DEL(B_v).$$

At any time after uv becomes eligible at u ,

$$(C.8) \quad y(u) + z\{A : u \in V(A), uv \in I(A)\} = Y(u) + IU(uv) - \sigma \Delta.$$

We reiterate that the only terms on the right-hand side of these two equations that change with time are $DEL(B_v)$ and Δ .

Now define

$$SLACK(v) = \min\{\sigma(Y(u) + Y(v) + IU(uv) + IV(uv) - w(uv)) : uv \in E \text{ eligible at } u\}.$$

Let us show the above relations imply the desired invariant (C.3) for $SLACK$. Adding the two equations and multiplying by σ implies that at any point in time when uv is eligible and $v \notin \mathcal{S}$,

$$|\widehat{yz}(uv) - w(uv)| = \sigma(Y(u) + IU(uv) + Y(v) + IV(uv) - w(uv)) - \Delta + DEL(B_v).$$

Applying this for every edge uv in the definition of $SLACK$ gives (C.3) as desired.

It remains to give IV and IU . The contribution at the nonouter end v is defined by

$$IV(uv) = \begin{cases} 0 & uv \notin M \cup \eta(B_v) \\ 2DEL(v) & uv \in M - \eta(B_v) \\ 2DEL(B_v) & uv = \eta(B_v) \in M \\ 2(DEL(v) - DEL(B_v)) & uv = \eta(B_v) \notin M. \end{cases}$$

To discuss this definition we will use the following terminology. Recall that the algorithm computes $IV(uv)$ when uv becomes eligible at u . $IV(uv)$ is defined using the blossom/vertex B_v at that time. However we must verify (C.7) whenever $v \notin \mathcal{S}$, so B_v may change. To keep the two cases straight say the *defining* B_v is used to compute $IV(uv)$, and a *useful* B_v is one that may be required later on in (C.7) to establish the invariant (C.3) for the algorithm. The defining B_v is useful iff $v \notin \mathcal{S}$ when $IV(uv)$ is computed. Clearly a useful B_v is a subset of the defining B_v , but we shall see that not every such B_v is useful.

To prove the definition is correct we will analyze each of its four cases separately. We will show that if the defining B_v is in that case, so is every useful B_v . Then we will show (C.7) is satisfied for every useful B_v . To do this we will compute the value of the left-hand side of (C.7) and deduce the correct value of $IV(uv)$ by comparing to the right-hand side.

To begin the analysis, note that whenever $v \notin \mathcal{S}$ the current value of $y(v)$ is

$$Y(v) + DEL(B_v)$$

since every dual adjustment increases $y(v)$ by δ . Also when $uv \in I(B_v)$ the z contribution to the left-hand side of (C.7) is

$$z_0\{A : v \in V(A) \subseteq V(B_v)\} = 2(DEL(v) - DEL(B_v)),$$

by (C.5).

Case $uv \notin M \cup \eta(B_v)$: We assume this case holds for the defining B_v . So for any useful B_v , say B , uv is an unmatched edge and $uv \neq \eta(B)$ (by Lemma C.1(i)). So this case holds for every useful B .

Now we establish (C.7) for any useful B_v . The contribution to the left-hand side of (C.7) is $y(v) = Y(v) + \sigma DEL(B_v)$. This follows since this case has $uv \notin I(B_v)$ (so there is no z contribution) and $\sigma = 1$ (since $uv \notin M$). Comparing to the right-hand side of (C.7) shows $IV(uv) = 0$, as desired.

Case $uv \in M - \eta(B_v)$: We assume this holds for the defining B_v . So any useful B_v has uv matched and not its base edge (by Lemma C.1(i)). Thus this case holds for any useful B_v .

Now consider any useful B_v . If B_v is a blossom then $uv \in I(B_v)$. So the z contribution is $2(DEL(v) - DEL(B_v))$. This also holds if B_v is atomic, since the z contribution is 0. Since $uv \in M$, $\sigma = -1$. Adding the y and z contributions to the left-hand side of (C.7) gives total contribution

$$(Y(v) + DEL(B_v)) + 2(DEL(v) - DEL(B_v)) = Y(v) + 2DEL(v) + \sigma DEL(B_v).$$

Thus $IV(uv) = 2DEL(v)$, independent of B_v .

The next two cases have $uv = \eta(B_v)$ for the defining B_v . If $v \in \mathcal{S}$ at this point then wlog B_v is inner. Since $v = \beta(B_v)$, v will remain in \mathcal{S} for the rest of the search. So uv is irrelevant to the data structure. If $v \notin \mathcal{S}$ then B_v is itself the first useful B_v . The first time this B_v becomes a node of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$, the preceding argument applies. It shows there are no other useful B_v 's. In summary we have shown for the next two cases, every useful B_v belongs to the same case.

Case $uv = \eta(B_v) \in M$: Since $uv \notin I(B_v)$ there is no z contribution (by Lemma C.1(ii)). So the total contribution is $y(v) = Y(v) + DEL(B_v) = Y(v) + 2DEL(B_v) + \sigma DEL(B_v)$. Thus $IV(uv) = 2DEL(B_v)$.

Case $uv = \eta(B_v) \notin M$: This makes $uv \in I(B_v)$ so there is a z contribution. The total contribution is

$$(Y(v) + DEL(B_v)) + 2(DEL(v) - DEL(B_v)) = Y(v) + 2(DEL(v) - DEL(B_v)) + \sigma DEL(B_v).$$

Thus $IV(uv) = 2(DEL(v) - DEL(B_v))$.

Remark: It might seem that the cases for $uv = \eta(B_v)$ are subject to a simplification because this edge is often tight. Specifically if B_v was not a maximal blossom at the beginning of the current search then $\eta(B_v)$ is tight when the search starts. So $\eta(B_v)$ will be tight when B_v becomes maximal. However this need not be the case when $\eta(B_v)$ becomes eligible. For instance suppose a search starts out with the structure of Fig.17. Then the inner blossom B_5 gets expanded to give part of Fig.11, where $\alpha_2 = \eta_4 = \eta(B_4)$. As mentioned (in the Examples section after Fig.14) a dual adjustment makes α_2 strictly underrated. A subsequent expansion of B_3 may make α_2 eligible, but still underrated.

The contribution at the $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ end u is

$$IU(uv) = \begin{cases} DEL(B_u) - \Delta_0(B_u) & B_u \text{ inner, } uv \in M \\ 2DEL(u) - DEL(B_u) + \Delta_0(B_u) & B_u \text{ inner, } uv = \eta(B_u) \notin M \\ 0 & B_u \text{ outer, } uv \notin M \\ 2(DEL(u) - DEL(B_u) - 2\Delta_0(O_u) + \Delta_0(B_u)) & B_u \text{ outer, } uv \in M. \end{cases}$$




Figure 17: Precursor to structure of Fig.11.

O_u is defined below.

To verify correctness let Δ_0 be the value of Δ when uv first becomes eligible for (any) B_u . We will show (C.8) holds at that point. Thereafter, uv remains eligible (Lemma 5.8), so (5.5) shows the left-hand side of (C.8) changes by $-\sigma\delta$ in every dual adjustment, as does the right-hand side. Thus (C.8) continues to hold in every dual adjustment.

Case B_u inner, $uv \in M$: This makes $uv \notin I(B_u)$. (There are two cases: If B_u is a blossom then $uv = \eta(B_u)$ since uv is eligible. If B_u is atomic then $I(B_u) = \emptyset$.) Thus the contribution is

$$y(u) = Y(u) + DEL(B_u) = Y(u) + DEL(B_u) - \Delta_0(B_u) - \sigma\Delta_0.$$

Thus $IU(uv) = DEL(B_u) - \Delta_0(B_u)$.

Case B_u inner, $uv = \eta(B_u) \notin M$: This makes B_u a blossom and $uv \in I(B_u)$. The contribution for $y(u)$ is the same as the previous case. The contribution for z is $2(DEL(u) - DEL(B_u))$. The total contribution is $(Y(u) + DEL(B_u)) + 2(DEL(u) - DEL(B_u)) = Y(u) + 2DEL(u) - DEL(B_u) + \Delta_0(B_u) - \sigma\Delta_0$. Thus $IU(uv) = 2DEL(u) - DEL(B_u) + \Delta_0(B_u)$.

We are left with the case where uv first becomes eligible when u enters an outer node. Furthermore $uv \neq \eta(B_u)$ when B_u is a blossom. To prove the latter, the preceding two cases apply if blossom B_u enters \bar{S} as inner. If B_u enters as outer clearly $\eta(B_u) = \tau(B_u) \in \bar{S}$.

Let O_u be the first outer node that contains B_u . Let $\Delta_0(O_u)$ be the value of Δ when O_u is formed. So $\Delta_0 = \Delta_0(O_u)$. Recall that when O_u is formed we redefine $Y(u)$ to be the current value of $y(u)$ plus $\Delta_0(O_u)$. Hence at any time after O_u is formed B_u is outer and

$$y(u) = Y(u) - \Delta.$$

Also the only z contribution comes from B_u (since we assume $\Delta = \Delta_0$).

Case uv becomes eligible for O_u , $uv \notin M$: There is no z contribution. (This is by definition if B_u is atomic. If B_u is a blossom we have noted $uv \neq \eta(B_u)$.) So the total contribution is $y(u) = Y(u) - \Delta_0(O_u) = Y(u) - \sigma\Delta_0$. Thus $IU(uv) = 0$.

Case uv becomes eligible for O_u , $uv \in M$: First suppose B_u is a blossom. This case makes $uv \in I(B_u)$. When B_u becomes an \overline{S} -node (outer or inner) the z contribution is

$$z_0\{A : u \in V(A) \subseteq V(B_u)\}.$$

If B_u enters as an inner node and is later absorbed in an outer node, this z contribution decreases by

$$2(\Delta_0(O_u) - \Delta_0(B_u)).$$

This also holds if B_u enters as outer. (The latter may occur in a grow step that adds $B_u = O_u$, or in an expand step that makes B_u maximal and outer.)

It is possible that B_u is an atom. We must have B_u outer, by the first case. An atom has no z contribution. This is consistent with the two displayed z contributions, since they are both 0 for an atom B_u ($B_u = O_u$).

So in all cases, the left-hand side of (C.8) is

$$\begin{aligned} & (Y(u) - \Delta_0(O_u)) + 2(DEL(u) - DEL(B_u) - (\Delta_0(O_u) - \Delta_0(B_u))) \\ &= Y(u) + 2(DEL(u) - DEL(B_u) - 2\Delta_0(O_u) + \Delta_0(B_u)) - \sigma\Delta_0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $IU(uv) = 2(DEL(u) - DEL(B_u) - 2\Delta_0(O_u) + \Delta_0(B_u))$.

The only changes to the algorithm are the obvious ones for examining edges: Matched edges must be examined and added to the data structure. IU and IV quantities must be computed. It is easy to see the latter uses $O(1)$ time per edge. So the timing estimate is not affected.