

Flow polynomials of a signed graph

Jianguo Qian*

School of Mathematical Sciences, Xiamen University

Xiamen, Fujian 361005, P.R. China

Abstract

In contrast to ordinary graphs, the number of the nowhere-zero group-flows in a signed graph may vary with different groups, even if the groups have the same order. In fact, for a signed graph G and non-negative integer d , it was shown that there exists a polynomial $F_d(G, x)$ such that the number of the nowhere-zero Γ -flows in G equals $F_d(G, x)$ evaluated at k for every Abelian group Γ of order k with $\epsilon(\Gamma) = d$, where $\epsilon(\Gamma)$ is the largest integer d for which Γ has a subgroup isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}_2^d . We focus on the combinatorial structure of Γ -flows in a signed graph and the coefficients in $F_d(G, x)$. We first define the fundamental directed circuits for a signed graph G and show that all Γ -flows (not necessarily nowhere-zero) in G can be generated by these circuits. It turns out that all Γ -flows in G can be evenly classified into $2^{\epsilon(\Gamma)}$ -classes specified by the elements of order 2 in Γ , each class of which consists of the same number of flows depending only on the order of the group. This gives an explanation for why the number of Γ -flows in a signed graph varies with different $\epsilon(\Gamma)$, and also gives an answer to a problem posed by Beck and Zaslavsky. Secondly, using an extension of Whitney's broken circuit theory we give a combinatorial interpretation of the coefficients in $F_d(G, x)$ for $d = 0$, in terms of the broken bonds. As an example, we give an analytic expression of $F_0(G, x)$ for a class of the signed graphs that contain no balanced circuit. Finally, we show that the sets of edges in a signed graph that contain no broken bond form a homogeneous simplicial complex.

Keywords: signed graph; nowhere-zero flow; polynomial; coefficient

AMS classification: 05C21; 05C22; 05C31

*email address: jgqian@xmu.edu.cn

1 Introduction

Nowhere-zero \mathbb{Z}_k -flows, or modular k -flows, in a graph was initially introduced by Tutte [18] as a dual problem to vertex-colouring of plane graphs. It has long been known that the number of nowhere-zero \mathbb{Z}_k -flows or more in general, nowhere-zero Γ -flows (flows with values in Γ) for an Abelian group Γ of order k is a polynomial function in k , which does not depend on the algebraic structure of the group [18]. An analog to \mathbb{Z}_k -flow is the integer k -flow or, simply k -flow. It is well known that a graph has a nowhere-zero k -flow if and only if it has a nowhere-zero \mathbb{Z}_k -flow [17]. In [15], Kochol showed that the number of nowhere-zero k -flows is also a polynomial in k , although not the same polynomial as that for nowhere-zero \mathbb{Z}_k -flows. For more topics related to nowhere-zero flows in graphs see also Brylawski and Oxley [5], Jaeger [12], Seymour [16] and Zhang [22].

The notion of the signed graphs was introduced by Harary [11] initially as a model for social networks. In comparison with flows in plane graphs or more generally, in graphs embedded on orientable surface, the definition of \mathbb{Z}_k -flows in signed graphs is naturally considered for the study of graphs embedded on non-orientable surface, where nowhere-zero \mathbb{Z}_k -flows emerge as the dual notion to local tensions [14].

In contrast to ordinary graphs, the problem of counting the nowhere-zero flows in a signed graph seems more complicated and there are relatively few results to be found in the literatures. Using the theory of counting lattice points in inside-out polytopes to signed graphs, Beck and Zaslavsky [1] showed that the number of the nowhere-zero k -flows in a signed graph is a quasi-polynomial of period two, that is, a pair of polynomials, one for odd values of k and the other for even k . In the same paper, Beck and Zaslavsky also showed that there exists a polynomial $f(G, x)$ such that, for every odd integer k , the number of nowhere-zero Γ -flows in a signed graph G equals $f(G, x)$ evaluated at k for every Abelian group Γ with $|\Gamma| = k$. This result was recently extended by DeVos, Rollova and Šamal [7] (available from arXiv) to general Abelian group: for any non-negative integer d , there exists a polynomial $f_d(G, x)$ such that the number of nowhere-zero Γ -flows in G is exactly $f_d(G, x)$ evaluated at n for every Abelian group Γ with $\epsilon(\Gamma) = d$ and $|\Gamma| = 2^d n$, where $\epsilon(\Gamma)$ is the largest integer d for which Γ has a subgroup isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}_2^d . More recently, Goodall et. al. [10] (available from arXiv) gave an explicit expression of $f_d(G, x)$ in form of edge-subgraph expansions.

In this paper we focus on the combinatorial structure of Γ -flows in a signed graph G and the coefficients in the polynomial $f_d(G, x)$. For con-

venience, instead of working on $f_d(G, x)$, we will work on the polynomial $F_d(G, x)$ defined by $F_d(G, x) = f_d(G, 2^{-d}x)$ and call $F_d(G, x)$ the *d-type flow polynomial*, or simply, the *flow polynomial* of G . It can be seen that $F_d(G, x)$ evaluated at k is exactly the number of the nowhere-zero Γ -flows in G for every Abelian group Γ with $\epsilon(\Gamma) = d$ and $|\Gamma| = k$.

In the third section we introduce the fundamental directed circuits and the fundamental root circuit (a particular unbalanced circuit) in a signed graph G . We show that every Γ -flow (not necessarily nowhere-zero) in G can be generated by these circuits, each of which is assigned with a proper Γ -flow. More specifically, the values of the flows assigned to the fundamental directed circuits are the elements in Γ while the value to the fundamental root circuit is an element of order 2 in the group Γ . Therefore, all Γ -flows in G can be evenly classified into $2^{\epsilon(\Gamma)}$ -classes specified by the elements of order 2 in Γ . Moreover, each class consists of the same number of flows, which depends only on the order of the group. This gives an explanation for why the number of the Γ -flows in a signed graph varies with different $\epsilon(\Gamma)$ and, also gives an answer to a problem posed by Beck and Zaslavsky in [1]. Further, this result also yields an explicit expression of the polynomial $F_d(G, x)$ obtained earlier by Goodall et. al.

In the fifth section we give a combinatorial interpretation of the coefficients in $F_d(G, x)$ for $d = 0$. To this end, we apply Whitney's broken circuit theory [19]. In the study of graph coloring, one significance of Whitney's broken circuit theorem is that it gives a very nice 'cancellation' to reduce the terms in the chromatic polynomial (represented in the form of inclusion-exclusion) so that the remaining terms can not be cancelled out anymore and, therefore, yield a combinatorial interpretation for the coefficients of the polynomial [3, 4]. Using an extended form of the Whitney's theorem given by Dohmen and Trinks [8], we show that $F_0(G, x)$ is a polynomial with leading term x^{m-n} and with its coefficients alternating in signs. More specifically, the coefficient of $(-1)^i x^{m-n-i}$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, m-n$, is exactly the number of the sets consisting of i edges that contain no broken bond. As an example, we give an analytic expression of $F_0(G, x)$ for a class of the signed graphs that contain no balanced circuit. Finally, we show that the broken bonds in a signed graph form a nice topological structure, that is, a homogeneous simplicial complex of top dimension $m-n$. Thus, the coefficients of $F_0(G, x)$ are the simplex counts in each dimension of the complex.

2 Preliminaries

Graphs in this paper may contain parallel edges or loops. For a graph G , we use $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ to denote its vertex set and edge set, respectively. A *signed graph* is a pair (G, Σ) , where $\Sigma \subseteq E(G)$ and the edges in Σ are negative while the other ones are positive.

A *circuit* is a connected 2-regular graph. An *unbalanced circuit* in a signed graph (G, Σ) is a circuit in G that has an odd number of negative edges. A *balanced circuit* in (G, Σ) is a circuit that is not unbalanced. A subgraph of G is *unbalanced* if it contains an unbalanced circuit; otherwise, it is *balanced*. In particular, a subgraph without negative edges is balanced. A *barbell* is the union of two unbalanced circuits C_1, C_2 and a (possibly trivial) path P with end vertices $v_1 \in V(C_1)$ and $v_2 \in V(C_2)$, such that $C_1 - v_1$ is disjoint from $P \cup C_2$ and $C_2 - v_2$ is disjoint from $P \cup C_1$. We call P the *barbell path* of the barbell. A *signed circuit* is either a balanced circuit or a barbell.

Given a signed graph (G, Σ) , *switching* at a vertex v is the inversion of the sign of each edge incident with v . Two signed graphs are said to be *switching-equivalent* if one can be obtained from the other by a series of switchings. It is known [14] and easy to see that equivalent signed graphs have the same sets of unbalanced circuits and the same sets of balanced circuits. This means, in particular, that a balanced signed graph (G, Σ) is switching-equivalent to an ordinary graph G .

Following Bouchet [2] we now introduce the notion of the *half-edges* so as to orient a signed graph: each negative edge of (G, Σ) is viewed as composed of two half-edges. An orientation of a negative edge e is obtained by giving each of the two half-edges h and h' a direction so that both h and h' point toward the end vertices of e , called *extroverted*, or both h and h' point toward the inside of e , called *introverted*.

In the following, we will use G simply to denote a signed graph if no confusion can occur. Let D be a fixed orientation of a signed graph G and Γ be an additive Abelian group. A map $\mathbf{f} : E(D) \rightarrow \Gamma$ is called a Γ -flow if the usual conservation law (Kirchhoff's law) is satisfied, that is, for each vertex v , the sum of $\mathbf{f}(e)$ over the incoming edges $e \in E^-(v)$ at v (i.e., the edges and half-edges directed towards v) equals the sum of $\mathbf{f}(e)$ over the outgoing edges $e \in E^+(v)$, i.e.,

$$\sum_{e \in E^+(v)} \mathbf{f}(e) = \sum_{e \in E^-(v)} \mathbf{f}(e).$$

A flow \mathbf{f} is called nowhere-zero if $\mathbf{f}(e) \neq 0$ for each $e \in E(D)$. It is well known that the number of nowhere-zero Γ -flows is independent of the orientation of G . A signed graph is said to be Γ -flow admissible if it admits at least one nowhere-zero Γ -flow. It is clear that the property of ‘ Γ -flow admissible’ is invariant under switching inversion.

3 Fundamental circuits in a signed graph

In this section we generalize the notion of fundamental circuits in graphs to signed graphs, which will play an important role in revealing the structural property of Γ -flows in signed graphs.

For a signed graph G and a set F of edges, we denote by $G + F$ and $G - F$ the subgraphs obtained from G by adding and deleting the edges in F , respectively. Let $E_N = \{e_0, e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{m_N-1}\}$ be the set of all the negative edges of G , where $m_N = |E_N|$. In this section we always assume that G is unbalanced and, with no loss of generality, contains as few negative edges as possible in its switching equivalent class. Thus, $E_N \neq \emptyset$ and $G - E_N$ is connected [21].

Let T be a spanning tree of $G - E_N$. Choose an arbitrary edge e_0 from E_N and call $T_0 = T + e_0$ a *signed rooted tree* of G with root edge e_0 (note that a signed rooted tree we defined here is not a real tree because it has a unique unbalanced circuit). Let $\overline{T}_0 = E(G) \setminus E(T_0)$. For any $e \in \overline{T}_0$, it is clear that $T_0 + e$ contains a unique signed circuit. We call this circuit a *fundamental circuit* and denote it by C_e . We can see that, if $e \in \overline{T}_0 \setminus E_N$ then C_e is an ordinary circuit (a circuit without negative edge) and if $e \in E_N \setminus \{e_0\}$ then C_e is a barbell or a balanced circuit with two negative edges e_0 and e .

Given a fixed orientation D of G , a *fundamental directed circuit* \vec{C}_e of G is the orientation of a fundamental circuit C_e such that the direction of e is the same as what it was in D and the directions of all other edges on \vec{C}_e coincide consistently with e along with C_e . Under this orientation, it can be seen that if C_e is an ordinary circuit then an edge e' on \vec{C}_e is clockwise oriented if and only if e is clockwise oriented, and if C_e is a balanced circuit or a barbell (with two negative edges e_0 and e), then the direction of the two negative edges are always opposite, that is, e_0 is extroverted if and only if e is introverted, see Figure 1.

For an fundamental circuit C_e , let C_e^D be the orientation D restricted on




Figure 1. The edges e_0, e_1, e_2 are negative and e is positive.

C_e . We associate with C_e a function \mathbf{f}_e on $E(G)$ defined by

$$\mathbf{f}_e(a) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a \in \vec{C}_e; \\ -1, & \text{if } a \in C_e^D \setminus \vec{C}_e; \\ 2, & \text{if } a \in \vec{C}_e \text{ and } a \text{ is on the barbell path of } C_e; \\ -2, & \text{if } a \in C_e^D \setminus \vec{C}_e \text{ and } a \text{ is on the barbell path of } C_e; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for any $a \in E(D)$, where ‘ a is on the barbell path of C_e ’ means that C_e is a barbell and a is on the barbell path of C_e .

Form the above definition, it can be seen that $\mathbf{f}_e(e) = 1$ for any $e \in \overline{T}_0$.

Let C_0 be the unique (un-balanced) circuit in T_0 (i.e., formed by e_0 and T). Choose an arbitrary vertex v on C_0 and let \vec{C}_0 be the orientation of C_0 such that the direction of e_0 is extroverted and all other edges on C_0 are oriented so that $d^-(v) = 2, d^+(v) = 0$ and $d^-(u) = d^+(u) = 1$ for any vertex u on C_0 other than v , where $d^-(v)$ and $d^+(v)$ are the in-degree and out-degree of v on \vec{C}_0 , respectively, see Figure 1. We call \vec{C}_0 the *fundamental root circuit* and associate it with a function \mathbf{g} on $E(G)$ defined by

$$\mathbf{g}(e) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } e \in \vec{C}_0; \\ -1, & \text{if } e \in C_0^D \setminus \vec{C}_0; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for any $e \in E(D)$.

For convenience, in the following we regard each Γ -flow, each function \mathbf{f}_e ($e \in \overline{T}_0$) and the function \mathbf{g} as m -dimensional vectors indexed by $e \in E(G)$. Let \mathcal{S}_G denote the class of all Γ -flows (not necessarily nowhere-zero) in G .

For a finite additive Abelian group Γ , let Γ_2 be the set of the elements of order 2 in Γ (including the zero element). Recalling that $\epsilon(\Gamma)$ is the largest integer d for which Γ has a subgroup isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}_2^d , we have $|\Gamma_2| = 2^{\epsilon(\Gamma)}$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let Γ be an additive Abelian group and let G be a connected unbalanced signed graph. Let T be a spanning tree T of G consisting of positive edges and let $e_0 \in E_N$. Then*

$$\mathcal{S}_G = \left\{ \gamma \mathbf{g} + \sum_{e \in \overline{T}_0} \gamma_e \mathbf{f}_e : \gamma \in \Gamma_2, \gamma_e \in \Gamma \right\}. \quad (1)$$

Proof. It is clear that

$$\gamma \mathbf{g} + \sum_{e \in \overline{T}_0} \gamma_e \mathbf{f}_e \quad (2)$$

is a Γ -flow for any $\gamma \in \Gamma_2$ and $\gamma_e \in \Gamma$. Let \mathbf{f} be an arbitrary Γ -flow in G . We need only prove that \mathbf{f} can be written as the combination (2).

Since a Γ -flow is independent of the orientation D , to simplify our discussion we make the following assumption:

Assumption 1. In orientation D , the direction of the root edge e_0 is extroverted while the directions of all other negative edges are introverted.

For each negative edge $e_i = u_i v_i \in E_N$, insert a new vertex w_i into the middle of e_i so that the two half edges of e_i in D become two ordinary directed edges $w_i u_i$ (with direction from w_i to u_i) and $w_i v_i$ if $i = 0$, or $u_i w_i$ and $v_i w_i$ if $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_N - 1\}$. We call w_i the *middle vertex* of e_i .

Further, add a new vertex w to D and, for each middle vertex w_i , add the directed edge $e'_i = w w_i$ if $i = 0$ and the directed edge $e'_i = w_i w$ if $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_N - 1\}$. The resulting graph, denoted by D^w , is a directed graph without negative edges, that is, D^w is an ordinary directed graph. Further, for $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, m_N - 1\}$, assign the edge e'_i with the value $2\mathbf{f}(e_i)$. It clear that, except the possible w , the conservation law is satisfied at all the vertices in D^w and therefore must be satisfied at w , either. As a result, we get a span of the Γ -flow \mathbf{f} to D^w and denote it by \mathbf{f}^w . Thus, by the conservation law at w , we have

$$\mathbf{f}^w(e'_0) = \sum_{i=1}^{m_N-1} \mathbf{f}^w(e'_i)$$

or equivalently,

$$2\mathbf{f}(e_0) = \sum_{i=1}^{m_N-1} 2\mathbf{f}(e_i) = 2 \sum_{e_i \in E_N^*} \mathbf{f}(e_i), \quad (3)$$

where $E_N^* = E_N \setminus \{e_0\} = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{m_N-1}\}$.

Further, we notice that, for any $\gamma \in \Gamma$, the solution of the equation $2x = 2\gamma$ (in x) over Γ has the form $x = \gamma + \gamma_2$, where γ_2 is an element of order 2 (possibly the zero element), i.e., $\gamma_2 \in \Gamma_2$. Thus, (3) is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{f}(e_0) = \gamma_2 + \sum_{e_i \in E_N^*} \mathbf{f}(e_i), \quad (4)$$

where $\gamma_2 \in \Gamma_2$.

On the other hand, for any $e \in E_N^*$, by Assumption 1 and the definitions of \vec{C}_e and \mathbf{f}_e , we have

$$\mathbf{f}_e(e_0) = \mathbf{f}_e(e_i) = 1. \quad (5)$$

In (2), we set $\gamma = \gamma_2$ and for $e \in \bar{T}_0$, set $\gamma_e = \mathbf{f}(e)$. Let

$$\mathbf{f}' = \mathbf{f} - (\gamma_2 \mathbf{g} + \sum_{e \in \bar{T}_0} \gamma_e \mathbf{f}_e). \quad (6)$$

Then for any $e \in \bar{T}_0$, by the definition of the vector \mathbf{g} we have $\gamma_2 \mathbf{g}(e) = 0$ since e is not on C_0 . This implies that $\mathbf{f}'(e) = 0$ for any $e \in \bar{T}_0$ because $\gamma_e = \mathbf{f}(e)$ and, as mentioned earlier, $\mathbf{f}_e(e) = 1$. Further, by (4), (5) and (6) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}'(e_0) &= \mathbf{f}(e_0) - (\gamma_2 \mathbf{g}(e_0) + \sum_{e \in \bar{T}_0} \gamma_e \mathbf{f}_e(e_0)) \\ &= \gamma_2 + \sum_{e \in E_N^*} \mathbf{f}(e) - (\gamma_2 \mathbf{g}(e_0) + \sum_{e \in \bar{T}_0 \setminus E_N^*} \gamma_e \mathbf{f}_e(e_0) + \sum_{e \in E_N^*} \gamma_e \mathbf{f}_e(e_0)) \\ &= \sum_{e \in E_N^*} \mathbf{f}(e) - \sum_{e \in E_N^*} \gamma_e \mathbf{f}_e(e_0) \\ &= \sum_{e \in E_N^*} \mathbf{f}(e)(1 - \mathbf{f}_e(e_0)) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality holds because $\mathbf{g}(e_0) = 1$ and $e_0 \notin C_e$ for any $e \in \bar{T}_0 \setminus E_N^*$ and therefore, $\mathbf{f}_e(e_0) = 0$; and the last two equalities hold because of (5) and $\gamma_e = \mathbf{f}(e)$ for any $e \in E_N^*$.

The above discussion means that \mathbf{f}' evaluated at each edge outside of T is zero. Thus, we must have $\mathbf{f}' = \mathbf{0}$ (the vector of all zeros) because the values of \mathbf{f}' at the edges of T are uniquely determined by that outside of T . In conclusion, \mathbf{f} is represented as the combination (2), which completes our proof. \square

4 Classification of Γ -flows in a signed graph

From Theorem 3.1, we have known that all the Γ -flows in a connected unbalanced signed graph can be ‘generated’ by fundamental root circuit \vec{C}_0 and the fundamental directed circuits $\vec{C}_e, e \in \bar{T}_0$. This leads to the following classification of Γ -flows in a signed graph, which are specified by the elements of order 2 in Γ .

Theorem 4.1. *Let Γ be an additive Abelian group of order k and let G be a connected unbalanced signed graph. Let T be a spanning tree T of G consisting of positive edges and let $e_0 \in E_N$.*

1). *The flows in \mathcal{S}_G are pairwise distinct and, therefore,*

$$|\mathcal{S}_G| = 2^{\epsilon(\Gamma)} k^{m-n}; \quad (7)$$

2). *\mathcal{S}_G can be evenly classified into $|\Gamma_2|$ classes specified by the elements in Γ_2 , i.e., $\mathcal{S}_G = \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_2} \mathcal{S}_G(\gamma)$ and $|\mathcal{S}_G(\gamma)| = k^{m-n}$ for any $\gamma \in \Gamma_2$, where*

$$\mathcal{S}_G(\gamma) = \left\{ \gamma \mathbf{g} + \sum_{e \in \bar{T}_0} \gamma_e \mathbf{f}_e : \gamma_e \in \Gamma \right\}. \quad (8)$$

Proof. 1). We need only prove that

$$\gamma \mathbf{g} + \sum_{e \in \bar{T}_0} \gamma_e \mathbf{f}_e = \gamma' \mathbf{g} + \sum_{e \in \bar{T}_0} \gamma'_e \mathbf{f}_e \quad (9)$$

if and only if $\gamma = \gamma'$ and $\gamma_e = \gamma'_e$ for any $e \in \bar{T}_0$. For any $e \in \bar{T}_0$, by the definition of \mathbf{g} and \mathbf{f}_e we have $\mathbf{f}_e(e) = 1, \mathbf{g}(e) = 0$ and $\mathbf{f}_{e'}(e) = 0$ for any $e' \in \bar{T}_0$ with $e' \neq e$. Thus, (9) implies that $\gamma_e \mathbf{f}_e(e) = \gamma'_e \mathbf{f}_e(e)$ and therefore, $\gamma_e = \gamma'_e$ for any $e \in \bar{T}_0$. Consequently, again by (9), we have $\gamma \mathbf{g} = \gamma' \mathbf{g}$ and therefore, $\gamma = \gamma'$.

2). Since the flows in \mathcal{S}_G are pairwise distinct, 2) follows directly. \square

For a component ω of a signed graph G , denote

$$\beta(\omega) = \begin{cases} m(\omega) - n(\omega) + 1, & \text{if } \omega \text{ is balanced;} \\ m(\omega) - n(\omega), & \text{if } \omega \text{ is unbalanced,} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where $m(\omega)$ and $n(\omega)$ are the number of edges and vertices in ω , respectively. In general, we denote $\beta(G) = \sum \beta(\omega)$, where the sum is taken over all the components ω of G . Let $\kappa(G)$ be the number of unbalanced components and $F^*(G, \Gamma)$ be the number of Γ -flows (not necessarily nowhere-zero) in G .

Corollary 4.2. *Let G be a signed graph and let Γ be an additive Abelian group of order k . Then*

$$F^*(G, \Gamma) = 2^{\kappa(G)\epsilon(\Gamma)} k^{\beta(G)}. \quad (11)$$

Proof. If G is not connected then $F^*(G, \Gamma) = \prod F^*(\omega, \Gamma)$, where the product is taken over all the components ω of G . We need only consider the case when G is connected.

If G is unbalanced then (11) follows directly from (7). Now assume that G is balanced. Recall that a balanced signed graph is switching-equivalent to an ordinary graph. In this case it is known [13] that the number of Γ -flows (not necessarily nowhere-zero) in an ordinary graph is k^{m-n+1} , i.e., $F^*(G, \Gamma) = k^{m-n+1}$, where m and n are the numbers of edges and vertices in G , respectively. This agrees with (11) because $\kappa(G) = 0$ and $\beta(G) = m-n+1$ when G is balanced. The proof is completed. \square

Remark 1. When k (the order of Γ) is odd, Beck and Zaslavsky posed a problem (Problem 4.2, [1]): Is there any significance to $F^*(G, \Gamma)$ evaluated at even natural numbers? By Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 4.2 we can now give an answer to this problem. For simplicity, let's consider the case when G is connected and unbalanced. Since k is odd, we have $\epsilon(\Gamma) = 0$ and therefore, $F^*(G, \Gamma) = k^{m-n}$. Thus, $F^*(G, \Gamma)$ evaluated at an even number h equals h^{m-n} , which is exactly the number of the Γ' -flows in G divided by $2^{\epsilon(\Gamma')}$ for any group Γ' of order h . More specifically, by Theorem 4.1, $F^*(G, \Gamma)$ evaluated at h equals the number of those Γ' -flows in G which have the form

$$\mathbf{f} = \gamma \mathbf{g} + \sum_{e \in \bar{T}_0} \gamma_e \mathbf{f}_e, \quad \gamma_e \in \Gamma',$$

where γ is an arbitrary fixed element of order 2 in Γ' (in particular we may choose $\gamma = 0$). \square

For any $e \in E(G)$, the number of the Γ -flows in G with value 0 at e is clearly equal to $F^*(G - e, \Gamma)$. Notice that the flows counted by $F_d(G, x)$ are nowhere-zero. So by Corollary 4.2 and the principle of inclusion-exclusion, we get the following expression of $F_d(G, x)$ obtained by Goodall et. al.:

Corollary 4.3. [10] *For any signed graph G and non-negative integer d ,*

$$F_d(G, x) = \sum_{F \subseteq E} (-1)^{|F|} 2^{\kappa(G-F)d} x^{\beta(G-F)}.$$

We note that, if G is an ordinary graph then $\kappa(G - F) = 0$ for any $F \subseteq E(G)$. Therefore, Corollary 4.3 generalizes the corresponding result for ordinary graph [9, 13].

Example. By Corollary 4.3, if G is the graph with two vertices joined by a negative edge and a positive edge then $F_d(G, x) = 2^d - 1$; if G is the graph consisting of two negative loops at a vertex then $F_d(G, x) = 2^d x - 2^{d+1} + 1$; and if G is the graph consisting of a negative loop and a positive loop at a vertex then $F_d(G, x) = (2^d - 1)(x - 1)$.

5 Coefficients in $F_0(G, x)$

In this section we will give a combinatorial interpretation of the coefficients in $F_d(G, x)$ for $d = 0$. We begin with the following extension of Whitney's broken theorem given by Dohmen and Trinks.

Lemma 5.1. [8] *Let P be a finite linearly ordered set, $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^P \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ and Γ be an additive Abelian group. Let $f : 2^P \rightarrow \Gamma$ be a mapping such that, for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and $A \supseteq B$,*

$$f(A) = f(A \setminus \{B_{\max}\}). \quad (12)$$

Then

$$\sum_{A \in 2^P} (-1)^{|A|} f(A) = \sum_{A \in 2^P \setminus \mathcal{B}^*} (-1)^{|A|} f(A), \quad (13)$$

where B_{\max} is the maximum element in B and $\mathcal{B}^* = \{A : A \in 2^P, A \supseteq B \setminus \{B_{\max}\} \text{ for some } B \in \mathcal{B}\}$.

We call \mathcal{B} in Lemma 5.1 a *broken system* of f and $B \setminus \{B_{\max}\}$ a *broken set* for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$.

To apply Lemma 5.1 we need to define a broken system and broken sets for signed graphs. We follow the idea of the notion of 'bonds' introduced in [6, 21]. For a signed graph G and $X \subseteq V(G)$, denote by $[X, X^C]$ the set of edges between X and its complement X^C , by $G[X]$ the subgraph of G induced by X , and by $E(X)$ the set of the edges in $G[X]$. A non-empty edge subset $B \subseteq E(G)$ is called a *cut* [6] or *improving set* [21] of G if it has the form $B = [X, X^C] \cup E_X$, where $X \subseteq V(G)$ is non-empty and $E_X \subseteq E(X)$ is minimal to have $G[X] - E_X$ balanced. A cut is called a *bond* of G if it is minimal. We note that, in the case when G is balanced, we have $E_X = \emptyset$ by the minimality of E_X and therefore, a bond is exactly a usual bond as in an

ordinary graph. In this sense, the notion ‘bond’ for signed graph is a very nice extension of that for ordinary graphs [13].

By the definition of the broken set, it is not difficult to see that if B is a bond then, for any $e \in B$,

$$\beta(G - B) = \beta(G - (B \setminus \{e\})). \quad (14)$$

On the other hand, by Corollary 4.3, we have

$$F_0(G, x) = \sum_{F \subseteq E} (-1)^{|F|} x^{\beta(G-F)}.$$

Thus, an edge subset of G is a broken set of $F_0(G, x)$ if it has the form $B \setminus \{B_{\max}\}$ for some $B \subseteq E(G)$ such that, for any $A \supseteq B$,

$$\beta(G - A) = \beta(G - (A \setminus \{B_{\max}\})). \quad (15)$$

On the other hand, by (14), for any bond B we have

$$\beta(G - B) = \beta(G - (B \setminus \{B_{\max}\})).$$

Moreover, it is not difficult to see that, for any $A \supseteq B$, (15) is satisfied by A and B . Thus, $B \setminus \{B_{\max}\}$ is a broken set of $F_0(G, x)$ for any bond B and is called a *broken bond* of G .

Let \mathcal{B} be the class of all the broken bonds of G and let

$$\mathcal{B}^* = \{F : F \in 2^{E(G)}, F \supseteq B \text{ for some } B \in \mathcal{B}\}.$$

Then by Lemma 5.1, we have the following result immediately.

Theorem 5.2. *For any signed graph G with a linear order \prec on $E(G)$,*

$$F_0(G, x) = \sum_{F \in 2^{E(G)} \setminus \mathcal{B}^*} (-1)^{|F|} x^{\beta(G-F)}. \quad (16)$$

Remark 2. If G is balanced, then each broken bond is exactly a usual broken bond of an ordinary graph. In this case, (16) is still valid. Thus, Theorem 5.2 is a generalization of that for ordinary graph [13]. Further, in a very special case when an unbalanced signed graph G contains an edge whose removal leaves a balanced graph, the empty set is a broken bond and therefore, any set of edges (including the empty set) contains a broken bond. This case means that $\mathcal{B}^* = 2^{E(G)}$ and thus, $F_0(G, x) = 0$, which coincides with an obvious fact that such G is not Γ -flow admissible when $|\Gamma|$ is odd. \square

Proposition 5.3. *For any signed graph G and $F \subseteq E(G)$, if F contains no broken bond then each component of $G - F$ is unbalanced, unless G is balanced.*

Proof. To the contrary suppose that one component ω of $G - F$ is balanced. Let $B = [V(\omega), \overline{V(\omega)}] \cup E_F$, where E_F is the set of edges in F whose two end vertices are both in ω . Then B is a bond since ω is balanced and thus $B \setminus \{B_{\max}\}$ is a broken bond. Notice that $B \setminus \{B_{\max}\} \subset B \subseteq F$, which contradicts that F contains no broken bond. \square

Let $\sigma(G)$ be the number of those edges e such that there is an edge e' with $e \prec e'$ satisfying one of the following three conditions:

- 1). one of e and e' is a cut edge and $G - \{e, e'\}$ has a balanced component;
- 2). $\{e, e'\}$ is an edge cut and $G - \{e, e'\}$ has a balanced component;
- 3). $\{e, e'\}$ is contained in a component ω of G and $\omega - \{e, e'\}$ is balanced.

Corollary 5.4. *Let G be an unbalanced, Γ -flow admissible ($|\Gamma|$ is odd) signed graph with n vertices and m edges. Then for any linear order \prec on $E(G)$,*

$$F_0(G, x) = a_0 x^{m-n} - a_1 x^{m-n-1} + a_2 x^{m-n-2} - \dots + (-1)^{m-n} a_{m-n}, \quad (17)$$

where, for any $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, m-n\}$, a_i is the number of the edge subsets of G having i edges and containing no broken bond as a subset. In particular,

- 1). $a_i > 0$ for every $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m-n$;
- 2). $a_0 = 1$;
- 3). $a_1 = m - \sigma(G)$;

Proof. Let $F \subseteq E(G)$ be an edge subset that contains no broken bond. Since G is unbalanced, so by Proposition 5.3, every component ω of $G - F$ is unbalanced. Thus, $\beta(\omega) = m(\omega) - n(\omega)$ due to (11). Therefore,

$$\beta(G - F) = \sum_{\omega} \beta(\omega) = m(G - F) - n(G - F) = m - n - |F|,$$

where the sum is taken over all the components of $G - F$. This equation means that the value of $\beta(G - F)$ is determined uniquely by the number of edges in F , as long as F contains no broken bond. So by Theorem 5.2, the coefficient of $(-1)^i x^{m-n-i}$ in $F_0(G, x)$ counts exactly those edge subsets F which have i edges and contain no broken bond. Thus, (17) follows directly.

- 1). We first show that there is an edge set F with n edges that contains no broken bond. By the definition of the broken bond, an edge set F contains no broken bond if and only if $E(G) \setminus F$ contains at least one edge from each

broken bond of G . Let F^* be maximum such that $E(G) \setminus F^*$ contains at least one edge from each broken bond of G (such F^* clearly exists because $E(G) \setminus \emptyset$ does). Let ω be a component of $G - F^*$. Then by Proposition 5.3, ω contains at least one unbalanced circuit, say C_u . We claim that ω does not contain any other circuit.

Suppose to the contrary that C is a circuit in ω with $C \neq C_u$. Since C is a circuit, the property that $G - F^*$ contains at least one edge from each broken bond is still satisfied by $G - F^* - C_{\max}$ because any bond containing C_{\max} must contain another edge e on C with, of course, $e \prec C_{\max}$. This contradicts our assumption that F^* is maximum. Our claim follows.

In a word, each component ω of $G - F^*$ contains exactly one unbalanced circuit and no any other circuit. This means that $m(\omega) = n(\omega)$ and therefore, $m(G - F^*) = n$, i.e., $|F^*| = m - n$. Thus, $a_{m-n} > 0$. Further, if an edge subset F contains no broken bond then any subset of F contains neither broken bond, which implies $a_i > 0$ for any i with $0 \leq i \leq m - n$.

2). Since G is flow-admissible, as pointed out in Remark 1, G contains no edge whose removal leaves a balanced graph. This means that the empty set is not a broken bond. Thus, a_0 equals the number of the edge subsets of G having 0 edges, that is, the unique empty set.

3). Now we consider the coefficient a_1 . From the above discussion we see that a_1 equals the number of the edges that are not broken bond. On the other hand, an edge e is a broken bond if there is e' such that $B = \{e, e'\}$ is a bond and $e' = B_{\max}$. By the definition of a bond, $B = \{e, e'\}$ must satisfy one of the above three conditions and, vice versa. \square

6 Applications

An ordinary graph can be viewed as a signed graph that contains no any unbalanced circuit. Oppositely, our first application is to consider a class of the signed graphs which are Γ -flow admissible for $|\Gamma|$ odd but contain no any balanced circuit.

For a tree T , let G_T be the signed graph obtained from T by replacing each of its end vertices (the vertices of degree 1) with an unbalanced circuit. It is clear that G_T contains no balanced circuit.

Let v_1, v_2, \dots, v_p be the vertices in T that have degree at least 3 and let d_1, d_2, \dots, d_p be their degrees, respectively. Choosing an arbitrary vertex r of T as the root, we get a rooted tree (here the ‘rooted tree’ is not the same

thing as the ‘signed rooted tree’ defined earlier). For a vertex v_i (with degree at least 3) and an edge e incident with v_i , we call e *the father* of *the family* v_i if e is nearer to the root than other edges incident with v_i and call every edge other than the father a *child* of the family v_i . In particular, we call the set of all the children of v_i *the children class* of v_i and denote it by $C(v_i)$.

Let \prec be an ordering on $E(G_T)$ such that no child is greater than its father and no edge on an unbalanced circuit is greater than one on T . Let F be an edge set of G_T that contains no broken bond. By Corollary 5.4, F contribute $(-1)^{|F|}x^{m-n-|F|}$ to $F_0(G_T, x)$, where $m = |E(G_T)|$, $n = |V(G_T)|$. On the other hand, by our definition of \prec , F contains no broken bond if and only if F contains neither an edge from an unbalanced circuit nor a children class of a family. For any vertex v_i , let $F_i = F \cap C(v_i)$. In particular, let $F_r = F \cap \{e_r\}$, where e_r is the unique edge incident with the root r . Thus, the contribution of F to $F_0(G_T, x)$ can be specified as

$$x^{m-n}(-1)^{|F_r|}x^{-|F_r|} \prod_{i=1}^p (-1)^{|F_i|}x^{-|F_i|}. \quad (18)$$

On the other hand, we notice that $m-n = (d_1-2)+(d_2-2)+\dots+(d_p-2)+1$. Rewrite (18) as

$$(-1)^{|F_r|}x^{1-|F_r|} \prod_{i=1}^p (-1)^{|F_i|}x^{d_i-2-|F_i|}.$$

This means that $(-1)^{|F_r|}x^{1-|F_r|}$ and $(-1)^{|F_i|}x^{d_i-2-|F_i|}$ could be regarded as the contribution of F restricted on $\{e_r\}$ and $C(v_i)$, respectively. Since $F \cap \{e_r\} = \emptyset$ or $F \cap \{e_r\} = \{e_r\}$, all the possible contributions of F restricted on $\{e_r\}$ can be represented as $(-1)^{|\emptyset|}x^{1-|\emptyset|} + (-1)^{|\{e_r\}|}x^{1-|\{e_r\}|} = x - 1$.

In general, for any v_i , since v_i has exactly $d_i - 1$ children, all the possible contributions of F restricted on $C(v_i)$ equals

$$x^{d_i-2} - \binom{d_i-1}{1}x^{d_i-3} + \dots + (-1)^{d_i-2} \binom{d_i-1}{d_i-2}.$$

Thus, the total contributions of all F that contains no broken bond equals

$$F_0(G_T, x) = (x-1) \prod_{i=1}^p \left(x^{d_i-2} - \binom{d_i-1}{1}x^{d_i-3} + \dots + (-1)^{d_i-2} \binom{d_i-1}{d_i-2} \right).$$

Our second application is to show that all the broken bonds in a signed graph form a nice topological structure, namely, the homogeneous simplicial

complex. A finite collection \mathcal{S} of finite sets is called a *simplicial complex* if $S \in \mathcal{S}$ implying $T \in \mathcal{S}$ for any $T \subseteq S$. A simplicial complex is *homogeneous* [20] or *pure* [3] if all the maximal simplices have the same dimension (cardinality). A classic example of homogeneous simplicial complex related to a graph is the broken-circuit complex [3, 4]. It was shown [20] that the class $\mathfrak{B}(G)$ consisting of all the edge subsets of an ordinary graph G that contain no broken circuit is a homogeneous simplicial complex of top dimension $|V(G)| - 1$ and, moreover, the coefficients of the chromatic polynomial of G are the simplex counts in each dimension of $\mathfrak{B}(G)$.

Let $\mathfrak{F}(G)$ be the class consisting of all the edge subsets of a signed graph G that contain no broken bond.

Corollary 6.1. *Let G be a non-trivial signed graph with n vertices, m edges and with a linear order \prec on $E(G)$. Then*

- 1). $\mathfrak{F}(G)$ is a homogeneous simplicial complex, i.e., every simplex is a subset of some simplex of top dimension $m - n$;
- 2). An edge set F is a simplex of top dimension $m - n$ of $\mathfrak{F}(G)$ if and only if $E(G) \setminus F$ contains at least one edge from each broken bond of G and each component $G - F$ contains no but exactly one unbalanced circuit;
- 3). For each $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, m - n\}$, the coefficient a_i in $F_0(G, x)$ is the number of the i -dimensional simplexes in $\mathfrak{F}(G)$.

Proof. 1). It is obvious that $\mathfrak{F}(G)$ is a simplicial complex. We prove that $\mathfrak{F}(G)$ is homogeneous.

Let F be a set of edges that contains no broken bond. If $|F| = m - n$ then we are done. We now assume that $|F| < m - n$, i.e., $|E(G - F)| > n$. In this case, it can be seen that there is a component ω in $G - F$ which contains at least two circuits C and C' . By Proposition 5.3, one of these two circuits, say C , is unbalanced. So by the same argument as that in Corollary 5.4, we can find an edge e in C' such that $G - F - e$ still contains an edge from each broken bond. Replacing F by $F \cup \{e\}$, the assertion follows by repeating this procedure, until $|F| = m - n$.

2) and 3) follows directly by Corollary 5.4. □

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China [Grant numbers, 11471273, 11561058].

References

- [1] M. Beck, T. Zaslavsky, The number of nowhere-zero flows on graphs and signed graphs, *J. Combi. Theory Ser B* 96 (2006) 901-918.
- [2] A. Bouchet, Nowhere-zero integral flows on a bidirected graph, *J. Combi. Theory Ser B* 34 (3) (1983) 279-292.
- [3] T. Brylawski, The broken-circuit complex, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 234(2)(1977) 417-433.
- [4] T. Brylawski, J. Oxley, The broken-circuit complex: Its structure and factorizations, *European J. Combi.* 2(2) (1981) 107-121.
- [5] T. Brylawski, J. Oxley, The Tutte polynomial and its applications, in “*Matroid Applications*” (N. White, Ed.), Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK, 1992
- [6] B.F Chen, J. Wang, The flow and tension spaces and lattices of signed graphs, *European J. Combi.* 30 (2009) 263-279.
- [7] M. DeVos, E Rollová, R. Šámal, A note on counting flows in signed graphs, arXiv:1701.07369v1.
- [8] K. Dohmen, M. Trinks, An abstraction of Whitney’s broken circuit theorem, *Electron J. Combi.* 21(4) (2014) P4. 32.
- [9] F.M. Dong, K.M. Koh, Bounds for the coefficients of flow polynomials, *J. Combi. Theory Ser B* 97 (2007) 413-420.
- [10] A. Goodall, B. Litjens, G. Regts, L. Vena, A Tutte polynomial for maps II: the non-orientable case, arXiv:1804.01496v1.
- [11] F. Harary, On the notion of balance of a signed graph, *Michigan Math. J.* 2 (2) (1953-1954) 143-146.
- [12] F. Jaeger, Nowhere-zero flow problems, in: Lowell W. Beineke, Robin J. Wilson (Eds.), *Selected Topics in Graph Theory*, vol. 3, Academic Press, London, 1988.
- [13] X.A. Jin, On the coefficients of the flow polynomial, *J. Xinjiang Uni.* 23 Supp. (2006) 53-57.
- [14] T. Kaiser, R. Lukot’ka, E. Rollová, Nowhere-zero flows in signed graphs: A survey, arXiv:1608.06944v1.

- [15] Martin Kochol, Polynomials associated with nowhere-zero flows, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 84 (2002) 260-269.
- [16] P.D. Seymour, Nowhere-zero flows, Appendix to Chapter 4, in: R.L. Graham, M. Grötschel, L. Lovász (Eds.), *Handbook of Combinatorics*, vol. 1, North-Holland (Elsevier), Amsterdam, 1995.
- [17] W.T. Tutte, On the imbedding of linear graphs in surfaces, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (2) 51 (1949) 474-483.
- [18] W.T. Tutte, A contribution to the theory of chromatic polynomials, *Canad. J. Math.* 6 (1954) 80-91.
- [19] H. Whitney, A logical expansion in mathematics, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 38(8) (1932) 572-579.
- [20] H. Wilf, Which polynomials are chromatic, *Proc. Colloq. Combinatorial Theory*, Rome. 1973.
- [21] T. Zaslavsky, Signed graphs, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 4 (1982) 47-74.
- [22] C.Q. Zhang, *Integer flows and cycle covers of graphs*, first ed., M. Dekker, New York, 1997.