

CONSTRUCTIVE CHARACTERIZATION OF CRITICAL BIPARTITE GRAFTS

NANAO KITA

ABSTRACT. Factor-critical graphs are a classical concept in matching theory that constitute an important component of the Gallai-Edmonds canonical decomposition and Edmonds' algorithm for maximum matchings. Lovász provided a constructive characterization of factor-critical graphs in terms of ear decompositions. This characterization has been a useful inductive tool for studying factor-critical graphs and also connects them with Edmonds' algorithm.

Joins in grafts, also known as T -joins in graphs, are a classical variant of matchings proposed in terms of parity. Minimum joins and grafts are generalizations of perfect matchings and graphs with perfect matchings, respectively. Accordingly, graft analogues of fundamental concepts and results from matching theory, such as canonical decompositions, will be fundamental contributions to the theory of minimum join. In this paper, we propose a new concept of *critical quasicombs* as a bipartite graft analogue of factor-critical graphs and provide a constructive characterization of critical quasicombs using a graft version of ear decompositions. This characterization can be considered as a bipartite graft analogue of Lovász' result. From our results, the Dulmage-Mendelsohn canonical decomposition, originally a theory for bipartite graphs, has been generalized for bipartite grafts.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Joins and Grafts. Joins in grafts, or T -joins in graphs, are a classical topic in combinatorics [16, 21, 23]. Let G be a graph, and let T be a set of vertices. A set F of edges is a T -join of G if every vertex in T is connected to an odd number of edges from F , whereas other vertices are connected to an even number of edges from F . A T -join of graph G is also referred to as a *join* of the pair (G, T) . The pair (G, T) is called a *graft* if every connected component of G has an even number of vertices from T .

Minimum joins in a graft are a generalization of 1-factors (perfect matchings) in a *factorizable* graph, that is, a graph with 1-factors. A pair (G, T) of a graph G and a set of vertices T has a join if and only if it is a graft. Hence, minimum joins in grafts are typically of interest. Let (G, T) be a graft where G is a factorizable graph and T is the vertex set of G . Then, a set of edges is a minimum join of (G, T) if and only if it is a 1-factor of G . That is, grafts and minimum joins are generalizations of factorizable graphs and 1-factors, respectively.

In addition, the minimum join problem on grafts contains several types of routing problems on (undirected) graphs such as the shortest path problem between two vertices and the Chinese postman problem [21, 23]. Joins on grafts are also closely related to classical unsolved problems in graph theory such as Tutte's 4-flow conjecture and the circuit double cover conjecture [23]. Compared with 1-factors, joins are rather poorly understood even though they have attracted considerable attention. Joins implicate significantly complicated and esoteric notions, as is often the case with generalized concepts involving parity.

1.2. Toward Canonical Decomposition Theory for Joins in Grafts.

Date: February 9, 2024.

1.2.1. *Canonical Decompositions in Matching Theory.* Canonical decompositions of a graph are a series of structure theorems that constitute the foundation of matching theory [21]. Several types of canonical decompositions are known for matchings, such as the *Gallai-Edmonds* [4, 6], *Kotzig-Lovász* [7, 9, 17–20], *Dulmage-Mendelsohn* [1–3], and *cathedral decompositions* [7, 9]. Each canonical decomposition has its own contexts or class of graphs where it can be effectively applied, but there are several common features. For a given graph, a canonical decomposition defines a uniquely determined partition, and uses this partition to characterize the structure of all maximum matchings in the graph. This feature makes canonical decompositions powerful tools in studying matchings that are employed in many contexts. Following canonical decompositions, a concept from matching theory is said to be canonical if it is uniquely determined for a graph.

1.2.2. *Factor-Components and Canonical Decompositions for Factorizable Graphs.* Factor-components are the fundamental building blocks of a factorizable graph in the context of matching theory [7, 9, 21]. A factorizable graph consists of disjoint subgraphs called *factor-components* and the edges between them. A set of edges is a 1-factor if and only if it is a union of 1-factors taken from each factor-component, and the factor-components form the most fine-grained set of subgraphs that satisfies this property.

The Dulmage-Mendelsohn and cathedral decompositions are canonical decompositions that are substantially applicable to bipartite and nonbipartite factorizable graphs, respectively; these decompositions are structure theorems that characterize the organization of a graph from its factor-components. In these decompositions, the relationship between factor-components is characterized by defining a certain canonical binary relation between them and then proving that this relation is in fact a partial order. These partial orders are called the *Dulmage-Mendelsohn* and *cathedral orders*.¹

Note that the cathedral decomposition is not a generalization of the Dulmage-Mendelsohn decomposition. The former is by definition applicable to all graphs including bipartite graphs. However, it is substantially applicable to nonbipartite graphs because no distinct factor-components in a bipartite graph can be compatible with respect to the cathedral order. The Dulmage-Mendelsohn decomposition is established on the premise of the two color classes, and can nontrivially apply to bipartite graphs.

1.2.3. *Extension to Grafts.* Because minimum joins in grafts are a generalization of 1-factors in factorizable graphs, a canonical decomposition theory for grafts will be the foundation for studying minimum joins. The Kotzig-Lovász, Dulmage-Mendelsohn, and cathedral decompositions are canonical decompositions for factorizable graphs. Among them, however, only the Kotzig-Lovász decomposition has been generalized for grafts [13, 24].

Under the analogy and the observation from Section 1.2.2, generalizations of the Dulmage-Mendelsohn and cathedral decompositions for grafts should be structure theorems that characterize the canonical relationship between factor-components in a bipartite and nonbipartite graft, respectively. The concept of factor-components can easily be generalized and defined for grafts [13]. Bipartite and nonbipartite grafts are also easily defined as grafts whose graph part is bipartite and nonbipartite, respectively. Reasonable generalizations of the Dulmage-Mendelsohn and cathedral decompositions would define a canonical binary relation between factor-components and then prove that this relation is a partial order for bipartite and nonbipartite grafts, respectively.

1.3. Factor-Critical Graphs.

¹More precisely, the cathedral decomposition is a composite theory in which the cathedral order is a constituent. The *general* Kotzig-Lovász decomposition is another constituent.




FIGURE 1. Relationships among factor-critical graph, factor-critical grafts, and critical quasicombs.

1.3.1. *Basics.* Factor-critical graphs are a classical concept in matching theory [16,21,23]. A graph is *factor-critical* if, for every vertex, deleting it results in a factorizable graph. It is easily confirmed from the definition that no factor-critical graph can be bipartite. Factor-critical graphs were proposed and appeared in the Gallai-Edmonds decomposition when Gallai [6] discovered this decomposition. In this decomposition, first, a partition of the vertex set into three parts is defined. Then, it is proved that the first part, which is defined as the set of vertices that may not be covered by a maximum matching, induces a subgraph whose connected components are factor-critical. From the connection between the decomposition and Edmonds' algorithm for maximum matchings [4, 16, 21, 23], this also implies that factor-critical graphs are an important element of this algorithm. That is, the so-called blossoms are in fact factor-critical graphs. Because the Gallai-Edmonds decomposition is quite a useful theorem and employed in numerous contexts in matching theory, factor-critical graphs are also involved in many situations.

1.3.2. *Lovász' Constructive Characterization of Factor-Critical Graphs.* Lovász [16, 21–23] discovered a constructive characterization of factor-critical graphs in terms of ear decompositions. An *ear decomposition* is a way of interpreting a graph as being constructed from a single vertex by sequentially adding paths or circuits called *ears*. Lovász proved that a graph is factor-critical if and only if it admits an ear decomposition in which every ear is *odd*, that is, has an odd number of edges. This characterization of factor-critical graphs has served as a very useful inductive tool for proving properties of factor-critical graphs. It also connects factor-critical graphs and blossoms from Edmonds' algorithm.

1.4. **Factor-Critical Graphs and Cathedral Decomposition.** Factor-critical graphs also play an important role in the cathedral decomposition theory [7, 9]. That is, the cathedral order is defined using factor-critical graphs. In a factorizable graph G , a factor-component C is greater than a factor-component D if the graph obtained from G by contracting D has a certain factor-critical subgraph that contains C . More precisely, C is greater than D if G has factor-components in which C and D are included such that the subgraph of G induced by the set of vertices from these factor-components becomes factor-critical after D is contracted. The cathedral decomposition has been applied to derive further results in matching theory [8, 10–12, 14] such as new proofs of the tight cut lemma by Edmonds et al. [5] and the saturated cathedral theorem by Lovász [20] as well as a characterization of the family of maximal *barriers* [21], the dual of maximum matchings under the Tutte-Berge theorem, in general graphs.

1.5. Our Aim and Results. We propose a new concept called *critical quasicomb* grafts that is a bipartite graft analogue of factor-critical graphs and provide a constructive characterization of these grafts for the purpose of deriving a generalization of the Dulmage-Mendelsohn decomposition for bipartite grafts. From the analogy between grafts and factorizable graphs, we can naturally define *factor-critical grafts*, that is, a graft analogue of factor-critical graphs; see Figure 1. Somewhat surprisingly, Sebö's distance theorem [25] implies that a graft (G, T) is factor-critical if and only if G is a factor-critical graph and T consists of all vertices except for one. As with factor-critical graphs, no factor-critical graft can be bipartite; every vertex in a factor-critical graft has a symmetrical role. In this paper, we further propose a bipartite analogue of factor-critical grafts: critical quasicombs. Criticality and bipartiteness are naturally and reasonably integrated in critical quasicombs.

Furthermore, we provide a constructive characterization of critical quasicombs that is an analogue of Lovász' characterization of factor-critical graphs. First, we define the addition of grafts and the graft analogue of the concept of ears; these enable us to define ear decompositions of grafts. We then propose types of ear grafts, which we term *effective* ear grafts, as the bipartite graft analogue of odd ears. We thus prove that a bipartite graft is a critical quasicomb if and only if it admits a graft ear decomposition in which every ear is effective. The proof is given from first principles.

1.6. Consequence of Our Results. In our next paper [15], we use the results in this paper to derive a generalization of the Dulmage-Mendelsohn decomposition for bipartite grafts. This new decomposition characterizes the relationship between factor-components in a bipartite graft as a certain partial order. If a graft is a pair of a bipartite factorizable graph G and its vertex set, then the generalized decomposition for this graft coincides with the original Dulmage-Mendelsohn decomposition for G .

This new decomposition can also be referred to as a bipartite graft analogue of the cathedral decomposition.² The partial order between factor-components in a bipartite graft is similar to the cathedral order except that critical quasicombs replace the role of factor-critical graphs. That is, in this new decomposition, factor-component C is defined to be greater than factor-component D if there are factor-components in which C and D are included such that the subgraph induced by the set of vertices from these factor-components becomes a critical quasicomb after D is contracted. Then, it is proved that this binary relation is a partial order where our constructive characterization of critical quasicombs is used for the derivation. From this new decomposition, we can also understand the relationship between the original Dulmage-Mendelsohn and cathedral decompositions for factorizable graphs as the former being a bipartite analogue of the latter.

1.7. Organization of This Paper. Section 2 provides the basic definitions and notations. Sections 3 and 4 explain the fundamentals regarding joins and grafts. Sections 5 and 6 present preliminaries regarding factor-critical graphs and grafts, respectively. In Section 7, we introduce the concept of bipartite grafts with an ordered bipartition to facilitate the subsequent discussions on bipartite grafts. In Section 8, we explain a class of bipartite grafts known as *combs* and an existing result to be used in Section 10. In Section 9, we introduce a new concept of *quasicomb* bipartite grafts. In Section 10, we define *critical* bipartite grafts, that is, the bipartite graft analogue of factor-critical graphs. Here, we show that critical bipartite grafts are in fact special quasicombs and call critical bipartite grafts as critical quasicombs onwards. In Section 11, we introduce effective ear

²Note that there is an analogical relationship between the two, and one is not a generalization of the other.

grafts as the components for constructing critical quasicombs. In Section 12, our main theorem, namely, the constructive characterization for critical bipartite grafts is proved. Finally, Section 13 concludes the paper.

2. DEFINITIONS

2.1. Basic Notation. We mostly follow Schrijver [23] for standard notation and definitions. In the following, we list exceptions or nonstandard definitions. For two sets A and B , we denote the symmetric difference $(A \setminus B) \cup (B \setminus A)$ by $A\Delta B$. We often denote a singleton $\{x\}$ simply by x . For a graph G , we denote the vertex and edge sets of G by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$, respectively. We consider multigraphs. For two vertices u and v from a graph, uv denotes an edge between u and v . We consider paths and circuits as graphs. That is, a circuit is a connected graph in which every vertex is of degree two, whereas a path is a connected graph in which every vertex is of degree two or less, and at least one vertex is of degree less than two. A graph with a single vertex and no edge is a path. For a path P and vertices $x, y \in V(P)$, we denote by xPy the subpath of P with ends x and y . We often treat a graph G as if it is the set $V(G)$ of vertices. A perfect matching of a graph G is a set M of edges such that every vertex of G is connected to exactly one edge from M .

In the remainder of this section, let G be a graph unless stated otherwise. Let $X \subseteq V(G)$. The graph obtained by deleting X is denoted by $G - X$. For $X, Y \subseteq V(G)$, we denote by $E_G[X, Y]$ the set of edges between X and Y . The set $E_G[X, V(G) \setminus X]$ is denoted by $\delta_G(X)$.

Let G_1 and G_2 be subgraphs of G . The sum of G_1 and G_2 is denoted by $G_1 + G_2$. Let $F \subseteq E(G)$. For a subgraph H of G , $H + F$ denotes the graph obtained by adding F to H . The subgraph of G determined by F is denoted by $G.F = (V(G), F)$.

2.2. Ears. Let G be a graph, and let $X \subseteq V(G)$. Let P be a subgraph of G with $E(P) \neq \emptyset$. We call P a *round ear* relative to X if P is a path whose vertices except for its ends are disjoint from X or a circuit that shares exactly one vertex with X . We call P a *straight ear* relative to X if P is a path one of whose ends is the only vertex that P shares with X . We call P an *ear* if P is either a round or straight ear. For an ear P relative to X , vertices in $V(P) \cap X$ are called *bonds* of P . We call the end of a straight ear that is not the bond the *free end*.

3. JOINS AND GRAFTS

3.1. Basics. Let (G, T) be a pair of a graph G and a set $T \subseteq V(G)$. Set T may be empty. A set $F \subseteq E(G)$ is a *join* of (G, T) if $|\delta_G(v) \cap F|$ is odd for each $v \in T$ and is even for each $v \in V(G) \setminus T$. The pair (G, T) is a *graft* if $|V(C) \cap T|$ is even for every connected component C of G .

Fact 3.1. Let G be a graph, and let $T \subseteq V(G)$. Then, (G, T) has a join if and only if it is a graft.

Joins in a graft are also referred to as T -joins in a graph. Under Fact 3.1, we are typically interested in *minimum joins*, that is, joins with the minimum number of edges. We denote by $\nu(G, T)$ the number of edges in a minimum join of a graft (G, T) . According to the next fact, minimum joins and grafts are a generalization of perfect matchings and graphs with perfect matchings [21].

Fact 3.2. Let G be a graph with perfect matchings. Then, a set $M \subseteq E(G)$ is a perfect matching of G if and only if it is a minimum join of the graft $(G, V(G))$.

We often treat items of G as items of (G, T) . For example, we call a path in G a path in (G, T) . A graft (G, T) is *bipartite* if G is bipartite. We call sets A and B color classes of (G, T) if these sets are color classes of G .

3.2. Addition of Grafts. Let (G_1, T_1) and (G_2, T_2) be grafts. We define the sum of (G_1, T_1) and (G_2, T_2) as the graft $(G_1 + G_2, T_1 \Delta T_2)$ and denote this graft by $(G_1, T_1) \oplus (G_2, T_2)$.

Observation 3.3. If F_1 and F_2 are joins of grafts (G_1, T_1) and (G_2, T_2) , respectively, then $F_1 \cup F_2$ is a join of the graft $(G_1, T_1) \oplus (G_2, T_2)$.

Note that $F_1 \cup F_2$ may not be a minimum join even if F_1 and F_2 are minimum joins of (G_1, T_1) and (G_2, T_2) .

3.3. Ear Grafts. Let (G, T) and (P, T') be grafts. Graft (P, T') is an *ear graft* relative to (G, T) if P is an ear relative to G . Vertices of P are called the *bonds* of (P, T') if they are bonds of P . If P is straight, the free end of P is called the *free end* of (P, T') . We say that ear graft (P, T') is *round* or *straight* if P is round or straight, respectively.

4. EDGE WEIGHTING AND DISTANCES ON GRAFTS

In this section, we explain a certain edge weight on a graft typically determined by a minimum join and the distances between vertices with respect to this edge weight.

Definition 4.1. Let (G, T) be a graft. Let $F \subseteq E(G)$. We define $w_F : E(G) \rightarrow \{1, -1\}$ as $w_F(e) = 1$ for $e \in E(G) \setminus F$ and $w_F(e) = -1$ for $e \in F$. For a subgraph P of G , which is typically a path or circuit, $w_F(P)$ denotes $\sum_{e \in E(P)} w_F(e)$, and is referred to as the *F-weight* of P . For $u, v \in V(G)$, a path between u and v with the minimum F -weight is said to be *F-shortest* between u and v . The F -weight of an F -shortest path between u and v is referred to as the *F-distance* between u and v , and is denoted by $\lambda(u, v; F; G, T)$. Regarding these terms, we sometimes omit the prefix “ F -” if the meaning is apparent from the context.

The next proposition characterizes F -distances, where F is a minimum join. It implies that the F -distance between vertices does not depend on the minimum join F .

Proposition 4.2 (Sebö [25]). Let (G, T) be a graft, and let F be a minimum join. Then, $\lambda(u, v; F; G, T) = \nu(G, T \Delta \{u, v\}) - \nu(G, T)$ for every $u, v \in V(G)$.

The next lemma provides a necessary and sufficient condition for a set F to be a minimum join in terms of the F -weights of circuits. We will use this lemma to prove Theorem 10.4 and Lemma 12.2.

Lemma 4.3 (see also Sebö [25]). Let (G, T) be a graft, and let F be a join of (G, T) . Then, F is a minimum join of (G, T) if and only if there is no circuit C with $w_F(C) < 0$.

5. FACTOR-CRITICAL GRAPHS

In this section, we explain the classical concept of factor-critical graphs and their constructive characterization discovered by Lovász [21, 22]. In Section 6, graft analogues of this concept and result are presented, whereas in Sections 10 to 12, bipartite graft analogues are presented.

A graph is *factor-critical* if $G - v$ has a perfect matching for every $v \in V(G)$.

Definition 5.1. The family $\mathcal{L}(r)$ of graphs with vertex r is defined as follows.

- (i) $(\{r\}, \emptyset)$ is a member of $\mathcal{L}(r)$.

- (ii) Let G be a member of $\mathcal{L}(r)$, and let P be a round ear relative to G such that $|E(P)|$ is odd. Then, $G + P$ is a member of $\mathcal{L}(r)$.

Theorem 5.2 (Lovász [21, 22]). Let G be a graph, and let $r \in V(G)$. Then, G is factor-critical if and only if G is a member of $\mathcal{L}(r)$.

Remark 5.3. It is easily observed from the definition or Theorem 5.2 that every factor-critical graph with at least one edge is nonbipartite.

The following characterizaion of factor-critical graphs is also well known and rather easily derived from a discussion of alternating paths. In fact, Proposition 5.4 is used for deriving Theorem 5.2.

Proposition 5.4 (see Lovász and Plummer [21]). Let G be a graph, let $r \in V(G)$, and let $M \subseteq E(G)$ be a perfect matching of $G - r$. Then, G is factor-critical if and only if, for every $v \in V(G) \setminus \{r\}$, there is a path in G from v to r whose M -weight is zero.

6. FACTOR-CRITICAL GRAFTS

In this section, we introduce the concept of factor-critical grafts as a graft analogue of factor-critical graphs. A reasonable definition of factor-critical grafts is obvious from Sebö [25]. We first provide the definition of factor-critical grafts and then explain its validity. We then convert Theorem 5.2 into a constructive characterization for factor-critical grafts.

The definition of factor-critical grafts is provided as follows.

Definition 6.1. A graft (G, T) is *factor-critical* with root $r \in V(G)$ if $\nu(G, T) = \nu(G, T \Delta \{r, v\})$ for every $v \in V(G) \setminus \{r\}$.

Somewhat surprisingly, a result of Sebö [25] shows that factor-critical grafts can be characterized as follows.

Proposition 6.2 (Sebö [25]). The following two are equivalent for a graph G and a set $T \subseteq V(G)$.

- (i) (G, T) is a factor-critical graft with root $r \in V(G)$.
- (ii) Graph G is factor-critical, and $T = V(G) \setminus \{r\}$.

The validity of the definition of factor-critical grafts, along with the impact of Proposition 6.2, can be explained as follows. It is easily observed from Propositions 4.2 and 5.4 that, for a graph G and a vertex $r \in V(G)$, if G is factor-critical, then $(G, V(G) \setminus \{r\})$ is a graft with $\nu(G, V(G) \setminus \{r\}) = \nu(G, (V(G) \setminus \{v\}))$ for every $v \in V(G) \setminus \{r\}$. In fact, the converse also holds according to Proposition 6.2. This explains the validity of the definition of factor-critical grafts, where a pair of a factor-critical graph G and its vertex set missing one vertex can be considered a “graphic” factor-critical graft. Proposition 6.2 further proves that every factor-critical graft is in fact “graphic”.

Proposition 6.2 implies that if (G, T) is a factor-critical graft with root r , then, for every $v \in V(G) \setminus \{r\}$, $(G, T \Delta \{r, v\})$ is also a factor-critical graft with root v . Proposition 6.2 also implies the next property.

Observation 6.3. Let (G, T) be a factor-critical graft with root r , and let F be a minimum join of (G, T) . Then, $|\delta_G(v) \cap F| = 1$ for every $v \in V(G) \setminus \{r\}$, whereas $\delta_G(r) \cap F = \emptyset$.

From Proposition 6.2, it is obvious that Theorem 5.2 can easily be converted to a characterization for factor-critical grafts.

Definition 6.4. Define the family $\mathcal{L}^+(r)$ of grafts with vertex r as follows.

- (i) $(\{\{r\}, \emptyset, \emptyset)$ is a member of $\mathcal{L}^+(r)$.
- (ii) Let (G, T) be a member of $\mathcal{L}^+(r)$, and let (P, T') be an ear graft relative to (G, T) with bonds s and t such that P is round, $|E(P)|$ is odd, and $V(P) \cap T = V(P) \setminus \{s, t\}$. Then, $(G, T) \oplus (P, T')$ is a member of $\mathcal{L}^+(r)$.

Theorem 6.5. A graft is factor-critical with root r if and only if it is a member of $\mathcal{L}^+(r)$.

Remark 6.6. It is again easily observed from the definition, Proposition 6.2, or Theorem 6.5 that every factor-critical graft is nonbipartite.

7. BIPARTITE GRAFTS WITH ORDERED BIPARTITION

We now define bipartite grafts with an ordered bipartition and formulate related fundamental concepts such as addition and ear grafts. From this section onward, we only discuss bipartite grafts with an ordered bipartition.

Definition 7.1. We call a quadruple $(G, T; A, B)$ a *bipartite graft with an ordered bipartition* or sometimes simply a (bipartite) graft if (G, T) is a bipartite graft with color classes A and B . Note that $(G, T; A, B)$ and $(G, T; B, A)$ are not equivalent as bipartite grafts with an ordered bipartition. We often refer to a bipartite graft with an ordered bipartition simply as a bipartite graft or a graft. That is, if we say that $(G, T; A, B)$ is a (bipartite) graft, we imply that $(G, T; A, B)$ is a bipartite graft with an ordered bipartition.

Additional conditions are required for bipartite grafts with an ordered bipartition regarding addition and ear grafts.

Definition 7.2. Let $(G_1, T_1; A_1, B_1)$ and $(G_2, T_2; A_2, B_2)$ be bipartite grafts with $A_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$ and $A_2 \cap B_1 = \emptyset$. We define the sum of $(G_1, T_1; A_1, B_1)$ and $(G_2, T_2; A_2, B_2)$ as the bipartite graft $(G_1 + G_2, T_1 \Delta T_2; A_1 \cup A_2, B_1 \cup B_2)$ and denote this graft by $(G_1, T_1; A_1, B_1) \oplus (G_2, T_2; A_2, B_2)$.

Definition 7.3. Let $(G, T; A, B)$ and $(P, T'; A', B')$ be bipartite grafts with an ordered bipartition. We say that $(P, T'; A', B')$ is an *ear graft* relative to $(G, T; A, B)$ if

- (i) $A \cap B' = \emptyset$ and $A' \cap B = \emptyset$, and
- (ii) (P, T') is an ear graft relative to (G, T) .

That is, if $(P, T'; A', B')$ is an ear graft relative to $(G, T; A, B)$, then $(G, T; A, B) \oplus (P, T'; A', B')$ is a bipartite graft $(G + P, T \Delta T'; A \cup A', B \cup B')$.

8. COMBS

We present the concept of comb bipartite grafts and a sufficient condition for a bipartite graft to be a comb that has been provided by Sebö [25]. Combs are also discussed by Kita [13].

Definition 8.1. A bipartite graft $(G, T; A, B)$ is a *comb* if $B \subseteq T$ holds and $\nu(G, T) = |B|$. For a comb $(G, T; A, B)$, A and B are called the *spine* and *tooth* sets.

Remark 8.2. It is easily confirmed that the definition of combs can be rephrased as follows. Let $(G, T; A, B)$ be a graft, and let F be a minimum join. Then, $(G, T; A, B)$ is a comb if and only if $|\delta_G(v) \cap F| = 1$ for every $v \in B$.

Theorem 8.3 (Sebö [25]). Let $(G, T; A, B)$ be a bipartite graft, and let $r \in A$. Let F be a minimum join. If $\lambda(r, v; F; G, T) = 0$ for every $v \in A$ and $\lambda(r, v; F; G, T) = -1$ for every $v \in B$, then $(G, T; A, B)$ is a comb.

We use Theorem 8.3 to prove Theorem 10.4.

9. QUASICOMBS

We now introduce the new concept of quasicombs. This is a broader concept than that of combs. Later in this paper, we prove that the bipartite graft analogue of factor-critical graphs forms a special class of quasicombs.

Definition 9.1. Let $(G, T; A, B)$ be a bipartite graft. If $\nu(G, T) = |B \cap T|$, then this graft is called a *quasicomb*, and sets A and B are called the *spine* and *tooth* sets, respectively.

Remark 9.2. The definition of quasicombs can be rephrased as follows. Let $(G, T; A, B)$ be a bipartite graft, and let F be a minimum join. Then, $(G, T; A, B)$ is a quasicomb if and only if $|\delta_G(v) \cap F| \leq 1$ for every $v \in B$.

Lemmas 9.3 and 9.5 below are fundamental observations regarding quasicombs and can easily be confirmed. We use these lemmas in later sections, sometimes without explicitly mentioning them.

Lemma 9.3. Let $(G, T; A, B)$ be a quasicomb, and let F be a minimum join of $(G, T; A, B)$. Then, the following properties hold:

- (i) $\lambda(x, y; F; G, T) \geq 0$ for every $x, y \in A$.
- (ii) $\lambda(x, y; F; G, T) \geq -1$ for every $x \in A$ and every $y \in B$.
- (iii) $\lambda(x, y; F; G, T) \geq -2$ for every $x, y \in B$.

Definition 9.4. Let $(G, T; A, B)$ be a graft, and let $F \subseteq E(G)$ and $s, t \in V(G)$. We say that a path P between s and t is *F-balanced* if $|\delta_P(v) \cap F| = 1$ holds for every $v \in V(P) \cap B \setminus \{s, t\}$.

Lemma 9.5. Let $(G, T; A, B)$ be a quasicomb, and let F be a minimum join of $(G, T; A, B)$. Let $x, y \in V(G)$, and let P be an F -balanced path between x and y . Then, the following hold:

- (i) If $x, y \in A$ holds, then $w_F(P) = 0$.
- (ii) If $x \in A$ and $y \in B$ hold, then $w_F(P) \in \{1, -1\}$ holds. Additionally, $w_F(P)$ is -1 or 1 if and only if the edge of P connected to y is in F or not in F , respectively.
- (iii) If $x, y \in B$ hold, then $w_F(P) \in \{-2, 0, 2\}$ holds. Additionally, $w_F(P)$ is equal to -2 or 2 if and only if the edges of P connected to the ends are in F or not in F , respectively.

10. CRITICAL QUASICOMBS

We now define the new concept of critical bipartite grafts as a bipartite analogue of factor-critical grafts and a bipartite analogue of factor-critical grafts. We also prove from Theorem 8.3 that critical bipartite grafts are in fact quasicombs.

Definition 10.1. Let $(G, T; A, B)$ be a bipartite graft. Let $r \in B$. We say that $(G, T; A, B)$ is *critical* with root r if $\nu(G, T \Delta \{x, r\}) - \nu(G, T) = 1$ for each $x \in A$ and $\nu(G, T \Delta \{x, r\}) - \nu(G, T) = 0$ for each $x \in B$.

Remark 10.2. The rationality of this definition can be explained from the definition of factor-critical grafts. A simple parity argument proves that, for a minimum join F , the F -distance between r and a vertex x is odd or even if x is in A or B , respectively. Therefore, $\nu(G, T \Delta \{x, r\}) - \nu(G, T)$ is odd for every $x \in A$ and is even for every $x \in B$. Furthermore, every factor-critical graph or graft is connected. Critical bipartite grafts can equivalently be defined as connected bipartite grafts $(G, T; A, B)$ with $\nu(G, T \Delta \{x, r\}) - \nu(G, T) = 0$ for each $x \in B$.

In the sequel, we frequently use the following three lemmas, sometimes without explicitly mentioning them. First, by Proposition 4.2, the definition of critical quasicombs can be rephrased as follows.

Lemma 10.3. Let $(G, T; A, B)$ be a bipartite graft, and let $r \in B$. Let F be a minimum join. Then, the following properties are equivalent.

- (i) $(G, T; A, B)$ is a critical bipartite graft with root r .
- (ii) $\lambda(x, r; F; G, T) = 1$ for each $x \in A$, and $\lambda(x, r; F; G, T) = 0$ for each $x \in B$.

The next theorem states that every critical bipartite graft is in fact a quasicomb.

Theorem 10.4. If $(G, T; A, B)$ is a critical bipartite graft with root $r \in V(G)$, then $(G, T; A, B)$ is a quasicomb with $T \cap B = B \setminus \{r\}$.

Proof. Let \hat{G} be the graph obtained from G by adding a new vertex s and an edge sr . Let $(\hat{G}, \hat{T}; \hat{A}, \hat{B})$ be the bipartite graft with $\hat{T} = T \cup \{s, r\}$, $\hat{A} = A \cup \{s\}$, and $\hat{B} = B$. Let F be a minimum join of (G, T) , and let $\hat{F} = F \cup \{sr\}$. Then, \hat{F} is obviously a minimum join of (\hat{G}, \hat{T}) by Lemma 4.3. Lemma 10.3 easily implies $\lambda(s, v; \hat{F}; \hat{G}, \hat{T}) = 0$ for every $v \in \hat{A}$ and $\lambda(s, v; \hat{F}; \hat{G}, \hat{T}) = -1$ for every $v \in \hat{B}$. Then, Theorem 8.3 implies that $(\hat{G}, \hat{T}; \hat{A}, \hat{B})$ is a comb. This further implies $|\hat{F}| = |\hat{B}| = |\hat{B} \cap \hat{T}|$. Therefore, $|F| = |B \cap T|$ holds, and $(G, T; A, B)$ is a quasicomb with $T \cap B = B \setminus \{r\}$. \square

In the remainder of this paper, we assume Theorem 10.4 without explicitly mentioning it. Hereafter, we refer to critical bipartite grafts as critical quasicombs and refrain from referring to Theorem 10.4. We can also confirm from Theorem 10.4 that the bipartite analogue of Observation 6.3 holds for critical bipartite grafts.

From Lemma 10.3, the next lemma is easily implied.

Lemma 10.5. Let $(G, T; A, B)$ be a critical quasicomb whose root is $r \in B$. Let F be a minimum join of (G, T) . Then, the following properties hold.

- (i) $\delta_G(r) \cap F = \emptyset$.
- (ii) $|\delta_G(v) \cap F| = 1$ for each $v \in B \setminus \{r\}$.
- (iii) Every F -shortest path between $v \in B \setminus \{r\}$ and r is an F -balanced path of weight 0 in which v is connected to an edge from F .
- (iv) Every F -shortest path between $v \in A$ and r is an F -balanced path of weight 1.

11. EFFECTIVE EAR GRAFTS

In this section, we define the concept of effective ear grafts for bipartite grafts with an ordered bipartition and then present some of their basic properties. In the next section, critical quasicombs are characterized as grafts that are constructed from effective ear grafts. That is, effective ear grafts are a bipartite graft analogue of round ears with an odd number of edges that appear in Theorem 5.2, and they also serve as a graft analogue of ear grafts that appear in Theorem 6.5.

Definition 11.1. Let $(G, T; A, B)$ be a graft, and let $(P, T'; A', B')$ be an ear graft relative to $(G, T; A, B)$ for which $s, t \in V(P)$ are bonds. We say that $(P, T'; A', B')$ is *effective* if it satisfies the following.

- (i) $(V(P) \setminus \{s, t\}) \cap B \subseteq T$.
- (ii) $\{s, t\} \cap B \cap T = \emptyset$.
- (iii) If it is straight, then $s \in A'$ implies $s \in T$, whereas $v \in A'$ implies $v \notin T$, where v is the free end of P .

The next lemma can easily be confirmed; it claims that effective straight ears can be classified into four types with simple structures.

Lemma 11.2. Let $(G, T; A, B)$ be a graft, and let $(P, T'; A', B')$ be an ear graft relative to $(G, T; A, B)$ that is effective and straight. Let s and t be the free end and the bond of P , respectively. Then, $V(P) \setminus \{s, t\} \subseteq T$ holds. Additionally, $(P, T'; A, B)$ has only one minimum join F , and it satisfies the following properties:

- (i) If $s \in A'$ and $t \in B'$ hold, then F is a perfect matching of $P - s - t$.
- (ii) If $s \in A'$ and $t \in A'$ hold, then F is a perfect matching of $P - s$.
- (iii) If $s \in B'$ and $t \in A'$ hold, then F is a perfect matching of P .
- (iv) If $s \in B'$ and $t \in B'$ hold, then F is a perfect matching of $P - t$.

The next lemma is easily confirmed from the definition of effective ear grafts and Lemmas 9.5 and 11.2; it is used to prove Lemma 12.2.

Lemma 11.3. Let $(G, T; A, B)$ be a graft, and let $(P, T'; A', B')$ be an effective ear graft relative to $(G, T; A, B)$ with bonds s and t . Let F be a minimum join of $(P, T'; A', B')$. Then, the following properties hold:

- (i) For each $x \in V(P) \cap A'$, there exists $r \in \{s, t\}$ with either $r \in A'$ or $r \in B'$ such that xPr is an F -balanced path of weight 0, or xPr is an F -balanced path of weight 1, respectively.
- (ii) For each $x \in V(P) \cap B'$, there exists $r \in \{s, t\}$ with either $r \in A'$ or $r \in B'$ such that xPr is an F -balanced path of weight -1 , or xPr is an F -balanced path of weight 0 in which x is connected to an edge from F , respectively.

12. CONSTRUCTIVE CHARACTERIZATION FOR CRITICAL QUASICOMBS

We finally present our main results. In this section, we provide a constructive characterization for critical quasicombs. The main results here, Theorems 12.7 and 12.10, are used by Kita [15] for deriving the generalization of the Dulmage-Mendelsohn decomposition for bipartite grafts.

Definition 12.1. We define a family $\mathcal{G}(r)$ of bipartite grafts with an ordered bipartition that have a vertex r as follows.

- (i) The graft $((\{r\}, \emptyset), \emptyset; \emptyset, \{r\})$ is a member of $\mathcal{G}(r)$.
- (ii) Let $(G, T; A, B) \in \mathcal{G}(r)$, and let $(P, T'; A', B')$ be an effective ear graft relative to $(G, T; A, B)$. Then, $(G, T; A, B) \oplus (P, T'; A', B')$ is a member of $\mathcal{G}(r)$.

In the following, we show Lemmas 12.2, 12.5, and 12.6 to prove in Theorem 12.7 that $\mathcal{G}(r)$ is the family of critical quasicombs with root r .

Lemma 12.2. Every member of $\mathcal{G}(r)$ is a critical quasicomb with root r .

Proof. We prove this lemma by induction along the definition of $\mathcal{G}(r)$. First, the statement clearly holds for $((\{r\}, \emptyset), \emptyset; \emptyset, \{r\})$. Next, let $(G, T; A, B) \in \mathcal{G}(r)$, and assume that the statement holds for $(G, T; A, B)$; that is, $(G, T; A, B)$ is a critical quasicomb with root r . Let $(P, T'; A', B')$ be an ear graft relative to (G, T) . Let F and F' be minimum joins of (G, T) and (P, T') , respectively. Let $(\hat{G}, \hat{T}; \hat{A}, \hat{B}) := (G, T; A, B) \oplus (P, T'; A', B')$. Let $\hat{F} := F \cup F'$. As is mentioned in Observation 3.3, \hat{F} is a join of $(\hat{G}, \hat{T}; \hat{A}, \hat{B})$.

Claim 12.3. The graft $(\hat{G}, \hat{T}; \hat{A}, \hat{B})$ is a quasicomb, and \hat{F} is a minimum join.

Proof. We first prove that \hat{F} is a minimum join. According to Lemma 4.3, we only need to prove that there is no circuit with negative \hat{F} -weight. If C is a circuit in $(\hat{G}, \hat{T}; \hat{A}, \hat{B})$ with negative \hat{F} -weight, then P is required to be a round ear with distinct bonds s and

t , and C is the sum of P and a path Q in $(G, T; A, B)$ between s and t . Hence, the claim can be proved if we prove $w_{F'}(P) + \lambda(s, t; F; G, T) \geq 0$ under the supposition that P is a round ear with distinct bonds s and t .

First, consider the case with $s, t \in B$. Lemma 9.5 implies $w_{\hat{F}}(P) = 2$, whereas Lemma 9.3 implies $\lambda(s, t; F; G, T) \geq -2$. Hence, $w_{F'}(P) + \lambda(s, t; F; G, T) \geq 0$. For the other cases, where the bonds s and t are both in A or individually in A and B , similar discussions prove $w_{F'}(P) + \lambda(s, t; F; G, T) \geq 0$. Therefore, no circuit in $(\hat{G}, \hat{T}; \hat{A}, \hat{B})$ can be of negative \hat{F} -weight; accordingly, \hat{F} is a minimum join. This further implies that $\nu(\hat{G}, \hat{T}) = |\hat{B} \setminus \{r\}| = |\hat{B} \cap \hat{T}|$. That is, $(\hat{G}, \hat{T}; \hat{A}, \hat{B})$ is a quasicomb. Thus, the claim is proved. \square

Under Claim 12.3, we further prove that $(\hat{G}, \hat{T}; \hat{A}, \hat{B})$ is a critical quasicomb.

Claim 12.4. $\lambda(r, x; \hat{F}; \hat{G}, \hat{T}) = 1$ holds for every $x \in \hat{A}$, whereas $\lambda(r, x; \hat{F}; \hat{G}, \hat{T}) = 0$ holds for every $x \in \hat{B}$.

Proof. Under the induction hypothesis and Lemma 10.5, the claim obviously holds for every $x \in V(G)$. This further proves the claim for every $x \in V(P) \setminus V(G)$ from Lemma 11.3 by considering the concatenation of paths. \square

Under Claims 12.3 and 12.4, Lemma 10.3 implies that $(\hat{G}, \hat{T}; \hat{A}, \hat{B})$ is a critical quasicomb with root r . This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

The next lemma is provided for proving Lemma 12.6.

Lemma 12.5. Let $(G, T; A, B)$ be a critical quasicomb with root $r \in B$, and let F be a minimum join of $(G, T; A, B)$. Let $(G', T'; A', B')$ be a subgraft of $(G, T; A, B)$, where $A' \subseteq A$ and $B' \subseteq B$, such that $r \in B'$, $V(G') \subsetneq V(G)$, and $E_G[B', A \setminus A'] \cap F = \emptyset$ hold. Then, $(G, T; A, B)$ has an ear graft $(G'', T''; A'', B'')$ relative to $(G', T'; A', B')$ with $V(G'') \setminus V(G') \neq \emptyset$ and $E_G[B'', A \setminus (A' \cup A'')] \cap F = \emptyset$.

Proof. First, we prove the case where $E_G[B', A \setminus A'] \neq \emptyset$. Let $e \in E_G[B', A \setminus A']$, and let $x \in A \setminus A'$ and $y \in B'$ be the ends of e . The assumption implies $e \notin F$. Hence, $(G.e, \emptyset; \{x\}, \{y\})$ is an ear graft relative to $(G', T'; A', B')$ that meets the condition.

Next, we prove the case where $E_G[B', A \setminus A'] = \emptyset$. Because G is obviously connected, we have $E_G[A', B \setminus B'] \neq \emptyset$. Let $f \in E_G[A', B \setminus B']$, and let $u \in A'$ and $v \in B \setminus B'$ be the ends of f .

First, consider the case with $f \notin F$. Under Lemma 10.3, let P be a path between v and r with $w_F(P) = 0$. Lemma 10.5 implies that P is F -balanced, and the edge of P connected to v is in F . Hence, $f \notin E(P)$ follows. Trace P from v , and let w be the first encountered vertex in $V(G')$. The assumption implies $w \in A'$. Let $Q := vPw + f$. Then, $(Q, T''; A \cap V(Q), B \cap V(Q))$ is a desired ear graft relative to $(G', T'; A', B')$ that meets the condition, where T'' is the set of vertices from $V(Q)$ that are connected to an odd number of edges from $E(Q) \cap F$.

For the remaining case with $f \in F$, $(G.f, \{u, v\}; \{u\}, \{v\})$ is a desired ear graft relative to $(G', T'; A', B')$. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 12.5 implies the next lemma.

Lemma 12.6. Every critical quasicomb with root r is a member of $\mathcal{G}(r)$.

Proof. Let $(G, T; A, B)$ be a critical quasicomb with root r . We prove the lemma by induction on $|V(G)|$. If $|V(G)| = 1$, that is, $(G, T; A, B)$ is $((\{r\}, \emptyset), \emptyset; \emptyset, \{r\})$, then $(G, T; A, B) \in \mathcal{G}(r)$ obviously holds. Next, let $|V(G)| > 1$, and assume that the statement holds for every critical quasicomb with a smaller number of vertices. Let F be a minimum




FIGURE 2. Critical quasicomb $(G, T; A, B)$ with root r and one of its minimum joins F : The gray and white points indicate vertices in T and $V(G) \setminus T$, respectively, and the upper and lower vertices form color classes B and A , respectively. Bold lines indicate edges in F .

join of $(G, T; A, B)$. Let (G', T', A', B') be a maximal subgraft of $(G, T; A, B)$ that is a member of $\mathcal{G}(r)$ for which $E_G[B', A \setminus A'] \cap F = \emptyset$.

Suppose $V(G') \subsetneq V(G)$. Lemma 12.2 implies that $(G', T'; A', B')$ is a critical quasicomb with root r . Therefore, Lemma 12.5 implies that $(G, T; A, B)$ has an ear graft $(P, T''; A'', B'')$ relative to $(G', T'; A', B')$ such that $V(P) \setminus V(G') \neq \emptyset$ and $E_G[B'', A \setminus (A' \cup A'')] \cap F = \emptyset$. Then, $(G', T'; A', B') \oplus (P, T''; A'', B'')$ is a member of $\mathcal{G}(r)$ for which $E_G[B' \cup B'', A \setminus (A' \cup A'')] \cap F = \emptyset$. This contradicts the maximality of $(G', T'; A', B')$. Hence, we obtain $V(G') = V(G)$. This further implies $(G, T; A, B) \in \mathcal{G}(r)$. The lemma is proved. \square

Combining Lemmas 12.2 and 12.6, we now obtain Theorem 12.7, the constructive characterization for critical quasicombs.

Theorem 12.7. A bipartite graft with an ordered bipartition is a critical quasicomb with root r if and only if it is a member of $\mathcal{G}(r)$.

We next provide Theorem 12.10.

Definition 12.8. Let $(G, T; A, B) \in \mathcal{G}(r)$. Let $\{(G_i, T_i; A_i, B_i) \in \mathcal{G}(r) : i = 1, \dots, l\}$, where $l \geq 1$, be a family of grafts such that

- (i) $(G_1, T_1; A_1, B_1) = ((\{r\}, \emptyset), \emptyset; \emptyset, \{r\})$,
- (ii) for each $i \in \{1, \dots, l\} \setminus \{1\}$, $(G_{i+1}, T_{i+1}; A_{i+1}, B_{i+1}) = (G_i, T_i; A_i, B_i) \oplus (P_i, T'_i; A'_i, B'_i)$, where $(P_i, T'_i; A'_i, B'_i)$ is an effective ear graft relative to $(G_i, T_i; A_i, B_i)$, and
- (iii) $(G_l, T_l; A_l, B_l) = (G, T; A, B)$.

We call the family $\{(P_i, T'_i; A'_i, B'_i) : i = 1, \dots, l\}$ a *graft ear decomposition* of $(G, T; A, B)$.

Definition 12.9. Let $(G, T; A, B)$ be a critical quasicomb with root $r \in B$, and let $F \subseteq E(G)$. Let \mathcal{P} be a family of bipartite grafts with an ordered bipartition that is a graft ear decomposition of $(G, T; A, B)$. We say that \mathcal{P} is *F-balanced* if $F \cap E(P)$ is a minimum join for each $(P, T'; A', B') \in \mathcal{P}$.

The next statement clearly follows from the proof of Lemma 12.6.

Theorem 12.10. Let $(G, T; A, B)$ be a critical quasicomb with root $r \in B$ and F be a minimum join. Then, there is a graft ear decomposition of $(G, T; A, B)$ that is *F-balanced*.




FIGURE 3. Graft $(G_1, T_1; A_1, B_1)$ and ear graft $(P_1, T'_1; A'_1, B'_1)$.




FIGURE 4. Graft $(G_2, T_2; A_2, B_2)$ and ear graft $(P_2, T'_2; A'_2, B'_2)$.




FIGURE 5. Graft $(G_3, T_3; A_3, B_3)$ and ear graft $(P_3, T'_3; A'_3, B'_3)$.




FIGURE 6. Graft $(G_4, T_4; A_4, B_4)$ and ear graft $(P_4, T'_4; A'_4, B'_4)$.

Example 12.11. Figures 3 to 6 illustrate an ear decomposition $\{(P_i, T'_i; A'_i, B'_i) : i = 1, \dots, 4\}$ of the critical quasicomb $(G, T; A, B)$ from Figure 2. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$, $(G_i, T_i; A_i, B_i)$ is a critical quasicomb with root r , and $(P_i, T'_i; A'_i, B'_i)$ is an ear graft relative to it. It holds that $(G_{i+1}, T_{i+1}; A_{i+1}, B_{i+1}) = (G_i, T_i; A_i, B_i) \oplus (P_i, T'_i; A'_i, B'_i)$, where $(G_5, T_5; A_5, B_5) := (G, T; A, B)$. As in Figure 2, lower points indicate vertices in A_i or A'_i , whereas upper points indicate vertices in B_i or B'_i . Gray vertices indicate those from T_i or T'_i , whereas white vertices indicate the others. Each dotted line shows a pair of vertices that are identified through the addition. As can be seen, this ear decomposition is F -balanced with respect to the minimum join F from Figure 2.

13. CONCLUSION

We introduced critical bipartite grafts as a bipartite graft analogue of factor-critical graphs and provided a constructive characterization of this class of grafts, which is an analogue of Lovász' theorem [16, 21–23] for factor-critical graphs. Our main results will be used to derive a generalization of the Dulmage-Mendelsohn canonical decomposition for grafts [15].

Acknowledgments. This study was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 18K13451.

REFERENCES

- [1] Dulmage, A.L., Mendelsohn, N.S.: Coverings of bipartite graphs. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics* 10, 517–534 (1958)
- [2] Dulmage, A.L., Mendelsohn, N.S.: A structure theory of bipartite graphs of finite exterior dimension. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, Section III* 53, 1–13 (1959)
- [3] Dulmage, A.L., Mendelsohn, N.S.: Two algorithms for bipartite graphs. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics* 11(1), 183–194 (1963)
- [4] Edmonds, J.: Paths, trees and flowers. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics* 17, 449–467 (1965)
- [5] Edmonds, J., Lovász, L., Pulleyblank, W.R.: Brick decompositions and the matching rank of graphs. *Combinatorica* 2(3), 247–274 (1982)
- [6] Gallai, T.: Maximale systeme unabhängiger kanten. *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia: Intézetének Közleményei* 8, 401–413 (1964)
- [7] Kita, N.: A new canonical decomposition in matching theory. arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.01051 Under review
- [8] Kita, N.: A canonical characterization of the family of barriers in general graphs. arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.5960 (2012)
- [9] Kita, N.: A partially ordered structure and a generalization of the canonical partition for general graphs with perfect matchings. In: Chao, K.M., Hsu, T.s., Lee, D.T. (eds.) 23rd Int. Symp. Algorithms Comput. ISAAC 2012. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 7676, pp. 85–94. Springer (2012)
- [10] Kita, N.: Disclosing barriers: A generalization of the canonical partition based on Lovász's formulation. In: Widmayer, P., Xu, Y., Zhu, B. (eds.) 7th International Conference of Combinatorial Optimization and Applications, COCOA 2013. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 8287, pp. 402–413. Springer (2013)
- [11] Kita, N.: An alternative proof of Lovász's cathedral theorem. *Journal of the Operations Research Society of Japan* 57(1), 15–34 (2014)
- [12] Kita, N.: A graph theoretic proof of the tight cut lemma. arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.08870 (2015)
- [13] Kita, N.: Parity factors I: General Kotzig-Lovász decomposition for grafts. arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.01920 (2017)
- [14] Kita, N.: Structure of towers and a new proof of the tight cut lemma. In: Gao, X., Du, H., Han, M. (eds.) *Combinatorial Optimization and Applications - 11th International Conference, COCOA 2017, Shanghai, China, December 16-18, 2017, Proceedings, Part I. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 10627, pp. 225–239. Springer (2017)
- [15] Kita, N.: Bipartite graft II: Cathedral decomposition for combs. arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.06678 (2021)

- [16] Korte, B., Vygen, J.: *Combinatorial Optimization: Theory and Algorithms*. Springer-Verlag, fourth edn. (2007)
- [17] Kotzig, A.: Z teórie konečných grafov s lineárnym faktorom. I. *Mathematica Slovaca* 9(2), 73–91 (1959), *in Slovak*
- [18] Kotzig, A.: Z teórie konečných grafov s lineárnym faktorom. II. *Mathematica Slovaca* 9(3), 136–159 (1959), *in Slovak*
- [19] Kotzig, A.: Z teórie konečných grafov s lineárnym faktorom. III. *Mathematica Slovaca* 10(4), 205–215 (1960), *in Slovak*
- [20] Lovász, L.: On the structure of factorizable graphs. *Acta Mathematica Hungarica* 23(1–2), 179–195 (1972)
- [21] Lovász, L., Plummer, M.D.: *Matching Theory*. AMS Chelsea Publishing (2009)
- [22] Lovász, L.: A note on factor-critical graphs. *Studia Sci. Math.* 7(279-280), 11 (1972)
- [23] Schrijver, A.: *Combinatorial Optimization: Polyhedra and Efficiency*. Springer-Verlag (2003)
- [24] Sebő, A.: Dual integrality and multicommodity flows. In: *Infinite and Finite Sets, Proceeding of a Conference held in Eger, North Holland*. pp. 453–469 (1987)
- [25] Sebő, A.: Undirected distances and the postman-structure of graphs. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B* 49(1), 10–39 (1990)

FURO-CHO, CHIKUSA-KU, NAGOYA, 464-8601, JAPAN

Email address: kita@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp