

Box Facets and Cut Facets of Lifted Multicut Polytopes

Lucas Fabian Naumann¹, Jannik Irmay¹, Shengxian Zhao^{1,2}, and Bjoern Andres^{1,2}

¹Faculty of Computer Science, TU Dresden

²Center for Scalable Data Analytics and AI, Dresden/Leipzig

bjoern.andres@tu-dresden.de

Abstract

The *lifted multicut problem* is a combinatorial optimization problem whose feasible solutions relate one-to-one to the decompositions of a graph $G = (V, E)$. Given an augmentation $\widehat{G} = (V, E \cup F)$ of G and given costs $c \in \mathbb{R}^{E \cup F}$, the objective is to minimize the sum of those c_{uw} with $uw \in E \cup F$ for which u and w are in distinct components. For $F = \emptyset$, the problem specializes to the multicut problem, and for $E = \binom{V}{2}$ to the clique partitioning problem. We study a binary linear program formulation of the lifted multicut problem. More specifically, we contribute to the analysis of the associated *lifted multicut polytopes*: Firstly, we establish a necessary, sufficient and efficiently decidable condition for a lower box inequality to define a facet. Secondly, we show that deciding whether a cut inequality of the binary linear program defines a facet is NP-hard.

1 Introduction

The *lifted multicut problem* (Keuper et al., 2015) is a combinatorial optimization problem whose feasible solutions relate one-to-one to the decompositions of a graph $G = (V, E)$. A decomposition of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a partition Π of the node set V such that for every $U \in \Pi$ the subgraph of G induced by U is connected. Given an augmentation $\widehat{G} = (V, E \cup F)$ of G with $F \cap E = \emptyset$ and costs $c \in \mathbb{R}^{E \cup F}$, the objective of the lifted multicut problem is to minimize the sum of those costs c_{uw} with $uw \in E \cup F$ for which u and w are in distinct components. For $F = \emptyset$, the lifted multicut problem specializes to the multicut problem (Deza et al., 1992; Chopra and Rao, 1993, 1995). For $E = \binom{V}{2}$, it is equivalent to the clique partitioning problem (Grötschel and Wakabayashi, 1989).

We study the binary linear program formulation of the lifted multicut problem by Hornáková et al. (2017) in which variables $x \in \{0, 1\}^{E \cup F}$ indicate for all $uw \in E \cup F$ whether the nodes u and w are in the same component, $x_{uw} = 0$, or distinct components, $x_{uw} = 1$:

Definition 1.1. (Hornáková et al., 2017, Def. 9) For any connected graph $G = (V, E)$, any augmentation $\widehat{G} = (V, E \cup F)$ with $F \cap E = \emptyset$, and any $c \in \mathbb{R}^{E \cup F}$, the




Figure 1: Depicted on the left is a graph $G = (V, E)$ with $E = \{e_1, e_2\}$ and an augmentation $\widehat{G} = (V, E \cup F)$ of G with $F = \{f\}$. Depicted in the middle are the four feasible solutions to the lifted multicut problem with respect to G and \widehat{G} . Depicted on the right is the lifted multicut polytope $\Xi_{G\widehat{G}}$. The figure is adopted from Andres et al. (2023).

instance of the (*minimum cost*) *lifted multicut problem* has the form

$$\min \left\{ \sum_{e \in E \cup F} c_e x_e \mid x \in X_{G\widehat{G}} \right\} \quad (1)$$

with $X_{G\widehat{G}}$ the set of all $x \in \{0, 1\}^{E \cup F}$ that satisfy the following linear inequalities that we discuss in Section 3:

$$\forall C \in \text{cycles}(G) \forall e \in E_C: x_e \leq \sum_{e' \in E_C \setminus \{e\}} x_{e'} \quad (2)$$

$$\forall uw \in F \forall P \in uw\text{-paths}(G): x_{uw} \leq \sum_{e \in E_P} x_e \quad (3)$$

$$\forall uw \in F \forall \delta \in uw\text{-cuts}(G): 1 - x_{uw} \leq \sum_{e \in \delta} (1 - x_e) \quad (4)$$

We analyze the convex hull $\Xi_{G\widehat{G}} := \text{conv } X_{G\widehat{G}}$ of the feasible set $X_{G\widehat{G}}$ in the real affine space $\mathbb{R}^{E \cup F}$, complementing properties established by Hornáková et al. (2017) and Andres et al. (2023) who call $\Xi_{G\widehat{G}}$ the *lifted multicut polytope* with respect to G and \widehat{G} (An example of this polytope is depicted in Figure 1). More specifically, we establish a necessary, sufficient and efficiently decidable condition for an inequality $0 \leq x_e$ with $e \in E \cup F$ to define a facet of $\Xi_{G\widehat{G}}$. Our proof involves an application of Menger's theorem (Menger, 1927). In addition, we show: Deciding whether a cut inequality (4) defines a facet of $\Xi_{G\widehat{G}}$ is NP-hard.

2 Related Work

The lifted multicut problem was introduced in the context of image and mesh segmentation by Keuper et al. (2015) and is discussed in further detail by Horňáková et al. (2017) and Andres et al. (2023). It has diverse applications, notably to the tasks of image segmentation (Keuper et al., 2015; Beier et al., 2016, 2017), video segmentation (Keuper, 2017; Keuper et al., 2020), and multiple object tracking (Tang et al., 2017; Nguyen et al., 2022; Kostyukhin et al., 2023). For these applications, local search algorithms are defined, implemented and compared empirically by Keuper et al. (2015); Levinkov et al. (2017). Two branch-and-cut algorithms for the lifted multicut problem are defined, implemented and compared empirically by Horňáková et al. (2017).

In order to significantly reduce the runtime of their branch-and-cut algorithm, Horňáková et al. (2017) are also the first to establish properties of lifted multicut polytopes, including its dimension $\dim \Xi_{G\hat{G}} = |E \cup F|$ and a characterization of facets induced by cycle inequalities (2), path inequalities (3), upper box inequalities $x_e \leq 1$ for $e \in E \cup F$, and lower box inequalities $0 \leq x_e$ for $e \in E$. Moreover, they establish necessary conditions on facets of lifted multicut polytopes induced by cut inequalities (4) and lower box inequalities $0 \leq x_e$ for $e \in F$. Andres et al. (2023) describe an additional class of facets induced by so-called half-chorded odd cycle inequalities and show that these are facets also of a polytope isomorphic to the clique partitioning polytope (Grötschel and Wakabayashi, 1990; Deza et al., 1992; Deza and Laurent, 1997; Sørensen, 2002). Additionally, they establish the class of facets induced by so-called intersection inequalities, which is discovered based on a necessary condition for facets induced by cut inequalities (4). However, they do not make progress toward characterizing the facets of lifted multicut polytopes induced by cut inequalities themselves or lower box inequalities $0 \leq x_e$ for $e \in F$, which motivates the work we show in this article.

3 Preliminaries

For clarity, we adopt elementary terms and notation: Let be $G = (V, E)$ a graph. For any distinct $u, w \in V$, we write uw and wu as an abbreviation of the set $\{u, w\}$. For any subset $A \subseteq E$, we write $\mathbb{1}_A \in \{0, 1\}^E$ for the characteristic vector of the set A , i.e. $(\mathbb{1}_A)_e = 1 \Leftrightarrow e \in A$ for all $e \in E$. For any distinct $u, w \in V$ and any $S \subseteq V$, we call S a uw -separator of G and say that u and w are separated by S in G if and only if every uw -path in G contains a node of S . We call S proper if and only if $u \notin S$ and $w \notin S$. For any $u, v, w \in V$ such that $S = \{v\}$ is a uw -separator of G , we call v a uw -cut-node of G . We call it proper if and only if S is proper. We let $C_{uw}(G)$ denote the set of all proper uw -cut-nodes of G .

Next, we discuss briefly the inequalities (2)–(4) from Definition 1.1 and refer to Andres et al. (2023, Proposition 3) for details: The inequalities (2) state that no cycle in G intersects with the set $\{e \in E \mid x_e = 1\}$ in precisely one edge. This property is equivalent to the existence of a decomposition Π of G such that for any $uw \in E$: $x_{uw} = 0$ if and only if there exists a component $U \in \Pi$ such that $uw \subseteq U$. The inequalities (3) and (4) together state for any $uw \in F$ that $x_{uw} = 0$ if and only if there exists a uw -path (V_P, E_P) in G with all edges $e \in E_P$ such that $x_e = 0$, i.e. that $x_{uw} = 0$ if and only if there exists a component $U \in \Pi$ such that $uw \subseteq U$.

Below, we establish one consequence of these properties that we apply in this article:

Lemma 3.1. *For any connected graph $G = (V, E)$, any augmentation $\hat{G} = (V, E \cup F)$ with $F \cap E = \emptyset$, any disjoint node sets $A \subseteq 2^V$ such that for all $U \in A$ the subgraph $G[U]$ of G induced by U is connected and any $x^A \in \{0, 1\}^{E \cup F}$ such that for all $uw \in E \cup F$, $x_{uw}^A = 0 \Leftrightarrow \exists U \in A: uw \subseteq U$, we have $x^A \in X_{G\hat{G}}$.*

Proof. Firstly, $\Pi = (A \setminus \{\emptyset\}) \cup \{\{v\} \mid v \in V \setminus \cup_{U \in A} U\}$ is a decomposition of G . Secondly, x^A is such that for any $uw \in E \cup F$ we have $x_{uw}^A = 0$ if and only if there is a $U \in \Pi$ such that $uw \subseteq U$. Thus, $x^A \in X_{G\hat{G}}$. \square

4 Lower Box Facets


In this section, we establish a necessary, sufficient and efficiently decidable condition for a lower box inequality $0 \leq x_{uw}$ with $uw \in E \cup F$ to define a facet of a lifted multicut polytope $\Xi_{G\hat{G}}$. Examples are shown in Figure 2.

Theorem 4.1. *For any connected graph $G = (V, E)$, any augmentation $\hat{G} = (V, E \cup F)$ with $F \cap E = \emptyset$ and any $uw \in E \cup F$, the lower box inequality $0 \leq x_{uw}$ is facet-defining for $\Xi_{G\hat{G}}$ if and only if the following two conditions hold:*


- (i) *There exists no simple path in \hat{G} of length at least one, besides $(\{u, w\}, \{uw\})$, whose end-nodes are uw -cut-nodes of G and whose edges are uw -separators of G .*
- (ii) *There exists no simple cycle in \hat{G} whose edges are uw -separators of G .*

In the remainder of this section, we prove a structural lemma and then apply this lemma in order to prove Theorem 4.1.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and let $u, w \in V$. Any simple cycle (V_C, E_C) with $V_C \subseteq V$ and $E_C \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$ such that no $v \in V_C$ is a uw -cut-node of G and every $e \in E_C$ is a uw -separator of G is even.*



$$0 = x_{uv_0} - x_{v_0v_1} + x_{v_1v_2} - x_{v_2v_3} + x_{v_3v_4} - x_{v_4v_5}$$



$$0 = x_{v_0v_1} - x_{v_1v_2} + x_{v_2v_3} - x_{v_3v_4} + x_{v_4v_5} - x_{v_5v_0}$$

Figure 2: Depicted above are two examples of a graph G (solid edges) and augmentation \widehat{G} (dashed edges) such that a condition of Theorem 4.1 is violated for the inequality $0 \leq x_{uw}$. In the upper example, the path with the edge set $\{uv_0, v_0v_1, v_1v_2, v_2v_3, v_3v_4, v_4w\}$ violates (i). In the lower example, the cycle with the edge set $\{v_0v_1, v_1v_2, v_2v_3, v_3v_4, v_4v_5, v_5v_0\}$ violates (ii). For both cases, Equation (5) from the proof of Theorem 4.1 is stated. Edges depicted in green occur with a positive sign in this equation, and edges depicted in red occur with a negative sign.

Proof of Lemma 4.2. In a first step, we construct for any $u, w \in V$ and any cycle $C = (V_C, E_C)$ as defined in the lemma an auxiliary graph $G' = (V', E')$ by removing from G the set $C_{uw}(G)$ of all proper uw -cut-nodes and connecting remaining nodes, which are connected in G by a path of only proper uw -cut-nodes, by additional edges, i.e.

$$V' = V \setminus C_{uw}(G)$$

$$E' = \{st \in \binom{V'}{2} \mid \exists (V_P, E_P) \in st\text{-paths}(G) : \\ V_P \setminus st \subseteq C_{uw}(G)\} \cup (E \cap \binom{V'}{2}) .$$

An example of this construction is shown in Figure 3.

In a second step, we now show that G' has the following properties:

- (i) $V_C \cup \{u, w\} \subseteq V'$ and $E_C \subseteq \binom{V'}{2}$;
- (ii) there exist no proper uw -cut-nodes of G' ;
- (iii) all $e \in E_C$ are proper uw -separators of G' .

Property (i) follows directly from the construction of the auxiliary graph G' .

Assume (ii) does not hold. Then there exists a $v \in C_{uw}(G')$. It follows $v \notin \{u, w\}$ and, by construction




Figure 3: Depicted on the left is a graph G , and depicted on the right is the corresponding auxiliary graph G' , whose construction is described in the proof of Lemma 4.2. The nodes depicted in green are proper uw -cut-nodes of G and get removed in the construction of G' .

of G' , that $v \notin C_{uw}(G)$. Thus, v is no uw -cut-node of G and there exists a uw -path (V_P, E_P) in G such that $v \notin V_P$. By construction of G' , we can create a uw -path $(V_{P'}, E_{P'})$ in G' with $v \notin V_{P'}$ by replacing all subpaths of (V_P, E_P) whose internal nodes are in $C_{uw}(G)$ with edges in $E' \setminus E$. The existence of such a uw -path $(V_{P'}, E_{P'})$ contradicts $v \in C_{uw}(G')$.

Assume (iii) does not hold. Then there exists an $e \in E_C$ that is not a proper uw -separator of G' . As $e \cap \{u, w\} = \emptyset$ by assumption, e is also no uw -separator of G' . Thus, there exists a uw -path $(V_{P'}, E_{P'})$ in G' with $e \cap V_{P'} = \emptyset$. By construction of G' , we can create a uw -path (V_P, E_P) in G from $(V_{P'}, E_{P'})$ by replacing all edges in $E_{P'} \setminus E$ with paths in G whose internal nodes are in $C_{uw}(G)$. For this path P , it holds $e \cap V_P = \emptyset$ because $e \cap V_{P'} = \emptyset$ (see above) and $e \cap C_{uw}(G) = \emptyset$ (by assumption). The existence of such a uw -path (V_P, E_P) contradicts e being a uw -separator of G .

In a third step, we now prove that C is even: Menger's theorem (Menger, 1927) states that for two distinct non-adjacent nodes $a, b \in V'$, the number of internally node-disjoint ab -paths in G' is equal to the minimal size of proper ab -separators of G' . By (i), u and w are in V' . Furthermore, they are distinct and non-adjacent in G' , as otherwise every uw -separator of G' would contain u or w , in contradiction to the elements of E_C being proper uw -separators of G' by (iii). As $C_{uw}(G') = \emptyset$ by (ii), and all edges in E_C are proper uw -separators of G' by (iii), the minimal size of proper uw -separators of G' is two. Thus, there exist precisely two internally node-disjoint uw -paths $P_1 = (V_{P_1}, E_{P_1})$ and $P_2 = (V_{P_2}, E_{P_2})$ in G' , by Menger's theorem.

W.l.o.g., we enumerate the nodes in the cycle (V_C, E_C) : For $n := |V_C|$, let $v: \mathbb{Z}_n \rightarrow V_C$ such that $E_C = \{v_jv_{j+1} \mid j \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}$. As v_0v_1 is a uw -separator of G' by (iii), the paths P_1 and P_2 each contain v_0 or v_1 . Moreover, as these paths are internally node-disjoint, precisely one of them contains v_0 , the other v_1 . Assume w.l.o.g. that $v_0 \in V_{P_1}$ and $v_1 \in V_{P_2}$. By (iii), any $v_jv_{j+1} \in E_C$ with $j \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}$ is a uw -separator of G' . Thus:

$$V_{P_1} \cap V_C = \{v_{2j} \mid j \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor\}\} \\ V_{P_2} \cap V_C = \{v_{2j+1} \mid j \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor\}\} .$$

If C were odd, n would be odd. Thus, $n - 1$ would be even. Consequently, it would follow that $v_{n-1}v_0 \cap V_{P_2} = \emptyset$, in contradiction to $v_{n-1}v_0$ being a uw -separator of G' by (iii). Thus, C must be even. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Assume there exists a path or cycle $H = (V_H, E_H)$ of uw -separators of G as defined in the theorem.

W.l.o.g., fix enumerations of the nodes and edges of H as follows: Let $n := |E_H|$. If H is a path, let $v: \{0, \dots, n\} \rightarrow V_H$ and $e: \{0, \dots, n-1\} \rightarrow E_H$ such that $\forall j \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}: e_j = v_jv_{j+1}$ and $E_H = \{e_j \mid j \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}\}$. If H is a cycle, let $v: \mathbb{Z}_n \rightarrow V_H$ and $e: \mathbb{Z}_n \rightarrow E_H$ such that $\forall j \in \mathbb{Z}_n: e_j = v_jv_{j+1}$ and $E_H = \{e_j \mid j \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}$. If H is a cycle containing uw -cut-nodes of G , assume further and w.l.o.g. that $v_0 = v_n$ is such a uw -cut-node. Finally, consider the partition $\{E_0, E_1\}$ of E_H into even and odd edges, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} E_0 &= \{e_{2j} \in E_H \mid j \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor\}\} \\ E_1 &= \{e_{2j+1} \in E_H \mid j \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor\}\} . \end{aligned}$$

We will prove that $\sigma = \{x \in X_{G\widehat{G}} \mid x_{uw} = 0\}$ is not a facet of $\Xi_{G\widehat{G}}$ by showing that all $x \in \sigma$ satisfy the additional orthogonal equality

$$0 = \sum_{j \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}} (-1)^j x_{e_j} . \quad (5)$$

More specifically, we will prove for every $x \in \sigma$ the existence of a bijection

$$\vartheta_x: E_0 \cap x^{-1}(1) \rightarrow E_1 \cap x^{-1}(1) .$$

Using these bijections, we conclude for every $x \in \sigma$ that the number of elements in the sum of (5) taking the value +1 is equal to the number of elements taking the value -1, and thus that the equality holds.

We now show that these bijections exist. Let $x \in \sigma$. As $x_{uw} = 0$, the decomposition of G induced by x has a component containing both u and w . Let V_{uw} be the node set of that component.

If $n = 1$, then H is a path ($\{v_0, v_1\}, \{e_0\}$). Thus, $E_1 \cap x^{-1}(1) = \emptyset$ because $E_1 = \emptyset$. Moreover, $E_0 \cap x^{-1}(1) = \emptyset$ as v_0 and v_1 are uw -cut-nodes of G and thus elements of V_{uw} , which implies $x_{e_0} = 0$. In this case, $\vartheta_x = \emptyset$ and (5) specializes to $x_{e_0} = 0$, which is satisfied.

We now consider $n \geq 2$. For every $e_j = v_jv_{j+1} \in E_0 \cap x^{-1}(1)$, we define:

$$\vartheta_x(e_j) = \begin{cases} e_{j-1} & \text{if } v_j \notin V_{uw} \\ e_{j+1} & \text{if } v_{j+1} \notin V_{uw} \end{cases} . \quad (6)$$

We show that ϑ_x is well-defined: Let $e_j \in E_0 \cap x^{-1}(1)$. In general, at least one of v_j and v_{j+1} is not in V_{uw}

because $x_{e_j} = 1$, and at most one of v_j and v_{j+1} is not in V_{uw} because e_j is a uw -separator of G . Thus, ϑ_x assigns e_j a unique element, it remains to show that this element is in $E_1 \cap x^{-1}(1)$.

Firstly, we show $\vartheta_x(e_j) \in E_1$. Clearly, it holds for $j \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}$, that $\vartheta_x(e_j) \in E_1$. We regard the remaining cases of $j \in \{0, n-1\}$. Let first $j = 0$. For H a path or cycle with uw -cut-node, $\vartheta_x(e_0) = e_1 \in E_1$ because $v_0 \in V_{uw}$ as v_0 is a uw -cut-node of G . For H a cycle without uw -cut-node, we distinguish $v_0 \in V_{uw}$ and $v_0 \notin V_{uw}$. If $v_0 \in V_{uw}$, then $\vartheta_x(e_0) = e_1 \in E_1$. If $v_0 \notin V_{uw}$, then $\vartheta_x(e_0) = e_{n-1} \in E_1$ because $n-1$ is odd by Lemma 4.2. Let now $j = n-1$. For H a path or cycle with uw -cut-node, $\vartheta_x(e_{n-1}) = e_{n-2} \in E_1$ because $v_n \in V_{uw}$ as v_n is a uw -cut-node of G . For H a cycle without uw -cut-node, $e_{n-1} \notin E_0 \cap x^{-1}(1)$ because $n-1$ is odd by Lemma 4.2.

Secondly, we show $x_{\vartheta_x(e_j)} = 1$. By definition of ϑ_x , e_j and $\vartheta_x(e_j)$ share a node $v \notin V_{uw}$. As $\vartheta_x(e_j)$ is a uw -separator of G , the other node of $\vartheta_x(e_j)$ is in V_{uw} and therefore $x_{\vartheta_x(e_j)} = 1$. Thus, it holds $\vartheta_x(e_j) \in E_1 \cap x^{-1}(1)$, and ϑ_x is well-defined.

We show that ϑ_x is surjective: Let $e_j \in E_1 \cap x^{-1}(1)$. As $x_{e_j} = 1$, either $v_j \notin V_{uw}$ or $v_{j+1} \notin V_{uw}$. If $v_j \notin V_{uw}$, then $e_{j-1} \in E_0 \cap x^{-1}(1)$ and $\vartheta_x(e_{j-1}) = e_j$. If $v_{j+1} \notin V_{uw}$, then $e_{j+1} \in E_0 \cap x^{-1}(1)$ and $\vartheta_x(e_{j+1}) = e_j$. Thus, ϑ_x is surjective.

We show that ϑ_x is injective: Assume ϑ_x is not injective. Then there exists a $j \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ such that $e_j \in E_1 \cap x^{-1}(1)$ and $e_{j-1}, e_{j+1} \in E_0 \cap x^{-1}(1)$ such that $\vartheta_x(e_{j-1}) = e_j = \vartheta_x(e_{j+1})$, by definition of ϑ_x . This implies $v_j, v_{j+1} \notin V_{uw}$, which contradicts e_j being a uw -separator. By this contradiction, ϑ_x is injective.

Altogether, we have shown that ϑ_x is well-defined, surjective and injective, and thus a bijection. This concludes the proof of necessity.

Assume now that (i) and (ii) are satisfied. We prove that $0 \leq x_{uw}$ is facet-defining by constructing $|E \cup F| - 1$ linearly independent vectors in the linear space $\text{lin}(\{x - y \mid x, y \in \sigma\})$ which we abbreviate by $\text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$, implying $\dim \text{aff } \sigma = \dim \text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma) = |E \cup F| - 1$. In particular, we construct the characteristic vectors of all $st \in E \cup F \setminus \{uw\}$. For this construction, we distinguish the following cases:

- (i) st is not a uw -separator of G ;
- (ii) st is a uw -separator of G and neither s nor t is a uw -cut-node;
- (iii) precisely one node of st is a uw -cut-node.

Note that no $st \in E \cup F \setminus \{uw\}$ is such that both s and t are uw -cut-nodes, as otherwise the path ($\{s, t\}, \{st\}$) would violate (i). Thus, this distinction of cases is complete.

For the first case, let $st \in E \cup F \setminus \{uw\}$ such that st is not a uw -separator of G . By this property, there exists a uw -path $(V_{P_{uw}}, E_{P_{uw}})$ in G that contains neither s nor t . Let further $(V_{P_{st}}, E_{P_{st}})$ be an st -path in G . If $G[V_{P_{uw}} \cup V_{P_{st}}]$ is not connected, we define:

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &= \{V_{P_{uw}}, V_{P_{st}}\} & V_2 &= \{V_{P_{uw}}, V_{P_{st}} \setminus \{s, t\}\} \\ V_3 &= \{V_{P_{uw}}, V_{P_{st}} \setminus \{s\}\} & V_4 &= \{V_{P_{uw}}, V_{P_{st}} \setminus \{t\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise, we define:

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &= \{V_{P_{uw}} \cup V_{P_{st}}\} & V_2 &= \{V_{P_{uw}} \cup V_{P_{st}} \setminus \{s, t\}\} \\ V_3 &= \{V_{P_{uw}} \cup V_{P_{st}} \setminus \{s\}\} & V_4 &= \{V_{P_{uw}} \cup V_{P_{st}} \setminus \{t\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

In both cases, it is easy to see for $i \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$ that $G[U]$ is connected for all $U \in V_i$ and thus $x^{V_i} \in X_{G\widehat{G}}$, by Lemma 3.1. It further holds, $\mathbb{1}_{\{st\}} = -x^{V_1} - x^{V_2} + x^{V_3} + x^{V_4}$ and $x_{uv}^{V_i} = 0$, as for all $pq \in E \cup F$:

- $x_{pq}^{V_i} = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, 4$ if $\nexists U \in V_i: \{p, q\} \subseteq U$
- $x_{pq}^{V_i} = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, 4$ if $\exists U \in V_i: \{p, q\} \subseteq U$
- $x_{pq}^{V_i} = 0$ for $i = 1, 3$ and $x_{pq}^{V_i} = 1$ for $i = 2, 4$ if $s \in \{p, q\}, t \notin \{p, q\}$ and $\exists U \in V_i: \{p, q\} \subseteq U$
- $x_{pq}^{V_i} = 0$ for $i = 1, 4$ and $x_{pq}^{V_i} = 1$ for $i = 2, 3$ if $t \in \{p, q\}, s \notin \{p, q\}$ and $\exists U \in V_i: \{p, q\} \subseteq U$
- $x_{pq}^{V_1} = 0$ and $x_{pq}^{V_i} = 1$ for $i = 2, 3, 4$ if $\{p, q\} = \{s, t\}$.

It follows from $x_{uv}^{V_i} = 0$ that $x^{V_i} \in \sigma$. Thus, $\mathbb{1}_{\{st\}} = -x^{V_1} - x^{V_2} + x^{V_3} + x^{V_4} \in \text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$, which concludes the first case.

For the second case, consider the set H of all $st \in E \cup F \setminus \{uw\}$ such that st is a uw -separator of G and neither s nor t is a uw -cut-node of G . Let $st \in H$ and let $v \in st$. As v is no uw -cut-node, there exists a uw -path $(V_{P_{uw}}, E_{P_{uw}})$ in G that does not contain v . Let further $(V_{P_{st}}, E_{P_{st}})$ be an st -path in G and let $P = (V_P, E_P) = (V_{P_{uw}} \cup V_{P_{st}}, E_{P_{uw}} \cup E_{P_{st}})$. With $E_{\widehat{G}}(P, v) = \{vv' \in (E \cup F) \cap \binom{V_P}{2}\}$ denoting the set of edges of \widehat{G} containing v whose nodes are in V_P , we first show that $\mathbb{1}_{E_{\widehat{G}}(P, v)} \in \text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$. If $G[V_{P_{uw}} \cup V_{P_{st}}]$ is not connected, we define:

$$V_1 = \{V_{P_{uw}}, V_{P_{st}}\} \quad V_4 = \{V_{P_{uw}}, V_{P_{st}} \setminus \{t\}\}.$$

Otherwise, we define:

$$V_1 = \{V_{P_{uw}} \cup V_{P_{st}}\} \quad V_4 = \{V_{P_{uw}} \cup V_{P_{st}} \setminus \{t\}\}.$$

Analogously to the previous case, we get $\mathbb{1}_{E_{\widehat{G}}(P, v)} = -x^{V_1} + x^{V_4} \in \text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$. Denoting by $E_{\widehat{G}}(v) = \{vv' \in (E \cup F)\}$ the set of edges of \widehat{G} containing v and noting that

$$\mathbb{1}_{\{st\}} = \mathbb{1}_{E_{\widehat{G}}(P, v)} - \sum_{e \in E_{\widehat{G}}(P, v) \setminus \{st\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{e\}} \quad (7)$$

and $E_{\widehat{G}}(P, v) \subseteq E_{\widehat{G}}(v)$, we see that it is sufficient for proving $\mathbb{1}_{\{st\}} \in \text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$ to show that there exists a node $v \in st$ such that $\mathbb{1}_{\{e\}} \in \text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$ for all $e \in E_{\widehat{G}}(v) \setminus \{st\}$.

Next, we define a sequence $\{H_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ of subsets of H (for an example see Figure 4) and show iteratively that the characteristic vectors of their elements are in $\text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$ using (7). For any $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we define:

$$\begin{aligned} H_j &= \{st \in H \setminus \cup_{k < j} H_k \mid \exists v \in st \forall e \in E_{\widehat{G}}(v) \setminus \{st\}: \\ &\quad e \text{ is no } uw\text{-separator of } G \vee e \in \cup_{k < j} H_k\}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

By this definition, for any $st \in H_0$ there exists a $v \in st$ such that all $e \in E_{\widehat{G}}(v) \setminus \{st\}$ are no uw -separators of G . Thus, it follows from the previous case that $\mathbb{1}_{\{e\}} \in \text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$ for all $e \in E_{\widehat{G}}(v) \setminus \{st\}$. Consequently, $\mathbb{1}_{\{st\}} \in \text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$ by (7). Let now $j > 0$ and assume that the characteristic vectors of all elements in $\cup_{k < j} H_k$ are in $\text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$. By definition, for any $st \in H_j$ there exists a $v \in st$ such that any $e \in E_{\widehat{G}}(v) \setminus \{st\}$ is either no uw -separator of G and thus $\mathbb{1}_{\{e\}} \in \text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$ by the previous case, or is in $\cup_{k < j} H_k$ and thus $\mathbb{1}_{\{e\}} \in \text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$ by assumption. Consequently, $\mathbb{1}_{\{st\}} \in \text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$ by (7).

For completing the second case, it remains to show that we have constructed the characteristic vectors of all elements in H by this, i.e. that $H \subseteq \cup_{j \geq 0} H_j$. This follows directly from Claim 4.3, which is proven in the appendix.

Claim 4.3. *If (i) and (ii) are satisfied, the set $\{H_j \mid j \in \mathbb{N}_0 \wedge H_j \neq \emptyset\}$ is a partition of H .*

This concludes the second case.

For the last case, let $st \in E \cup F \setminus \{uw\}$ such that precisely one node of st , say t , is a uw -cut-node. We show $\mathbb{1}_{E_{\widehat{G}}(s)} \in \text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$ analogously to the previous case and again have

$$\mathbb{1}_{\{st\}} = \mathbb{1}_{E_{\widehat{G}}(s)} - \sum_{e \in E_{\widehat{G}}(s) \setminus \{st\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{e\}}. \quad (9)$$

For any $e = s's \in E_{\widehat{G}}(s) \setminus \{st\}$, s' is no uw -cut-node of G , as otherwise the path $(\{s', s, t\}, \{s's, st\})$ would violate (i). Consequently, $\mathbb{1}_{\{e\}} \in \text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$ by the previous two cases. It follows from (9) that $\mathbb{1}_{\{st\}} \in \text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$, which concludes the third case. Altogether, we have constructed $|E \cup F| - 1$ linearly independent vectors in $\text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$ and have thus established sufficiency of the specified conditions. \square

5 NP-Hardness of Deciding Cut Facets

In this section, we prove that it is NP-hard to decide facet-definingness of cut inequalities (4) for lifted multicut polytopes. We do so in two steps: Firstly, we




Figure 4: Depicted above is an example of a graph G (solid edges) and augmentation \widehat{G} (dashed edges) that fulfills the conditions of Theorem 4.1 for $0 \leq x_{uw}$. Essential for the sufficiency proof of this theorem is that the introduced edge sets H and H_j for $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ have the property $H \subseteq \cup_{j \geq 0} H_j$. In the given example, $H = \{v_0v_1, v_1v_2, v_2v_3, v_3v_4, v_4v_5\}$, $H_0 = \{v_0v_1, v_4v_5\}$, $H_1 = \{v_1v_2, v_3v_4\}$, $H_2 = \{v_2v_3\}$, and $H_j = \emptyset$ for $j \geq 3$. Thus, $H \subseteq \cup_{j \geq 0} H_j$.




Figure 5: Depicted above is an example of the reduction from 3-SAT used in the proof of Lemma 5.3. Graphs G and \widehat{G} are constructed from the instance of the 3-SAT problem given by $\neg x_1 \vee x_2 \vee x_3$. The additional edge f as well as the edges in the f -cut δ are depicted in red. The f_d -path with respect δ , given by the green edges and d , corresponds to the solution of the 3-SAT problem instance: $\varphi(x_1) = \text{FALSE}$, $\varphi(x_2) = \text{FALSE}$ and $\varphi(x_3) = \text{TRUE}$.

establish a necessary and sufficient condition for facet-definingness of cut inequalities for lifted multicut polytopes in the special case $|F| = 1$ (Lemma 5.2). Secondly, we show that deciding this condition for these specific lifted multicut polytopes is NP-hard (Lemma 5.3). Together, this implies that facet-definingness is NP-hard to decide for cut inequalities of general lifted multicut polytopes (Theorem 5.4).

We begin by introducing a structure fundamental to this discussion, paths crossing a cut in precisely one edge that have no other edge of the cut as chord:

Definition 5.1. For any connected graph $G = (V, E)$, any augmentation $\widehat{G} = (V, E \cup F)$ with $F \cap E = \emptyset$, any $f \in F$, any f -cut δ of G and any $d \in \delta$, we call an f -path (V_P, E_P) in G an f_d -path in G with respect to δ if and only if it holds for all $d' \in \delta \setminus \{d\}$: $d' \not\subseteq V_P$.

We proceed by stating the two lemmata and the theorem in terms of f_d -paths.

Lemma 5.2. For any connected graph $G = (V, E)$, any augmentation $\widehat{G} = (V, E \cup F)$ with $F \cap E = \emptyset$, any $f \in F$ and any f -cut δ of G , it is necessary for the cut inequality $1 - x_f \leq \sum_{e \in \delta} (1 - x_e)$ to be facet-defining for $\Xi_{G\widehat{G}}$ that an f_d -path in G with respect to δ exists for all $d \in \delta$. For the special case of $F = \{f\}$, this condition is also sufficient.

Lemma 5.3. For any connected graph $G = (V, E)$, any augmentation $\widehat{G} = (V, E \cup F)$ with $F \cap E = \emptyset$, any $f \in F$ and any f -cut δ of G , it is NP-hard to decide if an f_d -path in G with respect to δ exists for all $d \in \delta$, even for the special case of $F = \{f\}$.

Theorem 5.4. For any connected graph $G = (V, E)$, any augmentation $\widehat{G} = (V, E \cup F)$ with $F \cap E = \emptyset$, any $f \in F$ and any f -cut δ of G , it is NP-hard to decide if the cut inequality $1 - x_f \leq \sum_{e \in \delta} (1 - x_e)$ is facet-defining for $\Xi_{G\widehat{G}}$, even for the special case of $F = \{f\}$.

In the remainder of this section, we prove first Theorem 5.4 and then Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 5.3.

Proof of Theorem 5.4. In case $F = \{f\}$, a cut inequality is facet defining if and only if there exists an f_d -path in G with respect to δ for all $d \in \delta$, by Lemma 5.2. Deciding if such paths exist is NP-hard, by Lemma 5.3. Together, this implies NP-hardness of deciding facet-definingness, even for the special case of $F = \{f\}$. \square

Proof of Lemma 5.2. Necessity of an equivalent statement was already proven as Condition C1 of Theorem 5 of Andres et al. (2023).

We now show sufficiency. For this, let $F = \{f\} = \{uw\}$, let $\sigma = \{x \in X_{G\widehat{G}} \mid 1 - x_f = \sum_{d \in \delta} (1 - x_d)\}$ and assume that there exists an f_d -path in G with respect to δ for all $d \in \delta$. We prove that the cut inequality with respect to f and δ is facet-defining under the specified conditions by explicitly constructing $|E \cup F| - 1 = |E|$ linearly independent vectors in the linear space $\text{lin}(\{x - y \mid x, y \in \sigma\})$ which we abbreviate by $\text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$, implying $\dim \text{aff } \sigma = \dim \text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma) = |E|$. In particular, we construct $\mathbb{1}_{\{d, f\}}$ for all $d \in \delta$ and the characteristic vectors of the elements in $E \setminus \delta$.

For any $e \in E \setminus \delta$, define:

$$V_1 = \{e\} \quad V_2 = \emptyset .$$

As $G[U]$ is connected for any $U \in V_1$ and $U \in V_2$, we have $x^{V_1}, x^{V_2} \in X_{G\widehat{G}}$, by Lemma 3.1. It further holds $\mathbb{1}_{\{e\}} = -x^{V_1} + x^{V_2}$ and, for $j \in \{0, 1\}$, that $x_{uw}^{V_j} = 1$ and $x_d^{V_j} = 1$ for all $d \in \delta$, as for all $pq \in E \cup F$:

- $x_{pq}^{V_1} = 1$ and $x_{pq}^{V_2} = 1$ if $\nexists U \in V_1: \{p, q\} \subseteq U$
- $x_{pq}^{V_1} = 0$ and $x_{pq}^{V_2} = 1$ if $\exists U \in V_1: \{p, q\} \subseteq U$.

It follows from $x_{uw}^{V_j} = 1$ and $x_d^{V_j} = 1$ for all $d \in \delta$ that $x^{V_j} \in \sigma$. Thus, $\mathbb{1}_{\{e\}} = -x^{V_1} + x^{V_2} \in \text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$, which concludes the first case.

For any $d \in \delta$, there exists an f_d -path $P = (V_P, E_P)$ in G with respect to δ according to our assumptions. We define:

$$V_1 = \{V_P\} \quad V_2 = \emptyset .$$

Analogously to the previous case, we get $x^{V_1} \in X_{G\widehat{G}}$, $x^{V_2} \in \sigma$ and $\mathbb{1}_{E_P \cup \{f\}} = -x^{V_1} + x^{V_2}$. Using the same distinction of cases as before, we further get $x_{uw}^{V_1} = 0$ and, as P is an f_d path, $x_d^{V_1} = 0$ and $x_{d'}^{V_1} = 1$ for all $d' \in \delta \setminus \{d\}$, implying $x^{V_1} \in \sigma$. Consequently, $\mathbb{1}_{E_P \cup \{f\}} = -x^{V_1} + x^{V_2} \in \text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$. We now note that the characteristic vector associated with f and d can be written as

$$\mathbb{1}_{\{f,d\}} = \mathbb{1}_{E_P \cup \{f\}} - \sum_{e \in E_P \setminus \{d\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{e\}} . \quad (10)$$

As $\mathbb{1}_{\{e\}} \in \text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$ for all $e \in E_P \setminus \{d\}$ by the previous case, this implies $\mathbb{1}_{\{f,d\}} \in \text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$ and concludes the second case. Altogether, we have constructed $|E|$ linearly independent vectors in $\text{lin}(\sigma - \sigma)$ and have thus established sufficiency of the specified condition. \square

Proof of Lemma 5.3. For showing NP-hardness, we use a reduction from the NP-hard 3-SAT problem with exactly three literals per clause and no duplicating literals within clauses (Schaefer, 1978). For any instance of this 3-SAT problem, with variables x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n and clauses C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m , we construct in polynomial time an instance of our decision problem and show that it has a solution if and only if the instance of the 3-SAT problem has a solution. An example of this construction is depicted in Figure 5. We begin by defining two graphs, G_1 and G_2 , which will be the components of G induced by the f -cut δ of our original decision problem.

In the first graph $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$, there are $3m + 2$ nodes which are organized in $m + 2$ fully-connected layers. For $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, m + 1\}$, we denote the set of nodes in the j -th layer by V_{1j} . The 0-th layer contains a single node u and the $m + 1$ -th layer a single node d_1 . The remaining m layers correspond to the m clauses C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m and contain three nodes each. The edges between consecutive layers are the only edges in E_1 . For $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, we label each node in the j -th layer by a different literal in C_j . For completeness, we label u (respectively d_1) by a unique auxiliary propositional variable x_u (respectively x_{d_1}). For any $v \in V_1$, we let $l(v)$ denote the label of that node.

The second graph $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ is such that $V_1 \cap V_2 = \emptyset$ and $E_1 \cap E_2 = \emptyset$. It consists of $2n + 3$ nodes which are organized in $n + 3$ fully-connected layers. For $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n + 2\}$, we denote the set of nodes in the k -th layer by V_{2k} . The 0-th layer contains a single node d_2 ,

the $n + 1$ -th layer a single node w and the $n + 2$ -th layer a single node w' , which is connected to all other nodes of G_2 , besides d_2 , by a set of edges $E_2' \subseteq E_2$. The remaining n layers correspond to the n variables x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n and contain two nodes each. The edges between consecutive layers and the edges in E_2' are the only edges in E_2 . For $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, we label one node in the k -th layer by x_k and the other by $\neg x_k$. Again, we label w (respectively d_2 and w') by a unique auxiliary propositional variable x_w (respectively x_{d_2} and $x_{w'}$) and denote the label of any $v \in V_2$ by $l(v)$.

We construct a third graph $G = (V, E)$ such that $V = V_1 \cup V_2$ and $E = E_1 \cup E_2 \cup \delta$ with

$$\delta = \{d_1 d_2, d_1 w'\} \cup \{st \subseteq V_1 \cup V_2 \mid s \in V_1 \wedge t \in V_2 \wedge l(s) = \neg l(t)\} .$$

For brevity, we introduce the symbol $d := d_1 d_2$. Finally, we define a fourth graph $\widehat{G} = (V, E \cup F)$ such that $F = \{f\} = \{uw\}$. Note that G is connected and that δ is an f -cut of G , partitioning it into V_1 and V_2 . Note also that $|F| = 1$, covering the part of the lemma claiming NP-hardness also for this special case.

Henceforth, we mean by an f_d -path an f_d -path in G with respect to δ .

Claim 5.5. *The graph G has the following properties:*

- (i) *For any clause C_j and any f_d -path (V_P, E_P) , there exists a literal in C_j labeled by a node from $V_P \cap V_1$.*
- (ii) *Any f_d -path that contains a node in V_1 labeled $\neg x_k$ (respectively x_k) does not contain a node labeled x_k (respectively $\neg x_k$).*

Using Claim 5.5, which is proven in the appendix, we show that the 3-SAT formula is satisfiable if and only if there exists an $f_{d'}$ -path for every $d' \in \delta$. We do so in two steps: Firstly, we show that the 3-SAT formula is satisfiable if and only if there exists an f_d -path for the specific edge $d \in \delta$. Secondly, we show that there always exists an $f_{d'}$ -path for every other edge $d' \in \delta \setminus \{d\}$.

Let $P = (V_P, E_P)$ be an f_d -path. We construct an assignment of truth values φ to the variables x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n satisfying the corresponding 3-SAT problem instance by setting $\varphi(x_k) = \text{TRUE}$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ if and only if there exists a node $v \in V_P \cap V_1$ such that $l(v) = x_k$. Assume this assignment would not satisfy the 3-SAT problem instance. Then there exists a clause C_j assigning FALSE to all of its labels. By (i), there exists a node $v \in V_P \cap V_1$ that is labeled by a literal in C_j . If $l(v) = x_k$ for some variable x_k , then $\varphi(x_k) = \text{TRUE}$, leading C_j to be true. If $l(v) = \neg x_k$, then $\varphi(x_k) = \text{FALSE}$ by (ii), leading C_j to be true as well. Consequently, such a clause C_j where all literals get assigned FALSE cannot exist and φ is a solution to the given 3-SAT problem instance.

Let now φ be an assignment of truth values to the variables x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n that satisfies the corresponding instance of the 3-SAT problem. In the following, we will show that an f_d -path $P = (V_P, E_P)$ in G is given by

$$\begin{aligned} V_P &= \{u, u_1, \dots, u_m, d_1, d_2, w_1, \dots, w_n, w\} \\ E_P &= \{uu_1, u_1u_2, \dots, u_mu_m, d_1d_2, \\ &\quad d_2w_1, w_1w_2, \dots, w_nw\} , \end{aligned}$$

where $u_j \in V_{1j}$ (respectively $w_k \in V_{2k}$) has a label that gets assigned TRUE by φ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ (respectively $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$). It is easy to see that P is an f -path in G . It remains to show that it is an f_d -path, i.e. that there exist no $d^* = d_1^*d_2^* \in \delta \setminus \{d\}$ such that $d^* \subseteq V_P$. Assume there exists such a d^* . As $w' \notin V_P$, it holds then $d^* \in \delta \setminus \{d, d_1w'\}$. By construction of δ , it follows $l(d_1^*) = \neg l(d_2^*)$. As both $l(d_1^*)$ and $\neg l(d_2^*)$ need to get assigned TRUE by φ according to the construction of P , this is a contradiction. Thus, there exists no such d^* , and P is an f_d -path. For an example of this correspondence between f_d -paths and solutions of the given 3-SAT problem instance, see again Figure 5.

Next, we regard the other edges of the cut. Let $d' = d'_1d'_2 \in \delta \setminus \{d\}$ be an edge in the cut except d . We assume w.l.o.g. that $d'_1 \in V_{1i}$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, m+1\}$ and regard the path $P = (V_P, E_P)$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} V_P &= \{u, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{i-1}, d'_1, d'_2, w', w\} \\ E_P &= \{uu_1, u_1u_2, \dots, u_{i-1}d'_1, d'_1d'_2, d'_2w', w'w\} , \end{aligned}$$

where u_j is an arbitrary node in V_{1j} such that $l(u_j) \neq l(d'_1)$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, i-1\}$. Note that such u_j are guaranteed to exist as we consider the 3-SAT problem with exactly three literals per clause and no duplicated literals within clauses. Again, it is easy to see that P is an f -path, and it remains to show that there exists no $d^* = d_1^*d_2^* \in \delta \setminus \{d'\}$ such that $d^* \subseteq V_P$. Assume there exists such a d^* . Then one of its nodes, say d_1^* , must be in V_1 and its other node must be in V_2 . We make a case distinction on whether $d_1^* \in V_1 \setminus \{d_1\}$ or $d_1^* = d_1$. If $d_1^* \in V_1 \setminus \{d_1\}$, then $d^* \in \delta \setminus \{d, d_1w'\}$. By construction of δ , it follows $l(d_1^*) = \neg l(d_2^*)$. As $d_2^* \in V_2 \cap V_P = \{d'_2, w', w\}$ and $l(d_1^*) \neq l(d'_1)$ according to the construction of P , this is a contradiction. On the other hand, if $d_1^* = d_1$, it holds by construction of P that $i = m+1$. As $d'_1 \in V_{1i} = V_{1m+1} = \{d_1\}$, it follows $d'_1 = d_1 = d_1^*$. Furthermore, as d_1d_2 and d_1w' are the only edges in δ containing d_1 and $d' \neq d$, we get $d'_2 = w'$. Thus, we especially have $d_2 \notin V_2 \cap V_P = \{w', w\}$, leading to $d_2^* = w'$ when using the same argument as before. Consequently, $d^* = d'$ which contradicts $d^* \in \delta \setminus \{d'\}$. As both cases lead to a contradiction, there does not exist such a d^* and P is an f_d -path. This finishes the reduction from the 3-SAT problem and the proof of the lemma. \square

6 Conclusion

We characterize in terms of efficiently decidable conditions the facets of lifted multicut polytopes induced by lower box inequalities. In addition, we show that deciding facet-definingness of cut inequalities for lifted multicut polytopes is NP-hard. Toward the design of cutting plane algorithms for the lifted multicut problem, our hardness result does not rule out the existence of inequalities strengthening the cut inequalities for which facet-definingness and possibly also the separation problem can be solved efficiently. The search for such inequalities is one direction of future work. In our proof, we identify a structure (paths crossing the cut that have an edge of the cut as a chord) that complicates the characterization of cut inequalities. This structure exists for cuts (edge subsets, as discussed in this article) but does not exist for separators (node subsets, not discussed in this article). This observation motivates the study of non-local connectedness with respect to separators instead of cuts.

Acknowledgements This work is partly supported by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research of Germany through DAAD Project 57616814 (SECAI).

A Additional Proofs

Proof of Claim 4.3. It follows directly from (8) that $H_j \cap H_k = \emptyset$ for any distinct $j, k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and that $\cup_{j \geq 0} H_j \subseteq H$. Let $H_\infty = H \setminus \cup_{j \geq 0} H_j$, it remains to show that $H_\infty = \emptyset$. Assume this does not hold, then there exists an $st \in H_\infty$, and thus especially a simple st -path ($\{s, t\}, \{st\}$) in \widehat{G} whose edges are all in H_∞ . We show that such a path cannot exist given (i) and (ii).

Assume there exist simple paths in \widehat{G} whose edges are all in H_∞ . As the number of edges in \widehat{G} is finite, there exists a maximum length of such paths. Let $P = (V_P, E_P)$ with $E_P \subseteq H_\infty$ be one of those simple paths with maximum length, let $p, q \in V$ be its end-nodes and let $e_p, e_q \in E_P$ be the unique edges in E_P containing p and q , respectively. Recall that, by definition of H , all edges in E_P are uw -separators of G and no node in V_P is a uw -cut-node of G . By (8), there exists a $qq' \in E_{\widehat{G}}(q) \setminus \{e_q\}$ such that qq' is a uw -separator and $qq' \notin \cup_{j \geq 0} H_j$. By definition of H , this is equivalent to q' being either a uw -cut-node of G or $qq' \in H_\infty$. It is not possible that $qq' \in H_\infty$, as either $q' \in V_P$ and there exists a cycle in $(V_P, E_P \cup \{qq'\})$ that violates (ii), or $q' \notin V_P$ and $(V_P \cup \{q'\}, E_P \cup \{qq'\})$ is a simple path in G whose edges are all in H_∞ , contradicting P to be the longest such path. Thus, q' must be a uw -cut-node. Further, it holds $q' \notin V_P$ as no node in V_P is a uw -cut-node of G . Analogously, there must exist a uw -cut-node $p' \in V \setminus V_P$ such that $p'p \in E_{\widehat{G}}(p) \setminus \{e_p\}$.

If $p' = q'$, the simple cycle $(V_P \cup \{p'\}, E_P \cup \{p'p, qq'\})$ violates (ii). If $p' \neq q'$, the simple $p'q'$ -path $(V_P \cup \{p', q'\}, E_P \cup \{p'p, qq'\})$ violates (i). As both cases lead to a contradiction, there cannot exist simple paths in \widehat{G} whose edges are all in H_∞ , and thus especially no $st \in H_\infty$. \square

Proof of Claim 5.5. For proving (i) and (ii), we first show that any f_d -path contains one node from each layer of G besides $V_{2n+2} = \{w'\}$. Assume this does not hold. Then there exists an f_d -path $P = (V_P, E_P)$ and a layer V_{1j} with $j \in \{0, \dots, m+1\}$ or V_{2k} with $k \in \{0, \dots, n+1\}$ such that no node in this layer is contained in P . As P is an f_d -path, it holds that $d_1 \in V_P$ and $E_P \cap \delta = \{d\}$. As $d_1 w' \in \delta$, this especially implies that $w' \notin V_P$ and thus $E_P \cap E'_2 = \emptyset$. Hence, E_C must be a subset of the remaining edges $E_1 \cup E_2 \cup \{d\} \setminus E'_2$. As these edges only exist between consecutive layers and P contains $u \in V_{1,0}$ and $w \in V_{2,n+1}$, having a layer in-between for which P does not contain a node would imply P not being connected and thus results in a contradiction.

Assume (i) does not hold. Then there exists a clause C_j and an f_d -path P such that no node in $V_P \cap V_1$ is labeled by a literal in C_j . By construction of the labels, this would imply that there exists no node in P that is in V_{1j} , contradicting the discussion of the previous paragraph.

Assume (ii) does not hold. Then there exists an f_d -path $P = (V_P, E_P)$ containing an $s \in V_1 \cap V_P$ with $l(s) = \neg x_k$ (respectively x_k) and a $t \in V_P$ with $l(t) = x_k$ (respectively $\neg x_k$). We make a case distinction depending on whether t is in V_1 or V_2 . Suppose $t \in V_1$. By the discussion of the first paragraph, P contains a $v \in V_{2k} \cap V_P$ with either $l(v) = x_k$ or $l(v) = \neg x_k$. By construction of δ , it follows either $sv \in \delta \setminus \{d\}$ or $tv \in \delta \setminus \{d\}$, contradicting P to be an f_d -path. Suppose $t \in V_2$. In this case, $st \in \delta \setminus \{d\}$ by construction of δ , contradicting P to be an f_d -path. As both cases lead a contradiction, such nodes s and t cannot exist. \square

References

- Bjoern Andres, Silvia Di Gregorio, Jannik Irmay, and Jan-Hendrik Lange. A polyhedral study of lifted multicuts. *Discrete Optimization*, 47:100757, 2023. doi: 10.1016/j.disopt.2022.100757.
- Thorsten Beier, Björn Andres, Ullrich Köthe, and Fred A. Hamprecht. An efficient fusion move algorithm for the minimum cost lifted multicut problem. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2016. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-46475-6_44.
- Thorsten Beier, Constantin Pape, Nasim Rahaman, Timo Prange, Stuart Berg, Davi D. Bock, Albert Cardona, Graham W. Knott, Stephen M. Plaza, Louis K. Scheffer, Ullrich Köthe, Anna Kreshuk, and Fred A. Hamprecht. Multicut brings automated neurite segmentation closer to human performance. *Nature Methods*, 14:101–102, 2017. doi: 10.1038/nmeth.4151.
- Sunil Chopra and M.R. Rao. The partition problem. *Mathematical Programming*, 59(1):87–115, 1993. doi: 10.1007/BF01581239.
- Sunil Chopra and M.R. Rao. Facets of the k-partition polytope. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 61(1):27–48, 1995. doi: 10.1016/0166-218X(93)E0175-X.
- Michel Marie Deza and Monique Laurent. *Geometry of Cuts and Metrics*. Springer, 1997. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-04295-9.
- Michel Marie Deza, Martin Grötschel, and Monique Laurent. Clique-web facets for multicut polytopes. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 17(4):981–1000, 1992. doi: 10.1287/moor.17.4.981.
- Martin Grötschel and Yoshiko Wakabayashi. A cutting plane algorithm for a clustering problem. *Mathematical Programming*, 45(1):59–96, 1989. doi: 10.1007/BF01589097.
- Martin Grötschel and Yoshiko Wakabayashi. Facets of the clique partitioning polytope. *Mathematical Programming*, 47(1):367–387, 1990. doi: 10.1007/BF01580870.
- Andrea Horňáková, Jan-Hendrik Lange, and Bjoern Andres. Analysis and optimization of graph decompositions by lifted multicuts. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2017. doi: 10.5555/3305381.3305540.
- Margret Keuper. Higher-order minimum cost lifted multicuts for motion segmentation. In *International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2017. doi: 10.1109/ICCV.2017.455.
- Margret Keuper, Evgeny Levinkov, Nicolas Bonneel, Guillaume Lavoué, Thomas Brox, and Bjoern Andres. Efficient decomposition of image and mesh graphs by lifted multicuts. In *International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2015. doi: 10.1109/ICCV.2015.204.
- Margret Keuper, Siyu Tang, Bjoern Andres, Thomas Brox, and Bernt Schiele. Motion segmentation and multiple object tracking by correlation co-clustering. *Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 42(1):140–153, 2020. doi: 10.1109/TPAMI.2018.2876253.
- Vadim Kostyukhin, Margret Keuper, Iskander Ibragimov, Nikolaus Owtsharenko, and Markus Cristinziani. Improving primary-vertex reconstruction with a minimum-cost lifted multicut graph partitioning algorithm. *Journal of*

Instrumentation, 18(07):P07013, 2023. doi:
10.1088/1748-0221/18/07/P07013.

Evgeny Levinkov, Jonas Uhrig, Siyu Tang, Mohamed Omran, Eldar Insafutdinov, Alexander Kirillov, Carsten Rother, Thomas Brox, Bernt Schiele, and Bjoern Andres. Joint graph decomposition and node labeling: Problem, algorithms, applications. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2017. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2017.206.

Karl Menger. Zur allgemeinen kurventheorie. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 10:96–115, 1927.

Duy M. H. Nguyen, Roberto Henschel, Bodo Rosenhahn, Daniel Sonntag, and Paul Swoboda. LMGP: lifted multicut meets geometry projections for multi-camera multi-object tracking. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2022. doi: 10.1109/CVPR52688.2022.00866.

Thomas J. Schaefer. The complexity of satisfiability problems. In *Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, 1978. doi: 10.1145/800133.804350.

Michael M. Sørensen. A note on clique-web facets for multicut polytopes. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 27(4):740–742, 2002. doi: 10.1287/moor.27.4.740.301.

Siyu Tang, Mykhaylo Andriluka, Bjoern Andres, and Bernt Schiele. Multiple people tracking by lifted multicut and person re-identification. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2017. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2017.394.