

---

# AN UNRESTRICTED FASTER ALGORITHM FOR MAXIMUM WEIGHT MATCHING IN BIPARTITE GRAPHS

---

**Shawxing Kwok**  
Independent Researcher  
Anhui, China  
shawxingkwok@126.com

## ABSTRACT

Given a weighted bipartite graph  $G = (L, R, E, w)$ , the maximum weight matching (MWM) problem aims to find a matching  $M \subseteq E$  that maximizes the total weight  $\sum_{e \in M} w(e)$ . The widely used Hungarian algorithm efficiently solves the maximum weight perfect matching (MWPM) subproblem for complete bipartite graphs with  $|L| = |R|$  and  $|E| = |L||R|$ , achieving a time complexity of  $O(V^3)$ , where  $V = L \cup R$ .

This work demonstrates that the existed non-line-covering variant of the Hungarian algorithm can be directly applied to complete bipartite graphs without vertex expansion, reducing the time complexity from  $O(LR^2)$  to  $O(L^2R)$  when  $|L| < |R|$ . Additionally, the variant is extended in this paper to solve the MWM problem for general bipartite graphs.

The time complexity of the proposed algorithm is  $O(LE + LR \min(L, X))$ , where  $X$  is the weight dispersion coefficient. Specifically, if the maximum weight is  $N$  and the weights are represented with a precision of  $p$ , then  $X$  is defined as  $\frac{N}{p}$ <sup>1</sup>. Experimental results highlight significant runtime improvements, especially for sparse graphs, when compared to traditional methods. The detailed implementation of the proposed algorithm is publicly available at <https://github.com/ShawxingKwok/Kwok-algorithm>.

**Keywords** Maximum Weight Matching, Bipartite Graphs, Hungarian Algorithm, Time Complexity, Graph Theory, Industrial Applications

## 1 Introduction

The maximum weight matching (MWM) problem is a fundamental challenge in combinatorial optimization. It is defined on a weighted bipartite graph  $G = (L, R, E, w)$ , where  $L$  and  $R$  are disjoint vertex sets,  $E$  is the set of edges connecting vertices in  $L$  to vertices in  $R$ , and  $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  assigns a weight to each edge. A matching  $M \subseteq E$  is a subset of edges such that no two edges share a common vertex. The objective is to find a matching  $M$  that maximizes  $\sum_{e \in M} w(e)$ . Additionally, in a perfect matching, each vertex is matched, implying  $|L| = |R|$  and leading to a subproblem known as the maximum weight perfect matching (MWPM) problem.

Originating from the work of Jacobi in the 19th century [1], the problem gained prominence with the development of the Hungarian algorithm by Kuhn and Munkres in the 1950s [2, 3]. Over the years, various algorithms and enhancements to the Hungarian algorithm have been introduced, as summarized in Table 1.

---

<sup>1</sup>For example, if the weights fall within the range  $[1.00, 10.00]$  with a precision of 0.01, then  $X = \frac{10.00}{0.01} = 1000$ . If there exist irrational fractional weights, then  $p = o(1)$  and  $X = \infty$ , meaning  $O(LE + LR \min(L, X)) = O(L^2R)$ .

Table 1: Historical results on MWPM and MWM.  $N$  is the maximum weight.  $p$  is the precision of the weights. Algorithms solving MWPM inherently solve MWM with equivalent time complexity. Conversely, MWM algorithms can address MWPM through graph augmentation (ensuring  $|L| = |R|$  and  $|E| = |L||R|$ ), while the factor  $N$  becomes  $nN$  in the running time. (\*) indicates Hungarian algorithm variants with different priority queue implementations.

Year	Author	Problem	Running Time	Notes
1955-1969	Kuhn, Munkres et al	MWPM	$V^3$	Hungarian algorithm with line covering
1970	Edmonds, Karp(*)	MWPM	$VE \log V$	Using binary heaps, non-negative weights
1971	Tomizawa(*)	MWPM	$VE \log V$	
1976	Bondy & Murty	MWPM	$V^3$	Hungarian algorithm without line covering
1983	Gabow	MWPM	$EV^{3/4} \log N$	Integer weights
		MWM	$NE\sqrt{V}$	
1984	Fredman & Tarjan(*)	MWPM	$VE + V^2 \log V$	Using Fibonacci heaps
1988	Gabow & Tarjan	MWPM	$E\sqrt{V} \log(VN)$	Integer weights
1992	Orlin & Ahuja			
2002	Thorup(*)	MWPM	$VE$	Integer weights, randomized
2003	Thorup(*)	MWPM	$VE + V^2 \log \log V$	Integer weights
2006	Sankowski	MWPM	$NV^\omega$	Integer weights, randomized, $\omega =$ matrix mult. exponent
2012	Ran Duan & Hsin-Hao Su	MWM	$E\sqrt{V} \log N$	Integer weights
2014	Ran Duan & Seth Pettie <sup>2</sup>	MWM	$E\epsilon^{-1} \log \epsilon^{-1}$	Arbitrary rational weights, $\epsilon = \frac{p}{w(M^*)}$
			$E\epsilon^{-1} \log N$	Integer weights, $\epsilon = \frac{1}{w(M^*)}$
2019	M. Asathulla et al	MWPM	$V^{4/3} \log VN$	Integer weights
2022	Li Chen et al <sup>3</sup>	MWM	$E^{1+o(1)}$	Polynomial integer weights
	New result	MWM	$LE + LR \min(L, X)$	Much more efficient in average, $X = \frac{N}{p}$

Most algorithms listed in Table 1 are designed for specific types of weighted bipartite graphs or have large hidden constants in their asymptotic complexity. Among them, the Hungarian algorithm stands out as the most widely adopted. Its original form, referred to as the line-covering method in this paper, initially ran in  $O(V^4)$  time when introduced in the 1950s. Subsequent optimizations reduced its complexity to  $O(V^3)$ . In 1976, Bondy and Murty[6] proposed a non-line-covering variant, which is commonly regarded as having an  $O(V^3)$  time complexity. Even today, this non-line-covering variant remains widely used and is also included in the *Introduction to Algorithms, 4th Edition* [7].

In the MWM problem, it is common that  $|L| < |R|$  or  $|E| < |L||R|$ . A straightforward approach is to add virtual vertices and edges to ensure  $|L| = |R|$  and  $|E| = |L||R|$ , thereby converting it into the MWPM problem. However, the line-covering method has been optimized [8] to handle cases where  $|L| < |R|$  directly, achieving a time complexity of  $O(L^2R)$ .

This paper focuses on the non-line-covering variant of the Hungarian algorithm, achieving the following results:

1. When virtual vertices are added as  $L'$  to ensure  $|L| + |L'| = |R|$ , this paper proves that the time complexity is more precisely  $O(LR^2)$ .
2. It further proves that adding vertices is unnecessary, reducing the time complexity from  $O(LR^2)$  to  $O(L^2R)$ .

<sup>2</sup>Although this algorithm[4] computes an approximate MWM,  $\epsilon$  is the input, and we can obtain the exact MWM as long as  $1 - \epsilon$  is sufficiently large. Let the MWM be denoted as  $M^*$ , and the computed matching as  $M$ , we have the conditions  $1 - \epsilon \leq \frac{w(M)}{w(M^*)}$  and  $w(M^*) - w(M) \notin (0, p)$ . Therefore, if  $\epsilon < \frac{p}{w(M^*)}$ , we can conclude that  $w(M) = w(M^*)$ . However, in this case, the time complexity will be very high in general.

<sup>3</sup>This algorithm [5] solves the maximum flow problem, for which the MWM problem is a subproblem.

- The variant is extended to eliminate the need for edge expansions, significantly improving computational efficiency. The proposed algorithm achieves a worst-case time complexity of  $O(LE + LR \min(L, X))$  and demonstrates superior average-case performance, particularly for sparse graphs.

Next begins by explaining the principles underlying the original non-line-covering variant of the Hungarian algorithm, followed by optimizations and concluding with detailed experimental results.

## 2 Definitions and Preliminaries

### 2.1 Complete Weighted Bipartite Graph Example




Figure 1: Adjacency matrix and corresponding bipartite graph  $G = (L, R, E, w)$ .

- To ensure a visually comfortable presentation, this paper adopts the convention that lowercase letters in the text correspond to uppercase letters in the diagrams.
- $L = \{a, b, c, d, e, f\}$
- $R = \{h, i, j, k, m, n\}$
- $\forall l_1, l_2 \in L, (l_1, l_2) \notin E; \forall r_1, r_2 \in R, (r_1, r_2) \notin E$
- $\forall l \in L, r \in R, (l, r) \in E$
- The weights  $w$  are stored in the adjacency matrix.

### 2.2 M-Augmenting Path $p^\uparrow$

In figure 2, let  $G = (L, R, E)$ ,  $L = \{a, b, c, d\}$ ,  $R = \{h, i, j, k, l\}$ ,  $E$  consists of both black and red edges. The set of red edges represents the matching  $M$ .




Figure 2: Initial matching  $M$  in  $G$ .

Clearly, by replacing  $(b, j)$  and  $(c, k)$  in  $M$  with  $(b, i)$ ,  $(c, j)$ , and  $(d, k)$ , we can obtain a larger available matching. These five edges form the path  $\langle i, b, j, c, k, d \rangle$ , which satisfies the following properties:

1. The first and last vertices are unmatched.
2. Black and red edges alternate along the path.
3. The first and last edges are black.

This path is referred to as an *M*-**augmenting path**. Once the path is applied, the graph changes as illustrated in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Graph after applying  $p^\uparrow$ .

For convenience, this paper designates such a path as  $p^\uparrow$ . It is important to note that  $p^\uparrow$  is not unique within a bipartite graph. In the more complex example below, another *M*-augmenting path,  $p^\uparrow = \langle i, b, j, d, l, c \rangle$ , can be similarly identified.




Figure 4: Example of a complex  $p^\uparrow$ .

### 2.3 Equality Subgraph

		0	0	0	0	0	0
		H	I	J	K	M	N
5	A	1	5	2	5	5	3
6	B	2	6	3	4	1	5
4	C	2	4	2	1	1	3
5	D	1	5	3	5	2	4
7	E	4	3	2	1	7	1
5	F	2	3	1	5	5	5

Figure 5: Initial equality subgraph with vertex labeling.

Figure 5 illustrates an initial vertex labeling  $h$  with the adjacency matrix defined as follows:

- $\forall l \in L, l.h = \max\{w(l, r) : r \in R\}$

- $\forall r \in R, r.h = 0$

For instance,  $a \in L$  and  $a.h = 5$ ,  $j \in R$  and  $j.h = 0$ .

Let  $E_h = \{(l, r) : (l, r) \in E \text{ and } w(l, r) = l.h + r.h\}$ . Figure 6 shows the initial equality subgraph  $G_h = (L, R, E_h, w)$ , in which each edge corresponds to a blue number in the adjacency matrix in Figure 5.




Figure 6: Equality subgraph  $G_h$  showing feasible edges.

Subsequently, the equality subgraph varies with  $l.h$  and  $r.h$ , but the condition  $l.h + r.h \geq w(l, r)$  must always hold. We refer to  $h$  as a **feasible vertex labeling**.

**Theorem:** After iteratively adjusting  $h$  and enlarging the matching, if a perfect matching  $M^*$  is found in  $G_h$ , then  $M^*$  is also the maximum weight perfect matching in the original graph  $G$ .

**Proof:**

Let  $M$  be an arbitrary perfect matching in the original graph  $G$ . Since every vertex is matched in a perfect matching, we have  $|M| = |L| = |R|$ . Given the inequality  $w(l, r) \leq l.h + r.h$ , we can conclude that:

$$w(M) = \sum_{(l,r) \in M} w(l, r) \leq \sum_{(l,r) \in M} (l.h + r.h) = \sum_{l \in L} l.h + \sum_{r \in R} r.h \quad (1)$$

Now assume  $M^*$  represents a perfect matching within the subgraph  $G_h$ . Since  $w(l, r) = l.h + r.h$  for each  $(l, r) \in E_h$  and  $|M^*| = |L| = |R|$ , we have:

$$w(M^*) = \sum_{(l,r) \in M^*} w(l, r) = \sum_{(l,r) \in M^*} (l.h + r.h) = \sum_{l \in L} l.h + \sum_{r \in R} r.h \quad (2)$$

Therefore:

$$w(M) \leq \sum_{l \in L} l.h + \sum_{r \in R} r.h = w(M^*) \quad (3)$$

This demonstrates that  $M^*$  is also the maximum weight perfect matching in the original graph  $G$ .

### 3 Non-Line-Covering Variant of the Hungarian Algorithm

#### 3.1 Procedure

Figure 7 illustrates an initial greedy selection of matching from  $G_h$ , which significantly accelerates the process. It is unnecessary to determine the initial maximum matching.

Next, for each  $l \in L$ , if  $l$  is unmatched, a breadth-first search (BFS) is performed with  $l$  as the source to search for  $p^\uparrow$  with the emphasized principle of alternating black and red edges. For instance, when  $b$  is enumerated, the breadth-first tree shown in Figure 8 emerges. In this scenario, no  $p^\uparrow$  is found. To increase  $|M|$ , it's necessary to extend  $E_h$ .

Let this limited breadth-first tree be  $T$ , where the vertex sets in this example on both sides are  $T.L = \{a, b, d, e\}$  and  $T.R = \{i, k, m\}$ , with the edge set given by  $T.E = \{b \rightarrow i, i \rightarrow a, a \rightarrow k, a \rightarrow m, k \rightarrow d, m \rightarrow e\}$ . To obtain  $p^\uparrow$ , additional edges should be introduced into  $E_h$ , with the selection range defined as  $\{l \rightarrow r : l \in T.L, r \in R - T.R\}$ . Specific restrictions will be detailed later. BFS continues, and the breadth-first tree can then expand by incorporating




Figure 7: Initial selection of matchings in  $G_h$ .




Figure 8: Breadth-first tree starting from  $b$ .

these newly introduced vertices and the edges incident to them. Once an unmatched vertex  $r \in T.R$  is found, the path  $b \rightsquigarrow r$  constitutes  $p^\uparrow$ .

Modifications to  $E_h$  must preserve the constraints of the feasible vertex labeling. It is given that for all  $l \in T.L$  and  $r \in R - T.R$ ,  $l.h + r.h > w(l, r)$ . The smallest difference is calculated as  $\delta = \min\{l.h + r.h - w(l, r) : l \in T.L \text{ and } r \in R - T.R\}$ . The new vertex labeling  $h'$  is then defined as follows:

$$v.h' = \begin{cases} v.h - \delta & \text{if } v \in T.L \\ v.h + \delta & \text{if } v \in T.R \\ v.h & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Next, for all  $l \in L$  and  $r \in R$ , the constraint  $l.h' + r.h' \geq w(l, r)$  under  $h'$  still holds, all red edges belong to  $E_{h'}$ , and the breadth-first tree can now expand because:

- For all  $l \in T.L, r \in T.R$ , we have  $l.h' + r.h' = l.h + r.h$ , implying that  $E_h \cap (T.L \times T.R) \subset E_{h'}$ .
- For all  $l \in L - T.L, r \in R - T.R$ , we have  $l.h' + r.h' = l.h + r.h$ , implying that  $E_h \cap ((L - T.L) \times (R - T.R)) \subset E_{h'}$ .
- All red edges, which belong to  $(T.L \times T.R) \cup ((L - T.L) \times (R - T.R))$ , are also contained in both  $E_h$  and  $E_{h'}$ . They are absent from the following two items.
- For all  $l \in T.L, r \in R - T.R$ , we have  $l.h' + r.h' < l.h + r.h$ , but still satisfying  $l.h' + r.h' \geq w(l, r)$ . Since  $E_h \cap (T.L \times (R - T.R)) = \emptyset$ , the breadth-first tree was previously not extendable. Now, it can expand along the newly introduced black edges, given by  $\{(l, r) : l \in T.L, r \in R - T.R, l.h + r.h - w(l, r) = 0\} \subset E_{h'}$ .

- For all  $l \in L - T.L, r \in T.R$ , we have  $l.h' + r.h' > l.h + r.h$ , and naturally  $l.h' + r.h' > w(l, r)$ . Consequently, black edges in  $E_h \cap ((L - T.L) \times T.R)$  disappear in  $E_{h'}$ .

It takes  $O(LR) = O(R^2)$  time to calculate  $\delta$  with  $\min\{l.h + r.h - w(l, r) : l \in T.L \text{ and } r \in R - T.R\}$ . However, this can be optimized by converting it to  $\delta = \min\{r.slack : r \in R - T.R\}$ . Initially, for each  $r \in R$ ,  $r.slack$  is set to  $\infty$  before the current BFS begins. As the breadth-first tree expands, for each  $r \in R - T.R$ ,  $r.slack$  is continuously minimized and maintained at  $\min\{l.h + r.h - w(l, r) : l \in T.L\}$ . Consequently, the overall time for calculating  $\delta$  decreases to  $\Theta(R)$ . Readers might find this step unclear, but specific code implementations can help clarify the process.

Then, the expansion of the breadth-first tree continues along the newly introduced edges while maintaining the same root node. Once  $p^\uparrow$  is identified, the matching can be extended. If  $p^\uparrow$  is not found, the feasible vertex labeling will be adjusted based on  $h'$ .

After locating  $p^\uparrow$  and extending the matching, BFS is performed again from the next vertex in  $L$ . This iterative process gradually achieves a perfect matching without violating the constraints of the equality graph. As demonstrated earlier, this perfect matching is also the maximum weight perfect matching.

### 3.2 Corollary 1

Throughout the procedure, for any unmatched vertex  $r \in R$ , we have  $r.h = 0$ .

**Proof:**

During each BFS:

- Each adjustment to  $h$  ensures that all red edges in  $E_h$  remain in the updated set  $E'_h$ , thereby matched vertices stay matched.
- When  $p^\uparrow$  is applied, matched vertices may change partners, but they remain matched, as  $p^\uparrow$  merely redistributes edges within the matching.

Consequently, no vertex transitions from matched to unmatched throughout the procedure, and unmatched  $r$  has not been introduced into the breadth-first tree, thus  $r.h$  remains 0 from the beginning.

## 3.3 Code

**Algorithm 1:** Hungarian

---

**Data:** Complete bipartite graph  $G = (L, R, w)$  requiring  $|L| = |R|$   
**Result:** Maximum weight perfect matching

```

foreach  $l \in L$  do
  |  $l.pair \leftarrow nil$ ;
  |  $l.h \leftarrow \max\{w(l, r) : r \in R\}$ ;
end
foreach  $r \in R$  do
  |  $r.pair \leftarrow nil$ ;
  |  $r.h \leftarrow 0$ ;
  |  $r.\pi \leftarrow nil$ ; // Parent node of  $r$  in the breadth-first tree
end
// Initial greedy matching
foreach  $l \in L$  do
  | foreach  $r \in R$  do
  | | if  $l.h + r.h = w(l, r)$  and  $r.pair = nil$  then
  | | |  $l.pair \leftarrow r$ ;
  | | |  $r.pair \leftarrow l$ ;
  | | | break;
  | | end
  | end
end
foreach  $l \in L$  do
  | if  $l.pair \neq nil$  then
  | | continue;
  | end
  |  $Q \leftarrow \{l\}$ ;
  | foreach  $l' \in L$  do
  | |  $l'.visited \leftarrow false$ ;
  | | end
  | |  $l.visited \leftarrow true$ ;
  | | foreach  $r \in R$  do
  | | |  $r.slack \leftarrow \infty$ ;
  | | |  $r.visited \leftarrow false$ ;
  | | | end
  | | | Call BFS( $Q$ );
  | end
end
return  $\{(l, r) : l \in L \text{ and } r = l.pair\}$ ;

```

---



BFS

**Input:** Queue  $Q$ 


---

```

while true do
  repeat
     $l \leftarrow \text{Dequeue}(Q)$ ;
    foreach  $r \in R$  do
      if  $r.visited$  then
        continue;
      end
       $diff \leftarrow l.h + r.h - w(l, r)$ ;
      if  $diff = 0$  then
         $r.\pi \leftarrow l$ ;
        if  $\text{ADVANCE}(Q, r)$  then
          return;
        end
      end
      else if  $r.slack > diff$  then
         $r.slack \leftarrow diff$ ;
         $r.\pi \leftarrow l$ ;
      end
    end
  until  $Q$  is empty;

   $T.L \leftarrow \{l : l \in L \text{ and } l.visited\}$ ;
   $T.R \leftarrow \{r : r \in R \text{ and } r.visited\}$ ;
   $\delta \leftarrow \min\{r.slack : r \in R - T.R\}$ ;

  foreach  $l \in T.L$  do
     $l.h \leftarrow l.h - \delta$ ;
  end
  foreach  $r \in T.R$  do
     $r.h \leftarrow r.h + \delta$ ;
  end
  foreach  $r \in R - T.R$  do
     $r.slack \leftarrow r.slack - \delta$ ;
  end
  foreach  $r \in R - T.R$  do
    if  $r.slack = 0$  and  $\text{ADVANCE}(Q, r)$  then
      return;
    end
  end
end

```

---

---

Advance

---

**Input:** Queue  $Q$ , Vertex  $r$   
**Result:** True if  $p^\uparrow$  has been found and applied; False if  $p^\uparrow$  has not been found from the root, and the search should continue.  
 $r.visited \leftarrow \text{true};$   
 $l \leftarrow r.pair;$   
**if**  $l \neq \text{nil}$  **then**  
     Enqueue( $Q, l$ );  
      $l.visited \leftarrow \text{true};$   
     **return false;**  
**end**  
 //  $l = r.pair = \text{nil}$  tells  $p^\uparrow$  is found, and being applied now.  
**repeat**  
      $l \leftarrow r.\pi;$   
      $prevR \leftarrow l.pair;$  //  $l.pair$  is also its parent node on  $p^\uparrow$ .  
      $l.pair \leftarrow r;$   
      $r.pair \leftarrow l;$   
      $r \leftarrow prevR;$   
**until**  $r = \text{nil};$   
**return true;**

---

### 3.4 Proof of Allowing $|L| < |R|$

The traditional approach involves adding vertices on the  $L$  side, denoted as the set  $L'$ . This process ensures  $|L| + |L'| = |R|$ . However, this section demonstrates that such an expansion is unnecessary.

Let the final imperfect matching obtained through the traditional approach, without graph expansion, be denoted as  $M^\downarrow$ , which satisfies the condition  $|M^\downarrow| = |L| < |R|$ .

We define the final set  $R$  as  $R = R_1 \cup R_2$ , where:

- $R_1$  consists of all matched vertices. Thus,  $|R_1| = |L|$ .
- $R_2$  consists of all unmatched vertices. Thus,  $|R_2| = |R| - |L|$ .

The weight of any matching  $M$  in  $G$ , which requires each vertex in  $L$  must be matched, can be expressed as:

$$w(M) = \sum_{(l,r) \in M} w(l,r) \leq \sum_{(l,r) \in M} (l.h + r.h) = \sum_{l \in L} l.h + \sum_{r \in R_1} r.h + \sum_{r \in R_2} r.h. \quad (5)$$

By Corollary 1, for all  $r \in R_2$ ,  $r.h$  remains 0. Substituting this into the equation simplifies it to:

$$w(M) \leq \sum_{l \in L} l.h + \sum_{r \in R_1} r.h = w(M^\downarrow). \quad (6)$$

Thus,  $M^\downarrow$  is the maximum weight matching in the complete bipartite graph where  $|L| < |R|$  and each vertex in  $L$  must be matched.

### 3.5 Variance of Time Complexity

When we assume  $|L| < |R|$  and virtual vertices are added as  $L'$  in the traditional non-line-covering variant of the Hungarian algorithm, the time complexity is analyzed as follows:

- If the initial greedy matching is included:
  - For all  $l \in L$ , the BFS process starting with  $l$  runs for  $O(E) = O(R^2)$  time. The vertex labeling  $h$  is adjusted  $O(R)$  times as each adjustment introduces at least one vertex from  $R - T.R$ . Each adjustment requires  $\Theta(R)$  time.
  - For all  $l \in L'$ ,  $l$  becomes matched before the BFS process starts. This part can be omitted in the total time complexity.

- If the initial greedy matching is not included:
  - For all  $l \in L$ , the BFS process and vertex labeling adjustments run within the same time complexity as above.
  - For all  $l \in L'$ , the BFS process starts with  $l$  runs for  $O(R)$  time, since an unmatched vertex in  $T.R$  can be immediately found and  $p^\uparrow$  is formed. In this case, no adjustments to  $h$  are needed.

Thus, the total time complexity of the traditional approach with virtual vertices remains  $O(LR^2)$ , regardless of whether the initial greedy matching is included.

When no additional virtual vertices are introduced, for all  $l \in L$ , the BFS process starting from  $l$  runs for  $O(LR)$  time. The vertex labeling  $h$  is adjusted  $O(L)$  times since there are at most  $|L|$  matched vertices in  $R$ . Once an unmatched vertex in  $R - T.R$  is introduced into  $T$ ,  $p^\uparrow$  is formed. Each adjustment also requires  $\Theta(R)$  time. Therefore, the total time complexity in this case is  $O(L^2R)$ .

## 4 Extensional Algorithm for MWM

### 4.1 Introduction

The MWM problem is defined on a general weighted bipartite graph, allowing  $|L| < |R|$  and  $|E| < |L||R|$ . Since there is no requirement for each vertex to be matched as in the MWPM problem, edges with weights  $\leq 0$  can be safely ignored. The traditional approach expands the graph by adding virtual vertices and edges with weight 0 to form a complete bipartite graph, ensuring  $|L| = |R|$  and  $|E| = |L||R|$ . This transforms the problem into the MWPM problem, after which virtual pairs are removed. In Section 3.4, we demonstrated that it is unnecessary to add vertices for the non-line-covering variant of the Hungarian algorithm. Furthermore, in this section, we extend the variant to eliminate the need for adding virtual edges, achieving a time complexity of  $O(LE + LR \min(L, X))$ .

### 4.2 Replace Added Virtual Edges

For any  $l \in T.L$  when  $p^\uparrow$  has not been formed from the root node of  $T$ , define:

- $E_l^0 = \{(l, r) : (l, r) \in E \text{ and } w(l, r) = 0\}$ . These are exactly the added virtual edges incident to  $l$ .
- Let  $r'$  be the first unmatched vertex in  $R$ . We have  $r'.h = 0$  according to Corollary 1. This section aims to replace  $E_l^0$  with  $r'$ .

For each edge  $(l, r_1) \in E_l^0$ , we analyze with  $r'$  and  $r_1$  as follows:

- If  $(l, r') \in E$ , we have  $l.h + r'.h - w(l, r') < l.h + r_1.h - w(l, r_1)$  since the inequality simplifies to  $-w(l, r') < 0 \leq r_1.h$ . In this case, we could disregard  $E_l^0$ .
- If  $(l, r') \notin E$  which implies that  $(l, r') \in E_l^0$ , we have  $l.h + r'.h - w(l, r') \leq l.h + r_1.h - w(l, r_1)$  since the inequality simplifies to  $0 \leq r_1.h$ , allowing us to prioritize introducing  $(l, r')$  and disregard other edges in  $E_l^0$ . Specifically, we either directly form  $p^\uparrow$  with  $r'$  or attempt to update its attributes (slack and  $\pi$ ).

$E_l^0$  seems replacable but we need to consider about the subsequent affects. If  $(l, r') \in E_l^0$  and was just part of  $p^\uparrow$ , it now belongs to  $E'_h$  but cannot be conventionally retrieved later from the adjacent list. However, this issue resolves itself automatically as follows where edge directions are specified according to the black-red alternating rule for searching  $p^\uparrow$ .

1. After  $p^\uparrow$  is applied, the black  $l \rightarrow r'$  becomes red  $r' \rightarrow l$  for searching the next  $p^\uparrow$ . Since  $r'.pair = l$ , the edge  $r' \rightarrow l$  can still be obtained.
2. For any unmatched vertex  $r \in R$ , we have  $l.h + r.h - w(l, r) \leq l.h + r'.h - w(l, r')$ , since the inequality simplifies to  $-w(l, r) \leq w(l, r') = 0$ . Therefore,  $(l, r) \in E_{h'}$  once  $(l, r') \in E_{h'}$ . When  $r' \rightarrow l$  is used in BFS for the first time,  $l \rightarrow r$  could be introduced into  $T$  and  $p^\uparrow$  is formed,  $r' \rightarrow l$  subsequently turns back to black  $l \rightarrow r'$ . At this point,  $l$  and  $r'$  are not paired, thus  $l \rightarrow r'$  cannot be conventionally retrieved from the adjacent list.
3. From this point until the procedure ends, there are always sufficient unmatched vertices in  $R$  for  $l$  to select as the endpoint of  $p^\uparrow$ , and  $l.h$  remains unchanged. In this scenario, we simply select the next unmatched vertex  $r'_1$  in  $R$  and consider  $l \rightarrow r'_1 \in E'_{h'}$ . When  $l$  is used in BFS for the next time,  $p^\uparrow$  is formed similarly to the previous case but without  $l \rightarrow r'$ . From now on,  $l \rightarrow r'$  can be treated as being needless to form  $p^\uparrow$ . Meanwhile,  $r' \rightarrow l$  will no longer appear in subsequent steps.

### 4.3 Storing Involved Vertices in Element Containers

The involved vertices in the BFS process consist of  $T.L$ ,  $T.R$ , and some vertices in  $R - T.R$  with updated slacks and parent nodes. In sparse graphs, the number of these vertices is significantly smaller. Therefore, they can be efficiently stored in specialized element containers, allowing faster  $h$  adjustments. Practical tests show that this optimization does not slow down the algorithm as long as the graph is not too dense.

### 4.4 Code

---

**Algorithm 2:** Kwok
 

---

**Data:** Bipartite graph  $G = (L, R, E, w)$  with adjacency list.

**Result:** Maximum weight matching

```

foreach  $l \in L$  do
  |  $l.pair \leftarrow nil$ ;
  |  $l.h \leftarrow \max\{w(l, r) : (l, r) \in E\}$ ;
end
foreach  $r \in R$  do
  |  $r.pair \leftarrow nil$ ;
  |  $r.h \leftarrow 0$ ;
  |  $r.\pi \leftarrow nil$ ;
end
foreach  $l \in L$  do
  | foreach  $r \in G.Adj[l]$  do
  | | if  $l.h + r.h = w(l, r)$  and  $r.pair = nil$  then
  | | |  $l.pair \leftarrow r$ ;
  | | |  $r.pair \leftarrow l$ ;
  | | | break;
  | | end
  | end
end
foreach  $l \in L$  do
  | if  $l.pair \neq nil$  then
  | | continue;
  | end
  |  $Q \leftarrow \{l\}$ ;
  | foreach  $r \in R$  do
  | |  $r.slack \leftarrow \infty$ ;
  | end
  |  $T.L \leftarrow \{l\}$ ;
  |  $T.R \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
  |  $R' \leftarrow \emptyset$ ; // Involved vertices in  $R - T.R$ 
  |  $r' \leftarrow$  the first unmatched vertex in  $R$ ;
  | Call  $BFS(Q, T.L, T.R, R', r')$ ;
end
return  $\{(l, r) : l \in L \text{ and } r = l.pair \text{ and } (l, r) \in E\}$ ; // Ensure  $(l, r) \in E$  to remove virtual pairs.

```

---

---

**Algorithm 3:** BFS
 

---

**Input:** Queue  $Q, T.L, T.R$ , Set  $R'$ <sup>4</sup>, Vertex  $r'$   
**while true do**  
   **repeat**  
      $l \leftarrow \text{Dequeue}(Q)$ ;  
     <sup>5</sup> **if**  $l.h = 0$  **then**  
        $r'.\pi \leftarrow l$ ;  
       **Call**  $\text{ADVANCE}(Q, T.L, T.R, R', r')$ ;  
       **return**;  
     **end**  
     **if**  $r'.slack > l.h$  **then**  
        $r'.slack \leftarrow l.h$ ;  
        $r'.\pi \leftarrow l$ ;  
        $R' \leftarrow R' \cup r'$   
     **end**  
     **foreach**  $r \in G.Adj[l]$  **do**  
       **if**  $r \in T.R$  **then**  
         **continue**;  
       **end**  
        $diff \leftarrow l.h + r.h - w(l, r)$ ;  
       **if**  $diff = 0$  **then**  
          $r.\pi \leftarrow l$ ;  
         **if**  $\text{ADVANCE}(Q, T.L, T.R, R', r)$  **then**  
           **return**;  
         **end**  
       **end**  
       **else if**  $r.slack > diff$  **then**  
          $r.\pi \leftarrow l$ ;  
          $r.slack \leftarrow diff$ ;  
          $R' \leftarrow R' \cup r$   
       **end**  
     **end**  
**until**  $Q$  is empty;  
  
 $\delta \leftarrow \min\{r.slack : r \in R'\}$ ;  
**foreach**  $l \in T.L$  **do**  
    $l.h \leftarrow l.h - \delta$ ;  
**end**  
**foreach**  $r \in T.R$  **do**  
    $r.h \leftarrow r.h + \delta$ ;  
**end**  
**foreach**  $r \in R'$  **do**  
    $r.slack \leftarrow r.slack - \delta$ ;  
**end**  
**foreach**  $r \in R'$  **do**  
   **if**  $r.slack = 0$  **and**  $\text{ADVANCE}(Q, T.L, T.R, R', r)$  **then**  
     **return**;  
   **end**  
**end**  
**end**

---

<sup>4</sup>Since hash set is relatively slow in the implementation, we had better customize the set with an array list and a boolean array.

<sup>5</sup>It's inefficient to check whether  $(l, r') \in E$  without first constructing an adjacency matrix. Here explains the alternative approach as follows:

- If  $(l, r') \notin E$ , we can consider  $w(l, r')$  as 0. In this case, the equation  $l.h + r'.h - w(l, r') = 0$  simplifies to  $l.h = 0$ , which allows the introduction of  $r'$ . Then, if  $l.h \neq 0$ ,  $r'.slack$  is correctly minimized with  $l.h + r'.h - w(l, r') = l.h$ .
- If  $(l, r') \in E$ , we have  $w(l, r') > 0$  and the equation  $l.h + r'.h - w(l, r') = l.h - w(l, r') \geq 0$  implies that  $l.h > 0$  and  $r'$  won't be processed in lines 5 and 6. Then,  $r'.slack$  is incorrectly minimized with a larger value of  $l.h$ . However,  $r'$  will be processed in the subsequent "foreach" loop unless  $p^\dagger$  is formed beforehand. In that case,  $r'$  is introduced, or  $r'.slack$  is correctly minimized with  $l.h + r'.h - w(l, r')$ .

---

**Algorithm 4:** Advance

---

**Input:** Queue  $Q, T.L, T.R$ , Set  $R'$ , Vertex  $r$

**Result:** True if  $p^\uparrow$  has been found and applied; False if  $p^\uparrow$  has not been found from the root, and the search should continue.

Enqueue( $T.R, r$ );

$R' \leftarrow R' - r$ ;

$l \leftarrow r.pair$ ;

**if**  $l \neq nil$  **then**

    Enqueue( $Q, l$ );

    Enqueue( $T.L, l$ );

**return false**;

**end**

**repeat**

$l \leftarrow r.\pi$ ;

$prevR \leftarrow l.pair$ ;

$l.pair \leftarrow r$ ;

$r.pair \leftarrow l$ ;

$r \leftarrow prevR$ ;

**until**  $r = nil$ ;

**return true**;

---

#### 4.5 Time Complexity and Expectation Analysis

For each  $l \in L$ , the time complexity of performing BFS with  $l$  as the source is  $O(E)$ . The vertex labeling is continuously adjusted  $O(\min(L, X))$  times.  $L$  was explained before in Section 3.5, and here focuses on  $X$ . Before this BFS begins,  $l$  has not appeared in any breadth-first tree, thus we have  $l.h = \max\{w(l, r) : (l, r) \in E\}$  and  $\delta \leq l.h + r'.h - w(l, r')$ . The value of  $\delta$  gradually decreases toward zero in this BFS until  $p^\uparrow$  is found. As defined in the abstract,  $X$  is the weight dispersion coefficient, which quantifies the granularity of the edge weights. Specifically, if the maximum weight is  $N$  and the weights are represented with a precision of  $d$ , then  $X = \frac{N}{d}$ . Each adjustment takes  $O(R)$  time. Consequently, the total worst-case time complexity of the algorithm is  $O(LE + LR \min(L, X))$ .

To analyze the expected performance, note that during BFS, as soon as an unmatched vertex is found in  $T.R$ ,  $p^\uparrow$  can be formed, allowing BFS to proceed with the next unmatched  $l$  as the source. As a result, the practical time complexity of BFS for each  $l$  is often significantly less than  $O(E)$ . Similarly, the number of consecutive adjustments to  $h$  is minimal in practice—less than 8, based on empirical tests conducted on random graphs. Empirical and statistical observations suggest that the average time complexity in practice is significantly lower than  $O(LE)$ .

## 5 Experimental Results

### 5.1 Background

- The test environment uses an Apple M1 Pro chip with 16 GB of memory.
- The programming language is Kotlin-JVM.
- The time unit for all measurements is milliseconds.
- $|L|$  is fixed at 1000.
- Weights are randomly distributed within the range  $[1, |R|]$ .
- In each round, a random bipartite graph is generated under specified conditions and shared among different algorithms. The run time of each algorithm is then recorded. After 10 rounds, the average run time of each algorithm is summarized in tables.
- Due to the impact of garbage collection (GC), the performance of the same algorithm under identical conditions may vary slightly, with runtime fluctuations of up to 20%.
- As  $|R|$  increases, observed runtime may deviate from the expected time complexity. This deviation is partly attributed to the increasing effectiveness of the initial greedy matching process.
- Code of the line-covering method is selected from <https://cp-algorithms.com/graph/hungarian-algorithm.html> and converted to Kotlin-JVM.

**5.2 Run Time Contrast among Bipartite Graphs with Different  $|E|$  and  $|L| : |R|$**

Table 2: Runtime for Different Ratios of  $|L| : |R|$  While Keeping  $|E| = \frac{|L| \log_2 |R|}{2}$

$ L  :  R $	line-covering	non-line-covering with additional vertices	non-line-covering without additional vertices	Kwok
1 : 1	133.20	17.40	17.59	1.10
1 : 2	13.00	30.60	11.16	0.35
1 : 4	17.84	73.97	12.20	0.21
1 : 8	34.15	332.89	18.39	0.19
1 : 16	89.47	1222.33	30.69	0.19

*Note:* The graph is sparse.

Table 3: Runtime for Different Ratios of  $|L| : |R|$  While Keeping  $|E| = 10|L| \log_2 |R|$

$ L  :  R $	line-covering	non-line-covering with additional vertices	non-line-covering without additional vertices	Kwok
1 : 1	73.27	75.23	70.41	19.22
1 : 2	12.52	22.53	10.68	2.41
1 : 4	20.33	64.06	17.84	1.86
1 : 8	35.12	206.37	20.34	1.44
1 : 16	102.80	857.45	42.21	1.61

*Note:* The graph is dense.

Table 4: Runtime for Different Ratios of  $|L| : |R|$  While Keeping  $|E| = \frac{|L||R|}{10}$

$ L  :  R $	line-covering	non-line-covering with additional vertices	non-line-covering without additional vertices	Kwok
1 : 1	76.34	69.58	76.68	21.94
1 : 2	13.94	23.45	11.56	4.56
1 : 4	27.92	66.18	20.96	6.23
1 : 8	56.31	247.95	26.24	8.57
1 : 16	153.16	973.00	32.77	17.75

*Note:* The graph is dense.

Table 5: Runtime for Different Ratios of  $|L| : |R|$  While Keeping  $|E| = \frac{|L||R|}{2}$

$ L  :  R $	line-covering	non-line-covering with additional vertices	non-line-covering without additional vertices	Kwok
1 : 1	80.52	67.93	66.87	55.09
1 : 2	30.32	33.80	20.28	21.34
1 : 4	56.23	76.18	34.75	23.41
1 : 8	97.63	283.75	21.20	87.81
1 : 16	164.11	2330.67	45.72	215.33

*Note:* The graph is very dense.

## 6 Further Optimization

For each  $l \in L$ :

1. If the size of  $G.Adj[l]$  exceeds  $|L|$ , retain only  $|L|$  vertices  $r \in G.Adj[l]$ , prioritizing those with the larger weights  $w(l, r)$ .
2. Sort  $G.Adj[l]$  by weight in descending order.
3. During BFS, when an unmatched vertex  $r \in R$  is encountered:
  - If  $(l, r) \in T.E$ ,  $p^\uparrow$  can be formed immediately.
  - If  $(l, r) \notin T.E$ , after attempting to update  $r.slack$  and  $r.\pi$ , the remaining vertices in  $G.Adj[l]$  can be ignored. This is justified as follows:
    - $l.h + r.h - w(l, r) = l.h - w(l, r) > 0$
    - For all  $r_1 \in$  the subsequent vertices in  $G.Adj[l]$ ,  $w(l, r_1) \leq w(l, r)$
 Consequently,  $l.h + r_1.h - w(l, r_1) \geq l.h - w(l, r) > 0$ , meaning the subsequent vertices in  $G.Adj[l]$  can be safely ignored.
4. After each BFS iteration, the number of vertices in  $R - T.R$  with updated slacks is bounded by  $O(L)$ , consisting of:
  - At most  $|L|$  matched vertices.
  - At most  $|L|$  unmatched vertices. Each  $l \in T.L$  involves at most one unmatched vertex except  $r'$ .

Therefore, by storing vertices in  $T$  and vertices in  $R - T.R$  with updated attributes (slack and  $\pi$ ) in element containers during BFS, the time complexity of each  $h$  adjustment can be reduced from  $\Theta(R)$  to  $O(L)$ .

Note that the optimization discussed in this section has limited utility for sparse graphs. Conversely, for dense graphs, the sorting process can be computationally expensive, even though the overall time complexity can decrease to  $O(L \min(E, L^2) + L^2 \min(L, X))$ . This, in turn, reflects the fact that the average time complexity is quite low. As a result, this optimization is not included in the algorithm. However, in dynamic scenarios, where the adjacency list can be efficiently restored to descending order by weight in linear time complexity, this optimization becomes worth considering.

## 7 Conclusion

This paper demonstrates that adding virtual vertices is unnecessary when applying the non-line-covering variant of the Hungarian algorithm to a complete weighted bipartite graph where  $|L| < |R|$ , achieving an improved time complexity of  $O(L^2R)$  compared to the previous  $O(LR^2)$ . Furthermore, it introduces a novel extension of the non-line-covering variant that efficiently solves the maximum weight matching (MWM) problem for weighted bipartite graphs without requiring vertex or edge expansions. The proposed algorithm retains a time complexity of  $O(LE + LR \min(L, X))$ , and it exhibits superior runtime performance, especially for sparse graphs, as long as the graph is not excessively dense, as confirmed by experimental results. These advancements make the algorithm highly suitable for applications such as resource allocation, scheduling, and optimization tasks in industrial and networked systems.

## Acknowledgments

The author thanks Yiyang Li and another anonymous reader for their invaluable feedback and constructive suggestions.

## References

- [1] François Ollivier. Looking for the order of a system of arbitrary ordinary differential equations: de investigando ordine systematis æquationibus differentialium vulgarium cujuscunque. *Applicable Algebra in Engineering, Communication and Computing*, 20:7–32, 2009. English translation of C. G. J. Jacobi’s book.
- [2] Harold W Kuhn. The hungarian method for the assignment problem. *Naval research logistics quarterly*, 2(1-2):83–97, 1955.
- [3] James Munkres. Algorithms for the assignment and transportation problems. *Journal of the society for industrial and applied mathematics*, 5(1):32–38, 1957.



- [4] Ran Duan and Seth Pettie. Linear-time approximation for maximum weight matching. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 61(1):1–23, 2014.
- [5] Li Chen, Rasmus Kyng, Yang P. Liu, Richard Peng, Maximilian Probst Gutenberg, and Sushant Sachdeva. Maximum flow and minimum-cost flow in almost-linear time. *2022 IEEE 63rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 612–623, 2022.
- [6] John Adrian Bondy, Uppaluri Siva Ramachandra Murty, et al. *Graph theory with applications*, volume 290. Macmillan London, 1976.
- [7] Thomas H. Cormen, Charles E. Leiserson, Ronald L. Rivest, and Clifford Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms*. MIT press, 4th edition, 2022.
- [8] cp algorithms. Hungarian algorithm for solving the assignment problem, 2023. No original source provided.