

A Cost-Scaling Algorithm for Minimum-Cost Node-Capacitated Multiflow Problem

Hiroshi HIRAI and Motoki IKEDA
Department of Mathematical Informatics,
Graduate School of Information Science and Technology,
The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, 113-8656, Japan
{hirai,motoki_ikeda}@mist.i.u-tokyo.ac.jp

September 5, 2019

Abstract

In this paper, we address the minimum-cost node-capacitated multiflow problem in an undirected network. For this problem, Babenko and Karzanov (2012) showed strongly polynomial-time solvability via the ellipsoid method. Our result is the first combinatorial weakly polynomial-time algorithm for this problem. Our algorithm finds a half-integral minimum-cost maximum multiflow in $O(m \log(nCD) \text{SF}(kn, m, k))$ time, where n is the number of nodes, m is the number of edges, k is the number of terminals, C is the maximum node capacity, D is the maximum edge cost, and $\text{SF}(n', m', \eta)$ is the time complexity of solving the submodular flow problem in a network of n' nodes, m' edges, and a submodular function with η -time-computable exchange capacity. Our algorithm is built on discrete convex analysis on graph structures and the concept of reducible bisubmodular flows.

Keywords: minimum-cost node-capacitated multiflow, discrete convex analysis, cost-scaling method, submodular flow, reducible bisubmodular flow.

1 Introduction

The *maximum free multiflow problem* and its variations/extensions are one of well-studied subjects in combinatorial optimization, specifically, theory of multiflows and disjoint paths; see [26, Part VII]. By “free” we mean that flows can connect any pairs of terminals freely. The problem we addressed in this paper is the *minimum-cost node-capacitated free multiflow problem (MNMF)* in an undirected network; the formal definition will be given later. The *edge-capacitated* version of this problem, a special case of MNMF, is classical in the literature. Particularly, for the zero-cost case (EMF)—the problem of finding a free multiflow of the maximum total flow-value in an edge-capacitated undirected network, the classical result by Lovász [21] and Cherkassky [4] says that the maximum is attained by a half-integral multiflow and can be obtained combinatorially in strongly polynomial time. Karzanov [17] extended the half-integrality property to a cost setting (MEMF). Later, he showed in [19] that, with help of the ellipsoid method, a half-integral minimum-cost maximum multiflow can be obtained in strongly polynomial time. Goldberg and Karzanov [11] gave two ‘ellipsoid-free’ combinatorial weakly polynomial-time algorithms for MEMF based on capacity and cost scaling.

The *node-capacitated* maximum free multiflow problem (NMF), i.e., the problem of finding a maximum free multiflow in a node-capacitated undirected network, was first considered by Garg, Vazirani, and Yannakakis [10] for approximating the *node-multiway cut problem*; see [27, Section 19.3]. Pap [24, 25] showed the half-integrality property and the strongly polynomial-time solvability of NMF using the ellipsoid method. For an ‘ellipsoid-free’ approach, Babenko

and Karzanov [2] developed a combinatorial weakly polynomial-time algorithm. For a cost setting (MNMF), Babenko and Karzanov [3] established the half-integrality and the strongly polynomial-time solvability via the ellipsoid method.

Recently the first author [13, 15, 16] of this paper initiated a unified approach to design efficient algorithms for classes of multiflow and network design problems. His approach regards the dual objective functions of multiflow problems as discrete convex functions, *L-convex functions*, on certain graph structures [16], and applies techniques of *Discrete Convex Analysis (DCA)* [22] previously developed for discrete convex functions on integer lattice \mathbb{Z}^n . By this approach, called *DCA beyond \mathbb{Z}^n* , he developed a combinatorial weakly polynomial-time algorithm for MEMF [13], and a combinatorial strongly polynomial-time algorithm for NMF [15]. The latter algorithm uses as a subroutine an algorithm of solving the *submodular flow problem* with a base polyhedron defined by a small number of inequalities. See also the survey [14] for more details.

In this paper, we continue this line of research for designing efficient multiflow algorithms via DCA beyond \mathbb{Z}^n . Our main result is the first combinatorial weakly polynomial-time algorithm for MNMF.

Theorem 1.1. *A half-integral minimum-cost maximum multiflow can be obtained in $O(m \cdot \log(nCD)\text{SF}(kn, m, k))$ time, where n is the number of nodes, m is the number of edges, k is the number of terminals, C is the maximum node-capacity, and D is the maximum edge-cost.*

Here $\text{SF}(n', m', \eta)$ stands for the time complexity of solving the submodular flow problem on a network of n' nodes and m' edges, and the time complexity η of computing the exchange capacity of the base polyhedron of the submodular function describing the problem. By using the push-relabel algorithm by Fujishige and Zhang [9], which solves the submodular flow problem combinatorially in $O(n'^3\eta)$ time, we can solve MNMF combinatorially in $O(mn^3k^4\log(nCD))$ time.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is outlined as follows. Our algorithm is designed largely on the basis of the approach in [15]. By sharpening the LP-duality, the dual of MNMF is formulated as an optimization problem over a grid structure \mathbb{G}^n , where \mathbb{G} is an amalgamation of k planar grid-graphs as in Figure 1. The objective function is shown to be an L-convex function on \mathbb{G}^n . An L-convex function can be minimized by a generic descent algorithm, called the *steepest descent algorithm (SDA)*. An abstract description of SDA is quite simple: Find a “local” minimizer (called a *steepest descent direction*) around the current point, update the current point if the objective value decreases, and repeat until the process gives no improvement. For NMF, [15] showed that SDA can be efficiently implemented by using a submodular flow algorithm and brings a (strongly) polynomial-time algorithm. In extending this approach to MNMF, there are two technical issues that should be resolved:

- How do we find a steepest descent direction efficiently? Additionally, even if an optimal dual solution is obtained by SDA, how do we recover an optimal multiflow? We here need to deal with a more general L-convex function than that in [15].
- Even if a steepest descent direction is available in each step, the number of iterations of SDA depends on the edge costs; therefore SDA gives only a pseudopolynomial-time algorithm.

The technical contribution in showing Theorem 1.1 is to resolve the two issues.

For the first issue, as was suggested in [15], we show that (a) checking the optimality of a dual solution, (b) finding a steepest descent direction, and (c) recovery of an optimal multiflow are reduced to the *bisubmodular flow (feasibility) problem*—the problem of finding a (fractional) bidirected flow whose boundary belongs to a given bisubmodular polyhedron. Although the bisubmodular flow problem itself is a natural problem, it has not been well-studied




Figure 1: Grid $\mathbb{G} \subseteq \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$ given in Section 2.1 ($k = 4$).

so far. Particularly, we need to deal with the *node-flowing polytope*, which is a bisubmodular polyhedron that represents the node-capacity constraint and the flow-conservation law on a node. [15] showed that the node-flowing polytope for a node of degree 3 is represented as the projection of the base polytope of a submodular function on a 6-element set. By this property and a perturbation technique specific to NMF, [15] reduced the bisubmodular flow problem for NMF to a submodular flow (feasibility) problem on a larger set. In this paper, we prove in Lemma 3.7 that such a lifting property holds for the general node-flowing polytope, and reduce the bisubmodular flow problem for MNMF to a submodular flow problem (with a small number of inequalities). For dealing with such a bisubmodular flow problem systematically, we develop a mini-theory for the *reducible bisubmodular flow problem*, which may be of independent interest.

To overcome the second issue, we combine the cost-scaling with SDA for improving the pseudopolynomial-time algorithm. Though the cost-scaling is a standard idea in network flow theory, for complexity analysis it requires the estimate of the number of iterations in each scaling phase. It is known [15] (see also [14, 16]) that the number of iterations of SDA is bounded by the distance between the initial point and minimizers. We prove a sensitivity theorem (Theorem 3.12) that minimizers of our L-convex function do not vary so much for a small change of an edge cost. Combining them, we obtain a polynomial bound of iterations of the cost-scaling SDA, and complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present preliminary results on discrete convexity and (reducible) bisubmodular flow. In Section 3, we study our multiflow problem MNMF and give the proof of Theorem 1.1. Some of proofs are technical and proved in Section 4.

2 Preliminaries

Let \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R}_+ , \mathbb{Z} , and \mathbb{Z}_+ denote the sets of reals, nonnegative reals, integers, and nonnegative integers. Let $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\underline{\mathbb{R}}$ denote $\mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and $\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$, respectively. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\lceil x \rceil$ denote the minimum integer which is not smaller than x . For a finite set V , a subset $X \subseteq V$,

and a function $g : V \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, let $g(X)$ denote the sum $\sum_{i \in X} g(i)$. We sometimes denote the function value $g(i)$ by g_i if no confusion occurs. For $i \in V$, let $\chi_i : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function defined by

$$\chi_i(j) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (j \in V).$$

For $X, Y \in V$ with $X \cap Y = \emptyset$, let $\chi_{X,Y} := \sum_{i \in X} \chi_i - \sum_{j \in Y} \chi_j$.

2.1 L-convex functions on \mathbb{G}^n

In this subsection, we briefly introduce a class of discrete convex functions (L-convex functions) on a certain grid-like graph structure \mathbb{G}^n . Then we describe the steepest descent algorithm for minimization of these functions. See [14, 16] for further details.

To begin with, let us recall the notion of L^{\natural} -convex functions on \mathbb{Z}^n , where our L-convex functions will be analogously introduced. A function $h : \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is an L^{\natural} -convex function if it satisfies the discrete midpoint convexity inequality

$$h(p) + h(q) \geq h(\lceil (p+q)/2 \rceil) + h(\lfloor (p+q)/2 \rfloor) \quad (p, q \in \mathbb{Z}^n), \quad (1)$$

where $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ and $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ are the rounding-up and -down operators that rounds up and down the fractional part of each component, respectively. See [22] for details of L^{\natural} -convex functions.

We are going to introduce a continuous space $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$ and a discrete subspace $\mathbb{G} \subseteq \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$, in which $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$ has a midpoint operation $(p, q) \mapsto (p+q)/2$ and \mathbb{G} has discrete midpoint operations $(p, q) \mapsto \lceil (p+q)/2 \rceil$ and $(p, q) \mapsto \lfloor (p+q)/2 \rfloor$. Then an L-convex function on \mathbb{G}^n is defined by the discrete midpoint convexity inequality (1) with replacing \mathbb{Z}^n by \mathbb{G}^n .

Let us first define the notion of the infinite k -star \mathbb{T} , where k is a positive integer. Informally speaking, the infinite k -star is a ‘‘continuous star’’ obtained by gluing k semi-infinite paths at the common endpoint; see the bottom of Figure 1. Consider the set $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ of k copies of \mathbb{R}_+ , and define equivalence relation \sim on it by $(x, s) \sim (x', s')$ if $(x, s) = (x', s')$ or $x = x' = 0$. Then the quotient space $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R}_+ \times \{1, 2, \dots, k\} / \sim$ is called the *infinite k -star*. For notational simplicity, the point $(x, s) \in \mathbb{T}$ is also denoted by x . For two points $x = (x, s), x' = (x', s') \in \mathbb{T}$, we denote the shortest distance on \mathbb{T} by $\text{dist}(x, x')$, i.e., $\text{dist}(x, x') = |x - x'|$ if $s = s'$ and $\text{dist}(x, x') = x + x'$ if $s \neq s'$. Then \mathbb{T} becomes a metric space with the distance function $\text{dist}(\cdot, \cdot)$. The *midpoint* of two points $x, x' \in \mathbb{T}$ is defined as the unique point $u \in \mathbb{T}$ such that $\text{dist}(x, u) = \text{dist}(u, x')$ and $\text{dist}(x, x') = \text{dist}(x, u) + \text{dist}(u, x')$. The midpoint u is denoted symbolically by $(x + x')/2$. A point $x = (x, s)$ is called *integral* if $\text{dist}(x, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}$ and *half-integral* if $2\text{dist}(x, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Also x is called *proper half-integral* if x is half-integral but not integral.

Second, consider the product $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$ of the infinite k -star \mathbb{T} and the set \mathbb{R} of reals. Let $\mathbb{G} \subseteq \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$ be the discrete subset of $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$ consisting of points (x, y) such that both x and y are integral or both x and y are proper half-integral; see Figure 1. A point $p = (x, y) \in \mathbb{G}$ is called *integral* if both x and y are integral. An integral point $p = (x, y)$ is said to be *even* (resp. *odd*) if $|x - y|$ is even (resp. *odd*). In Figure 1, even and odd points are drawn in black and white circles, respectively, and black and white diamonds are non-integral points (a meaning of color is described in Section 4.3). For two points $p = (x, y), q = (x', y') \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$, let $\|p - q\|$ denote $\text{dist}(x, x') + |y - y'|$. Note that $\|p - q\|$ is integral for any $p, q \in \mathbb{G}$. Two points $p, q \in \mathbb{G}$ are said to be *adjacent* if $\|p - q\| = 1$ and exactly one of p and q is integral. By joining each of adjacent points by an edge the set \mathbb{G} is viewed as a grid on $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$.

Third, we define discrete midpoint operations on \mathbb{G} . For two points $p = (x, y), q = (x', y') \in \mathbb{G}$, the midpoint $(p+q)/2 := ((x+x')/2, (y+y')/2) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$ is not necessarily a point in \mathbb{G} . As in the case of \mathbb{Z}^n , we consider rounding-up and -down of this point, which is defined via a partial order \preceq on \mathbb{G} . For each pair p, q of adjacent points in \mathbb{G} , $p \prec q$ is defined to hold if p




Figure 2: Midpoint operation: Here $w = (p + q)/2$ is not necessarily a point in \mathbb{G} . If $w \notin \mathbb{G}$, then w is the midpoint of an edge uv of \mathbb{G} or the center of a square (4-circuit) of \mathbb{G} . For the former case, $(\lfloor w \rfloor, \lceil w \rceil) = (u, v)$ if $u \prec v$. For the latter case, $\lfloor w \rfloor$ and $\lceil w \rceil$ are the even and odd points, respectively, of the square.

is even or q is odd. Then \preceq is defined as the reflexive transitive closure of \prec . Now odd and even points are maximal and minimal elements in the poset \mathbb{G} , respectively. For two point $p, q \in \mathbb{G}$, there is a unique pair of points $u, v \in \mathbb{G}$ such that $u \preceq v$ and $(p + q)/2 = (u + v)/2$. Then u and v are denoted by $\lfloor (p + q)/2 \rfloor$ and $\lceil (p + q)/2 \rceil$; see Figure 2.

Finally, we can define an L-convex function on \mathbb{G}^n . A function $h : \mathbb{G}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is an *L-convex function* if it satisfies

$$h(p) + h(q) \geq h(\lfloor (p + q)/2 \rfloor) + h(\lceil (p + q)/2 \rceil) \quad (p, q \in \mathbb{G}^n).$$

It is known that an L-convex function h can be minimized by the following algorithm, which is called the *steepest descent algorithm (SDA)*:

0. Find an initial point $p \in \mathbb{G}^n$ with $h(p) < \infty$.

1. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_p &:= \{q \in \mathbb{G}^n \mid q_i \succeq p_i \ (i = 1, \dots, n)\}, \\ \mathcal{I}_p &:= \{q \in \mathbb{G}^n \mid q_i \preceq p_i \ (i = 1, \dots, n)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

2. Find a minimizer q of h over $\mathcal{F}_p \cup \mathcal{I}_p$.

3. If $h(q) < h(p)$ then q is called a *steepest descent direction* at p ; update p by q and back to step 1. Otherwise stop; return p .

The left part of Figure 1 shows \mathcal{F}_p of an even integral point p , and the right part shows \mathcal{I}_q of a non-integral point q . If SDA terminates, the output p^* is a minimizer of h .

Lemma 2.1 ([14, Lemma 2.3]). *If $p \in \mathbb{G}^n$ with $h(p) < \infty$ is not a minimizer of an L-convex function h , then there exists $q \in \mathcal{F}_p \cup \mathcal{I}_p$ such that $h(q) < h(p)$.*

Define a kind of ℓ_∞ -distance on \mathbb{G}^n by

$$\|p - q\| := \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|p_i - q_i\| \quad (p, q \in \mathbb{G}^n).$$

The number of iterations of SDA is bounded by $\|\cdot\|$ as below.

Theorem 2.2 ([16, Theorem 4.3]). *Let $\text{opt}(h)$ be the set of minimizers of h , and let p be the initial point of SDA. If $\text{opt}(h) \neq \emptyset$, then SDA terminates after at most $\min_{q \in \text{opt}(h)} \|p - q\| + 2$ iterations.*

Currently the polynomial-time solvability of Step 2 of SDA is unknown. Thus it does not imply the polynomial-time solvability of the L-convex function minimization (under the value oracle model).

2.2 Submodular and bisubmodular flows

2.2.1 Submodular flow

For a finite set U , a function $\rho : 2^U \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ with $\rho(\emptyset) = 0$ is called *submodular* if it satisfies $\rho(X) + \rho(Y) \geq \rho(X \cap Y) + \rho(X \cup Y)$ for all $X, Y \subseteq U$. For a submodular function ρ , the *base polyhedron* $\mathcal{B}(\rho)$ is the set of all vectors $x \in \mathbb{R}^U$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} x(U) &= \rho(U), \\ x(X) &\leq \rho(X) \quad (X \subseteq U). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Let (U, A) be a directed graph on node set U . Let $\underline{b} : A \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\overline{b} : A \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be lower and upper capacity functions, respectively. Assume that $\underline{b}(a) \leq \overline{b}(a)$ for each $a \in A$. Let $\rho : U \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be a submodular function with $\rho(U) = 0$. For a function (flow) $\varphi : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let $\nabla\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^U$ be the *boundary* of φ defined by

$$(\nabla\varphi)(u) := \sum\{\varphi(a) \mid a \text{ leaves } u\} - \sum\{\varphi(a) \mid a \text{ enters } u\} \quad (u \in U).$$

The *submodular flow (feasibility) problem (SF)* is the problem of finding a flow $\varphi : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla\varphi &\in \mathcal{B}(\rho), \\ \underline{b}(a) &\leq \varphi(a) \leq \overline{b}(a) \quad (a \in A). \end{aligned}$$

We say that a flow φ is *feasible* if it satisfies the above conditions. The feasibility of SF can be characterized via its *cut function* $\kappa_{\underline{b}, \overline{b}}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{\underline{b}, \overline{b}}(X) &:= \sum\{\underline{b}(a) \mid a = ij \in A, i \in X, j \notin X\} \\ &\quad - \sum\{\overline{b}(a) \mid a = ij \in A, i \notin X, j \in X\} \quad (X \subseteq U). \end{aligned}$$

It is well-known that $-\kappa_{\underline{b}, \overline{b}}(X)$ is submodular; see, e.g., [7, Section 2.3]. We denote the cut function simply by $\kappa(X)$ if no confusion occurs.

Theorem 2.3 ([5]). *SF has a feasible flow if and only if it holds $\kappa(X) \leq \rho(X)$ for all $X \subseteq U$. In such a case, if $\underline{b}, \overline{b}$ and ρ are all integer-valued, there exists an integral feasible flow.*

We say that $X \subseteq U$ with $\kappa(X) > \rho(X)$ is a *violating cut*. A violating cut X is called *maximum* if $\kappa(X) - \rho(X)$ is maximum among all violating cuts.

There are a number of algorithmic results on SF; see the survey [8]. Those algorithms output a feasible flow when SF is feasible, and output a violating cut when SF is infeasible. If $\underline{b}, \overline{b}$, and ρ are all integer-valued, the above flow can be chosen as integral. Moreover, by modifying the algorithms like [6, Section 16.2.4], the above cut can be chosen as a maximum violating cut. For designing algorithms, one usually assume the *exchange capacity oracle* for ρ . For $x \in \mathcal{B}(\rho)$ and a distinct pair (i, j) of U , the *exchange capacity* is the minimum value of $\rho(X) - x(X)$ among all $X \subseteq U$ with $i \in X \not\cong j$.

2.2.2 Bisubmodular flow

Let 3^U denote the set of all pairs $Y, Z \subseteq U$ satisfying $Y \cap Z = \emptyset$. A function $\beta : 3^U \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ with $\beta(\emptyset, \emptyset) = 0$ is called *bisubmodular* if it satisfies the bisubmodularity inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(Y, Z) + \beta(Y', Z') &\geq \beta(Y \cap Y', Z \cap Z') \\ &\quad + \beta((Y \cup Y') \setminus (Z \cup Z'), (Z \cup Z') \setminus (Y \cup Y')) \end{aligned}$$

for all $(Y, Z), (Y', Z') \in 3^U$. For a bisubmodular function β on U , the *bisubmodular polyhedron* $\mathcal{D}(\beta)$ is the set of all vectors $z \in \mathbb{R}^U$ satisfying

$$z(Y) - z(Z) \leq \beta(Y, Z) \quad ((Y, Z) \in 3^U).$$

A *bidirected graph* is a graph $(U, E; \partial)$, where $\partial : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^U$ is a *boundary operator* such that for each $ij \in E$ it satisfies (i) $\partial e = \chi_i + \chi_j$, (ii) $\partial e = -\chi_i - \chi_j$, (iii) $\partial e = \chi_i - \chi_j$, or (iv) $\partial e = -\chi_i + \chi_j$. An undirected graph can be identified with a bidirected graph whose all arcs have boundaries of type (i), and a directed graph can be identified with a bidirected graph whose all arcs have boundaries of type (iii). In this paper, we do not admit self-loops of type (iii) or (iv).

Let $(U, E; \partial)$ be a bidirected graph. Let $\underline{c} : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\bar{c} : E \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be lower and upper capacities, respectively. Assume that $\underline{c}(e) \leq \bar{c}(e)$ for each $e \in E$. Let $\beta : 3^U \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be a bisubmodular function. For a function (bidirected flow) $\psi : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let $\nabla\psi \in \mathbb{R}^U$ be the *boundary* of ψ defined by $\nabla\psi := \sum\{\psi(e)\partial e \mid e \in E\}$. Note that this definition is consistent with that given in a directed case. The *bisubmodular flow (feasibility) problem (BF)* is the problem of finding a flow $\psi : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla\psi &\in \mathcal{D}(\beta), \\ \underline{c}(e) &\leq \psi(e) \leq \bar{c}(e) \quad (e \in E). \end{aligned}$$

We say that a flow ψ is *feasible* if it satisfies the above conditions.

There are few papers [18, 20] on BF despite its natural formulation. We give a similar characterization of feasibility of BF as SF. Let $\hat{\kappa}_{\underline{c}, \bar{c}} : 3^U \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be the *cut function* of the network defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\kappa}_{\underline{c}, \bar{c}}(Y, Z) &:= \sum\{\langle \partial e, \chi_{Y, Z} \rangle \underline{c}(e) \mid e \in E, \langle \partial e, \chi_{Y, Z} \rangle > 0\} \\ &\quad + \sum\{\langle \partial e, \chi_{Y, Z} \rangle \bar{c}(e) \mid e \in E, \langle \partial e, \chi_{Y, Z} \rangle < 0\} \quad ((Y, Z) \in 3^U), \end{aligned}$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the canonical inner product. We denote the cut function simply by $\kappa(Y, Z)$ if no confusion occurs.

Theorem 2.4. *BF has a feasible flow if and only if it holds $\kappa(Y, Z) \leq \beta(Y, Z)$ for all $(Y, Z) \in 3^U$. In such a case, if \underline{c}, \bar{c} and β are all integer-valued, there exists a half-integral feasible flow.*

Again, we say that $(Y, Z) \in 3^U$ with $\kappa(Y, Z) > \beta(Y, Z)$ is a *violating cut*.

Proof. These are known [1] that $\beta'(Y, Z) := -\kappa(Z, Y)$ is bisubmodular and

$$\mathcal{D}(\beta') = \{\nabla\psi \mid \psi \in \mathbb{R}^E, \underline{c} \leq \psi \leq \bar{c}\}.$$

Therefore, BF is to find a vector which belongs to the intersection of two bisubmodular polyhedra. It is shown [23] that the intersection $\mathcal{D}(\beta) \cap \mathcal{D}(\beta')$ of two bisubmodular polyhedra is nonempty if and only if $\beta(Y, Z) + \beta'(Z, Y) \geq 0$ for any $(Y, Z) \in 3^U$. Then the former part of the theorem immediately follows.

It is a folklore that the intersection of two integral bisubmodular polyhedra is half-integral; see, e.g., [20]. This implies that if BF has a feasible flow and \underline{c} , \bar{c} , and β are integral-valued, one can choose such a flow as its boundary is half-integral. For showing the half-integrality of a flow itself, divide each bidirected edge $e = ij \in E$ with $\partial e = \sigma_i \chi_i + \sigma_j \chi_j$ into two bidirected edges ik_e and $k'_e j$, where $\sigma_i, \sigma_j \in \{+1, -1\}$, and k_e and k'_e are new vertices. Define their boundaries by $\partial(ik_e) = \sigma_i \chi_i + \chi_{k_e}$ and $\partial(k'_e j) = \chi_{k'_e} + \sigma_j \chi_j$, and their capacities by $\underline{c}(ik_e) := \underline{c}(k'_e j) := \underline{c}(e)$ and $\bar{c}(ik_e) := \bar{c}(k'_e j) := \bar{c}(e)$. Let \tilde{E} be the set of divided edges. Consider the constraint $(\nabla\psi)(k_e) = (\nabla\psi)(k'_e)$ (or, equivalently, $\psi(ik_e) = \psi(k'_e j)$). It is easy to see that this is the boundary condition for the following bisubmodular function β_e on $\{k_e, k'_e\}$:

$$\beta_e(Y, Z) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } (Y, Z) = (\emptyset, \emptyset), (\{k_e\}, \{k'_e\}), (\{k'_e\}, \{k_e\}), \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad ((Y, Z) \in 3^{\{k_e, k'_e\}}).$$

Thus, extend the bisubmodular function β to $\tilde{\beta} : 3^{\tilde{U}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ with $\tilde{U} = U \cup \bigcup_{e \in E} \{k_e, k'_e\}$ by

$$\tilde{\beta}(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Z}) := \beta(\tilde{Y} \cap U, \tilde{Z} \cap U) + \sum_{e \in E} \beta_e(\tilde{Y} \cap \{k_e, k'_e\}, \tilde{Z} \cap \{k_e, k'_e\}) \quad ((\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Z}) \in 3^{\tilde{U}}).$$

The new instance $((\tilde{U}, \tilde{E}; \partial), \underline{c}, \bar{c}, \tilde{\beta})$ of BF is obviously equivalent to the original. Now the half-integrality of ψ follows from the half-integrality of $\nabla\tilde{\psi}$ (and thus, $\tilde{\psi}$). \square

2.2.3 Reducible bisubmodular flow

The *signed extension* U^\pm of U is defined by $U^\pm := U \times \{-1, +1\}$, where elements $(i, +1)$ and $(i, -1)$ in U^\pm are denoted by i^+ and i^- , respectively. For $X \subseteq U^\pm$, let \underline{X} be the set obtained from X by removals of all $\{i^+, i^-\}$ with $\{i^+, i^-\} \subseteq X$. For $Y \subseteq U$, let $Y^+ := \{i^+ \mid i \in Y\} \subseteq U^\pm$ and $Y^- := \{i^- \mid i \in Y\} \subseteq U^\pm$.

A function $\rho : 2^{U^\pm} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is called *transversally monotone* (*t-monotone*) if

$$\rho(\underline{X}) \leq \rho(X) \quad (X \subseteq 2^{U^\pm}).$$

Define a map (projection) $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^{U^\pm} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^U$ and a map (lift) $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{U^\pm}$ by

$$(\Phi(x))(i) := \frac{x(i^+) - x(i^-)}{2}, \quad (\Psi(z))(i^+) := z(i), \quad (\Psi(z))(i^-) := -z(i)$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^{U^\pm}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^U$, and $i \in U$. The following is a variant of [15, Lemma 2.3].

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\rho : 2^{U^\pm} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be a t-monotone submodular function. If $\Psi(\Phi(\mathcal{B}(\rho))) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\rho)$, then $\Phi(\mathcal{B}(\rho))$ is the bisubmodular polyhedron $\mathcal{D}(\beta)$ of a bisubmodular function $\beta : 3^U \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ defined by*

$$\beta(Y, Z) := \rho(Y^+ \cup Z^-) \quad ((Y, Z) \in 3^U).$$

Proof. First we check the bisubmodularity of β : For $(Y, Z), (Y', Z') \in 3^U$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(Y, Z) + \beta(Y', Z') &= \rho(Y^+ \cup Z^-) + \rho(Y'^+ \cup Z'^-) \\ &\geq \rho((Y \cap Y')^+ \cup (Z \cap Z')^-) + \rho((Y \cup Y')^+ \cup (Z \cup Z')^-) \\ &\geq \beta(Y \cap Y', Z \cap Z') + \beta((Y \cup Y') \setminus (Z \cup Z'), (Z \cup Z') \setminus (Y \cup Y')), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the t-monotonicity. Next we show $\Psi(\mathcal{B}(\rho)) = \mathcal{D}(\beta)$. Suppose that $z \in \Phi(\mathcal{B}(\rho))$. Since $\Psi(z) \in \mathcal{B}(\rho)$, we have

$$z(Y) - z(Z) = (\Psi(z))(Y^+ \cup Z^-) \leq \rho(Y^+ \cup Z^-) = \beta(Y, Z) \quad ((Y, Z) \in 3^U).$$

Thus $z \in \mathcal{D}(\beta)$. Conversely, suppose that $z \in \mathcal{D}(\beta)$. Let $X \subseteq U^\pm$ and take $Y, Z \subseteq U$ so that $\underline{X} = Y^+ \cup Z^-$. Since $Y \cap Z = \emptyset$, we have

$$\Psi(z)(X) = \Psi(z)(\underline{X}) = z(Y) - z(Z) \leq \beta(Y, Z) = \rho(\underline{X}) \leq \rho(X).$$

Hence $\Psi(z) \in \mathcal{B}(\rho)$, implying $z = \Phi(\Psi(z)) \in \Phi(\mathcal{B}(\rho))$. \square

By the fact that the bisubmodular function is uniquely determined for a bisubmodular polyhedron (see, e.g., [7, Section 3.5(b)]), β in the above lemma is unique. A bisubmodular function β is called *reducible* (or *reducible to ρ*) if it has a submodular function ρ satisfying the assumptions of the above lemma. Also, BF is called *reducible* if its bisubmodular function is reducible. Since $x(U^\pm) = 0$ for any $x \in \Psi(\Phi(\mathcal{B}(\rho))) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\rho)$, we observe that $\rho(U^\pm) = 0$. Thus we can consider an instance of SF on U^\pm using ρ . We show that the reducible BF can be reduced to the SF.

We construct a directed graph (U^\pm, A) as follows. For each $e \in E$ with $\partial e = \sigma_i \chi_i + \sigma_j \chi_j$, let $A_e := \{i^{\sigma_i} j^{-\sigma_j}, j^{\sigma_j} i^{-\sigma_i}\}$. It is allowed to form parallel arcs from a self-loop. The arc set A is defined to be the disjoint union of all A_e . Lower and upper capacity functions on A are defined by $\underline{b}(a) = \underline{c}(e)$ and $\bar{b}(a) = \bar{c}(e)$ for $a \in A_e$, respectively.

A violating cut $(Y, Z) \in 3^U$ is *maximum* if $\hat{\kappa}_{\underline{c}, \bar{c}}(Y, Z) - \beta(Y, Z)$ is maximum among all violating cuts.

Proposition 2.6. *Suppose that β is reducible to ρ . Let $((U, E; \partial), \underline{c}, \bar{c}, \beta)$ be an instance of BF, and $((U^\pm, A), \underline{b}, \bar{b}, \rho)$ be an instance of SF.*

- (1). *BF is feasible if and only if SF is feasible.*
- (2). *Suppose that BF (or SF) is infeasible. Then $(Y, Z) \in 3^U$ is a maximum violating cut for BF if and only if $Y^+ \cup Z^-$ is a maximum violating cut for SF.*

Proof. (1) Suppose that SF is feasible. Let $\varphi : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a feasible flow for SF. Define a flow $\psi : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for BF by

$$\psi(e) = \frac{1}{2} \varphi(A_e) \quad (e \in E). \quad (4)$$

Then, it is clear that $\underline{c}(e) \leq \psi(e) \leq \bar{c}(e)$ for each $e \in E$. Moreover, for $i \in V$, we can check from the definition that

$$(\nabla \psi)(i) = \frac{(\nabla \varphi)(i^+) - (\nabla \varphi)(i^-)}{2}. \quad (5)$$

Thus we have $\nabla \psi = \Phi(\nabla \varphi) \in \Phi(\mathcal{B}(\rho)) = \mathcal{D}(\beta)$. Therefore, ψ is a feasible flow for BF.

Suppose that SF is infeasible. These are shown [1]¹ that

$$\hat{\kappa}_{\underline{c}, \bar{c}}(Y, Z) = \kappa_{\underline{b}, \bar{b}}(Y^+ \cup Z^-) \quad ((Y, Z) \in 3^U), \quad (6)$$

$$\kappa_{\underline{b}, \bar{b}}(X) \leq \kappa_{\underline{b}, \bar{b}}(\underline{X}) \quad (X \subseteq U^\pm). \quad (7)$$

Let $X \subseteq U^\pm$ be a violating cut for SF, and take $Y, Z \subseteq U$ so that $\underline{X} = Y^+ \cup Z^-$. Then it follows from the t-monotonicity of ρ that

$$\hat{\kappa}_{\underline{c}, \bar{c}}(Y, Z) = \kappa_{\underline{b}, \bar{b}}(\underline{X}) \geq \kappa_{\underline{b}, \bar{b}}(X) > \rho(X) \geq \rho(\underline{X}) = \beta(Y, Z).$$

Thus, (Y, Z) is a violating cut for BF.

(2) Suppose that (Y, Z) is a maximum violating cut for BF, and $Y^+ \cup Z^-$ is not a maximum violating cut for SF. Let $X \subseteq U^\pm$ be a maximum violating cut for SF. Without loss of

¹Actually, in [1], these facts are shown only for the case $\underline{b} = 0$. But the same proofs are running in the case $\underline{b} \neq 0$.

generality, we can assume that $X = \bar{X}$ by (7) and t-monotonicity of ρ . Thus we can take $Y', Z' \subseteq U$ so that $X = Y'^+ \cup Z'^-$. From (6) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\kappa}_{\underline{c}, \bar{c}}(Y', Z') - \beta(Y', Z') &= \kappa_{\underline{b}, \bar{b}}(Y'^+ \cup Z'^-) - \rho(Y'^+ \cup Z'^-) \\ &> \kappa_{\underline{b}, \bar{b}}(Y^+ \cup Z^-) - \rho(Y^+ \cup Z^-) \\ &= \hat{\kappa}_{\underline{c}, \bar{c}}(Y, Z) - \beta(Y, Z). \end{aligned}$$

Thus (Y, Z) is not a maximum violating cut; a contradiction. The converse direction can be shown similarly. \square

A bisubmodular function $\beta : 3^U \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ is *separable* if there exists a partition (U_1, \dots, U_ℓ) of U and bisubmodular functions β_t on each U_t ($t = 1, \dots, \ell$) such that $\beta(Y, Z) = \sum_{t=1}^{\ell} \beta_t(Y \cap U_t, Z \cap U_t)$ for any $(Y, Z) \in 3^U$.

Theorem 2.7. (1). *Suppose that \underline{c} and \bar{c} are integral, and β is reducible to an integral submodular function ρ . Then we can obtain a half-integral feasible flow or a maximum violating cut for the instance $((U, E; \partial), \underline{c}, \bar{c}, \beta)$ of BF in $O(\text{SF}(n, m, \eta))$ time, where $n = |U|$, $m = |E|$, and η is the time complexity of an exchange capacity oracle for ρ .*

(2). *In addition, if β is separable to bisubmodular functions β_t on a partition (U_1, \dots, U_ℓ) which are reducible to integral submodular functions ρ_t ($t = 1, \dots, \ell$), the above half-integral feasible flow ψ can be chosen so that $(\nabla\psi)(U_t) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $t = 1, \dots, \ell$.*

Proof. (1) As was noted after Theorem 2.3, we can obtain, in $O(\text{SF}(n, m, \eta))$ time, an integral feasible flow φ or a maximum violating cut for the instance $((U^\pm, A), \underline{b}, \bar{b}, \rho)$ of SF. In the former case, we can obtain an integral feasible flow ψ for BF by (4). In the latter case, we can obtain a maximum violating cut for BF by Proposition 2.6 (2).

(2) We can take ρ as $\rho(X) = \sum_{t=1}^{\ell} \rho_t(X \cap U_t^\pm)$. Since $\rho(U_t^\pm) = \rho_t(U_t^\pm) = 0$, the above integral feasible flow φ satisfies $(\nabla\varphi)(U_t^\pm) = 0$ for each $t = 1, \dots, \ell$. Thus by (5), we have

$$(\nabla\psi)(U_t) = \sum_{i \in U_t} (\nabla\psi)(i) = \frac{\sum_{i \in U_t} (\nabla\varphi)(i^+) - \sum_{i \in U_t} (\nabla\varphi)(i^-)}{2} = (\nabla\varphi)(U_t^+)$$

for $t = 1, \dots, \ell$. The integrality of φ implies the lemma. \square

3 Minimum-cost multiflow problem

In this section, we study our problem MNMF. We first introduce basic multiflow terminologies and the formal description of MNMF (Section 3.1). Next we explain a combinatorial duality theory for MNMF (Section 3.2), and explain how the optimality check of the dual and the recovery of an optimal multiflow become a reducible BF (Section 3.3). Then, in Section 3.4, we explain that the dual objective function is viewed as an L-convex function on \mathbb{G}^n , and present a pseudopolynomial-time algorithm for MNMF by implementing SDA. We mention a sensitivity theorem of the dual. Finally, in Section 3.5, by incorporating a cost-scaling technique we improve the pseudopolynomial-time algorithm to a polynomial-time one, which proves Theorem 1.1.

3.1 Problem formulation

Let $((V, E), S, c, d)$ be a network of an undirected graph (V, E) , terminal set $S \subseteq V$, a nonnegative integer-valued capacity function $c : V \setminus S \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ on nonterminal nodes, and a nonnegative

integer-valued cost function $d : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ on edges. We can assume that the graph is simple, and there are no edges connecting two terminals. Also we can assume that $|S| \geq 3$.

An S -path is a path connecting distinct terminals. For a pair $f = (\mathcal{P}, \lambda)$ of a set \mathcal{P} of S -paths and a flow-value function $\lambda : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, the flow-values on node i and edge e are denoted by $f(i) := \sum\{\lambda(P) \mid P \in \mathcal{P}, i \in V(P)\}$ and $f(e) := \sum\{\lambda(P) \mid P \in \mathcal{P}, e \in E(P)\}$, respectively. A (node-capacitated) *multiflow* is a pair $f = (\mathcal{P}, \lambda)$ satisfying the node-capacity constraint $f(i) \leq c(i)$ for each $i \in V \setminus S$. The *total flow-value* $\text{val}(f)$ of a multiflow $f = (\mathcal{P}, \lambda)$ is defined by $\text{val}(f) := \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \lambda(P)$.

A multiflow $f = (\mathcal{P}, \lambda)$ is called *maximum* if it has the maximum total flow-value among all possible multiflows. The (*edge-*)*cost* $d(f)$ of a multiflow f is defined by $d(f) := \sum_{e \in E} d(e)f(e)$. (We deal with the edge-cost setting, since node-costs are transformed to edge-costs with no complexity overhead.) The *minimum-cost node-capacitated multiflow problem (MNMF)* is the problem of finding a minimum-cost maximum multiflow. A multiflow $f = (\mathcal{P}, \lambda)$ is said to be *integral* if λ is integer-valued, and *half-integral* if 2λ is integer-valued.

Let $n := |V|$ and $m := |E|$. Suppose that $S = \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$. For a technical issue, we assume that the cost d are positive by essentially the same modification as that given in [11, 19]; see Remark 3.2. As Karzanov [17] did for the edge-capacitated version (MEMF), we consider the maximization of

$$M \cdot \text{val}(f) - d(f) \tag{8}$$

for a sufficiently large integer $M > 0$; see Remark 3.1. Then an optimal multiflow for (8) is a minimum-cost maximum multiflow for MNMF.

Remark 3.1. Let $C := \max\{c(i) \mid i \in V\}$ and $D := \max\{d(e) \mid e \in E\}$. We show that $M > 2CD$ is sufficient in (8). From the primal half-integrality shown in [3], there exists a half-integral optimal multiflow for MNMF. Let f^* be such a half-integral optimal multiflow, and f an half-integral multiflow with the maximum value of (8). If $\text{val}(f^*) > \text{val}(f)$, then the difference is at least $1/2$ and

$$M(\text{val}(f^*) - \text{val}(f)) - d(f^*) + d(f) \geq M/2 - CD > 0.$$

It contradicts the maximality of f . Thus we have $\text{val}(f^*) = \text{val}(f)$, implying that f is also optimal for MNMF.

Remark 3.2. The positiveness of d is technically essential. We perturb the edge-cost d as follows. Let $Z := \{e \in E \mid d(e) = 0\}$. Define an edge-cost d' by

$$d'(e) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } e \in Z, \\ (2C|Z| + 1)d(e) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let f^* be a half-integral optimal multiflow for MNMF under the edge-cost d' . From the primal half-integrality shown in [3], there exists a half-integral optimal multiflow under the edge-cost d . Therefore, it is sufficient to show that f^* is also optimal under the edge-cost d . Let f be any half-integral multiflow with $\text{val}(f) = \text{val}(f^*)$. By the assumption we have $d'(f^*) \leq d'(f)$. Thus,

$$(2C|Z| + 1)(d(f^*) - d(f)) = d'(f^*) - d'(f) - f^*(Z) + f(Z) \leq C|Z|.$$

Since $d(f^*) - d(f)$ is half-integral, $d(f^*) - d(f) \leq C|Z|/(2C|Z| + 1) < 1/2$ implies $d(f^*) \leq d(f)$.

3.2 Duality

First of all, we double the objective function (8) by a technical reason. Formally, we consider the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(PMF)} \quad & \text{Maximize} \quad \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} 2M \cdot \lambda(P) - \sum_{e \in E} 2d(e)f(e) \\ & \text{subject to} \quad f = (\mathcal{P}, \lambda) \text{ is a multiflow.} \end{aligned}$$

The first author of this paper established [12] a combinatorial duality theory for this type of multiflow problems; see also [15]. He first took a natural LP-dual, and after some reductions, gave the following dual problem:

$$\text{(DMF)} \quad \text{Minimize} \quad \sum_{i \in V \setminus S} 2c_i y_i \quad (9a)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad (x, y) = ((x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)) \in \mathbb{G}^n, \quad (9b)$$

$$\text{dist}(x_i, x_j) - y_i - y_j \leq 2d_{ij} \quad (ij \in E), \quad (9c)$$

$$(x_s, y_s) = ((M, s), 0) \quad (s \in S), \quad (9d)$$

$$y_i \geq 0 \quad (i \in V). \quad (9e)$$

In intuition, a pair $(x_i, y_i) \in \mathbb{G}$ represents a ball on \mathbb{T} whose center is x_i and radius is y_i . The condition (9c) means that the distance between two balls is at most $2d_{ij}$ if the corresponding nodes i, j are connected in (V, E) , and (9d) is a boundary condition. We say that $(x, y) \in \mathbb{G}^n$ is a *potential* if (x, y) satisfies all the conditions (9c)–(9e).

Theorem 3.3 ([12]). *The optimum values of PMF and DMF coincide.*

The following is the complementary slackness conditions.

Lemma 3.4 ([12]). *Let $f = (\mathcal{P}, \lambda)$ a multiflow and $(x, y) \in \mathbb{G}^n$ be a potential. Then f and (x, y) are both optimal if and only if the following condition holds:*

$$\text{dist}(x_i, x_j) - y_i - y_j = 2d_{ij} \quad (ij \in E : f(ij) > 0), \quad (10)$$

$$f(i) = c(i) \quad (i \in V \setminus S : y_i > 0), \quad (11)$$

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\ell} \text{dist}(x_{i_{t-1}}, x_{i_t}) = \text{dist}(x_{i_0}, x_{i_\ell}) \quad (P = (i_0, \dots, i_\ell) \in \mathcal{P} : f(P) > 0). \quad (12)$$

The condition (12) says that by embedding $i \mapsto x_i$, the path P in (V, E) becomes a shortest path in \mathbb{T} .

The following lemma gives a range where an optimal potential exists.

Lemma 3.5 ([15]). *There exists an optimal potential $(x, y) \in \mathbb{G}^n$ with $\text{dist}(0, x_i) \leq M$ and $y_i \leq 2M$ for any $i \in V \setminus S$.*

Proof. Let $(x', y') = ((x', s'), y') = (((x'_1, s'_1), y'_1), \dots, ((x'_n, s'_n), y'_n)) \in \mathbb{G}^n$ be an optimal potential. We define $(x, y) \in \mathbb{G}^n$ by

$$(x_i, y_i) := \begin{cases} ((x'_i, s'_i), y'_i) & \text{if } x'_i \leq M, \\ ((M, s'_i), y'_i) & \text{if } x'_i > M \text{ and } (x'_i, y'_i) \text{ is integral,} \\ ((M - 1/2, s'_i), y'_i) & \text{if } x'_i > M \text{ and } (x'_i, y'_i) \text{ is non-integral} \end{cases} \quad (i \in V \setminus S),$$

and $(x_s, y_s) = ((M, s), 0)$ for $s \in S$. Since $\text{dist}(x_i, x_j) \leq \text{dist}(x'_i, x'_j)$ for any $ij \in E$, we see that (x, y) is a new potential with the same dual objective function value as (x', y') . Also, since $\text{dist}(x_i, x_j)$ is at most $2M$ for any $ij \in E$, we can modify y_i so that $y_i \leq 2M$ holds for any $i \in V$. Now the lemma follows. \square




Figure 3: Construction of the bidirected network.

The above proof shows that any potential (x, y) can be replaced, without changing the objective function value, by a potential (x', y') with $\text{dist}(0, x'_i) \leq M$. Therefore we assume in the following that a potential (x, y) satisfies

$$\text{dist}(0, x_i) \leq M \quad (i \in V). \quad (13)$$

3.3 Optimality via bisubmodular flow

In this subsection we explain that the optimality of a given potential is established by a reducible BF, which is outlined as follows. Given a potential $(x, y) \in \mathbb{G}^n$, we try to find a multiflow f satisfying the slackness (10), (11), and (12); if it exists, then both f and (x, y) are guaranteed to be optimal. Observe that (10) and (11) are conditions for the support $(f(e))_{e \in E}$ of a multiflow f . In fact, the third condition (12) can also be written as a condition for the support of f . Then the existence of a multiflow f satisfying the slackness with (x, y) is equivalent to the existence of a certain edge-weight ψ , which we call an (x, y) -feasible support, on a bidirected network associated with (x, y) . Any (x, y) -feasible support ψ is actually the support of some optimal multiflow f . Then f can be recovered from ψ in polynomial time (Lemma 3.6). Moreover, an (x, y) -feasible support is precisely a feasible flow of a reducible BF (Corollary 3.8).

Let $(x, y) \in \mathbb{G}^n$ be a potential. As mentioned above, we are interested in the support of a multiflow satisfying the slackness (10), (11), and (12) with (x, y) . Motivated by (10), define an edge subset $E_- \subseteq E$ by

$$E_- := \{ij \in E \mid \text{dist}(x_i, x_j) - y_i - y_j = 2d_{ij}\},$$

where other edges are not used by our target multiflows. From the subnetwork $((V, E_-), S, c)$ and (x, y) , we construct a bidirected network $((U, \tilde{E}; \partial), \underline{c}, \bar{c})$ as follows. See Figure 3 for the following construction. In the figure, $x_i = 0$, $x_j, x_{j'} \neq 0$, $y_j = 0$, and $y_{j'} \neq 0$.

For a nonterminal node $i \in V \setminus S$, if $x_i = 0$, then consider k -node set $U_i := \{i^1, i^2, \dots, i^k\}$, where i^s corresponds to the s -branch for $s \in S$. If $x_i \neq 0$, then the node set $U_i := \{i^0, i^+\}$ consists of i^0 (node directed to the origin) and i^+ (node away from the origin). For a terminal $s \in S$, define $s^0 := s$ and $U_s := \{s^0\}$. The node set U of the bidirected network is defined as the (disjoint) union of U_i for all $i \in V$. Next we define the edge set \tilde{E} . Since d_{ij} is positive, we see that x_i and x_j are distinct points for $ij \in E_-$. For each edge $ij \in E_-$, we replace the endpoints i, j according to the position of x_i and x_j in \mathbb{T} . If $x_i = 0$ and x_j is on s -th branch of \mathbb{T} , replace ij by $i^s j^0$. If $x_i, x_j \neq 0$ are on distinct branches, replace ij by $i^0 j^0$. If $x_i, x_j \neq 0$ are on the same branch and $\text{dist}(x_i, 0) < \text{dist}(x_j, 0)$, replace ij by $i^+ j^0$. Note that

j may be a terminal but i is a nonterminal by (13). The replaced edge set is also denoted by $E_=$. Also, we add an edge i^0i^+ for each nonterminal node $i \in V \setminus S$ with $x_i \neq 0$, and add an edge s^0s^0 , which is a self-loop, for each terminal $s \in S$. Let $E_- := \{i^0i^+ \mid i \in V \setminus S, x_i \neq 0\}$ and $E_S := \{s^0s^0 \mid s \in S\}$. Then the edge set \tilde{E} of the bidirected network is defined as $E_= \cup E_- \cup E_S$. A boundary operator $\partial : \tilde{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^U$ is defined by $\partial(ij) := \chi_i + \chi_j$ if $ij \in E_=$ and $\partial(ij) := -\chi_i - \chi_j$ otherwise. Define a lower capacity $\underline{c} : \tilde{E} \rightarrow \underline{\mathbb{R}}$ and an upper capacity $\bar{c} : \tilde{E} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ by

$$\underline{c}(e) := \begin{cases} c(i) & \text{if } e \in E_- \text{ and } y_i > 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \bar{c}(e) := \begin{cases} c(i) & \text{if } e \in E_-, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for each edge $e \in \tilde{E}$.

We say that a half-integral edge-weight function $\psi : \tilde{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/2$ is an (x, y) -feasible support if it satisfies

$$\underline{c}(e) \leq \psi(e) \leq \bar{c}(e) \quad (14)$$

for each edge $e \in \tilde{E}$ and

$$(\nabla\psi)(i') = 0 \quad (x_i \neq 0, i' \in U_i), \quad (15)$$

$$(\nabla\psi)(i^\ell) - (\nabla\psi)(U_i \setminus \{i^\ell\}) \leq 0 \quad (x_i = 0, \ell = 1, \dots, k), \quad (16)$$

$$(\nabla\psi)(U_i) \leq 2c(i) \quad (x_i = 0, y_i = 0), \quad (17)$$

$$(\nabla\psi)(U_i) = 2c(i) \quad (x_i = 0, y_i > 0), \quad (18)$$

$$(\nabla\psi)(U_i) \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \quad (x_i = 0) \quad (19)$$

for each node $i \in V$. See Section 2.2.2 for the definition of the boundary operator ∇ .

Any half-integral optimal multiflow f gives rise to an (x, y) -feasible support from its support $(f(e))_{e \in E}$. Indeed, let $\psi_f : \tilde{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/2$ be a function defined by

$$\psi_f(i'j') := \begin{cases} f(ij) & \text{if } i'j' \in E_=, i' \in U_i, \text{ and } j' \in U_j, \\ f(i) & \text{if } i'j' \in E_- \text{ and } i', j' \in U_i, \\ f(s)/2 & \text{if } i'j' \in E_S \text{ and } i'j' = s^0s^0 \end{cases} \quad (i'j' \in \tilde{E}).$$

Then ψ_f is an (x, y) -feasible support. Indeed, it is obvious that (17) is the capacity constraint and (18) corresponds to (11). (14) also corresponds to the capacity constraint and (11). (16) comes from (12): In the embedding $i \mapsto x_i \in \mathbb{T}$, a flow coming from the ℓ -th branch must go to the other branches. Hence the total flow-value $(\nabla\psi)(i_\ell)$ for such flows is at most the total flow-value $(\nabla\psi)(U_i \setminus \{i_\ell\})$ of flows going to branches other than the ℓ -th branch. The condition (15) is also explained by the same way. The condition (19) follows from the half-integrality of f .

Conversely, we can decompose an (x, y) -feasible support into a half-integral multiflow satisfying (10)–(12):

Lemma 3.6 ([12]). *Let (x, y) be a potential.*

- (1). (x, y) is optimal if and only if an (x, y) -feasible support exists.
- (2). Given an (x, y) -feasible support, we can obtain a half-integral optimal multiflow in $O(nm)$ time.

The algorithm for Lemma 3.6 given in [15, Algorithm 1] is an analogue of the flow decomposition procedure in the ordinary network flow.

Now our task is to find an (x, y) -feasible support. This can be done by solving a reducible BF. Recall that $S = \{1, \dots, k\}$. Motivated by (16) and (17), we consider the following condition for $z \in \mathbb{R}_+^S$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$:

$$z(S) \leq 2c, \quad (20)$$

$$z(t) \leq z(S \setminus \{t\}) \quad (t \in S). \quad (21)$$

Let P_c be sets of vectors of \mathbb{R}_+^S satisfying (20) and (21). We call P_c as the *node-flowing polytope* with capacity c . Also, motivated by (18), we consider the condition

$$z(S) = 2c. \quad (22)$$

Let \bar{P}_c be sets of vectors of \mathbb{R}_+^S satisfying (22) and (21). We call \bar{P}_c as the *tight node-flowing polytope* with capacity c .

Lemma 3.7. *P_c and \bar{P}_c are bisubmodular polyhedra of reducible bisubmodular functions β_c and $\bar{\beta}_c$, respectively, where $\beta_c, \bar{\beta}_c : 3^S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are reducible to submodular functions whose exchange capacity oracles are calculated in $O(k)$ time.*

The proof is given in Section 4.1.

Corollary 3.8. *Let (x, y) be an optimal potential. Then we can find an (x, y) -feasible support in $O(\text{SF}(kn, m, k))$ time.*

Proof. On the network $((U, \tilde{E}; \partial), \underline{c}, \bar{c})$, define a reducible bisubmodular function $\beta : 3^U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(Y, Z) := & \sum_{i \in V: x_i=0, y_i=0} \beta_{c_i}(Y \cap U_i, Z \cap U_i) \\ & + \sum_{i \in V: x_i=0, y_i>0} \bar{\beta}_{c_i}(Y \cap U_i, Z \cap U_i) \quad ((Y, Z) \in 3^U). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

There exists an (x, y) -feasible support by the optimality of (x, y) and Lemma 3.6. Since an (x, y) -feasible support is a feasible flow of the instance $((U, \tilde{E}; \partial), \underline{c}, \bar{c}, \beta)$ of BF, this instance is feasible.

By Theorem 2.7 and Lemma 3.7, we can obtain, in $O(\text{SF}(kn, m, k))$ time, a half-integral feasible flow $\psi : \tilde{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $(\nabla\psi)(U_i) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $i \in V$ with $x_i = 0$. Moreover, by the definition of \underline{c} and ∂ , this can be strengthened so that $(\nabla\psi)(U_i) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Observe that any feasible flow satisfies (14)–(18). Also, the obtained feasible flow satisfies the half-integrality and (19). Hence, this is an (x, y) -feasible support. \square

Therefore, given an optimal potential, we can obtain a half-integral optimal multifold of the original problem in $O(\text{SF}(kn, m, k) + nm) = O(\text{SF}(kn, m, k))$ time.

3.4 Discrete convexity and sensitivity

Here we study the objective function of the dual DMF. Define a function $h = h_{d, M} : \mathbb{G}^n \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ by

$$h(x, y) := \begin{cases} \sum_{i \in V \setminus S} c_i y_i & \text{if } (x, y) \text{ is a potential for } d \text{ and } M, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad ((x, y) \in \mathbb{G}^n). \quad (24)$$

Then DMF is precisely the minimization of h .

Proposition 3.9 ([15, Proposition 3.6]). *h is L -convex on \mathbb{G}^n .*

Thus we can apply SDA to h to obtain an optimal potential. The initial step is finding a potential $(x, y) \in \mathbb{G}^n$. It can be done immediately since

$$(x_i, y_i) = \begin{cases} ((M, s), 0) & \text{if } i = s \in S, \\ (0, M) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (i \in V)$$

is a potential for any d and M . To find a steepest descent direction at a current point $(x, y) \in \mathbb{G}^n$, we again make use of the bisubmodular flow theory.

Suppose that (x, y) is not optimal. By Lemma 3.6, there exists no (x, y) -feasible support on the bidirected network $((U, \tilde{E}; \partial), \underline{c}, \bar{c})$. Thus BF introduced in the previous subsection is infeasible. Then by Theorem 2.4, there exists a violating cut in the network. From a maximum violating cut, we can find a steepest descent direction.

Lemma 3.10. *Let (x, y) be a potential. Suppose that (x, y) is not optimal. Then we can find a steepest descent direction of h at (x, y) in $O(\text{SF}(kn, m, k))$ time.*

We give the proof in Section 4.3. By simply combining Corollary 3.8 and Lemma 3.10, we obtain a pseudopolynomial-time algorithm for MNMF.

Proposition 3.11. *A half-integral multiflow which maximizes (8) can be obtained in $O(M \cdot \text{SF}(kn, m, k))$ time.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.5, there exists an optimal potential $p^* = (x^*, y^*) \in \mathbb{G}^n$ for DMF satisfying $\|p - p^*\| = O(M)$, where $p = (x, y)$. Thus by Theorem 2.2, SDA terminates after at most $O(M)$ iterations. Each iteration can be done in $O(\text{SF}(kn, m, k))$ time by Lemma 3.10. Also, once an optimal potential is obtained, we can find a half-integral optimal multiflow in $O(\text{SF}(kn, m, k))$ time by Lemma 3.6 and Corollary 3.8. \square

From Remarks 3.1 and 3.2, we see that our algorithm in Proposition 3.11 runs in $O(nC^2D \cdot \text{SF}(kn, m, k))$ time.

To combine the above algorithm with cost-scaling, we use the following sensitivity property of h under a small cost change.

Theorem 3.12 (Sensitivity). *For a positive edge-cost $d : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$, let $e_0 \in E$ be an edge with $d(e_0) \in 2\mathbb{Z}$. Define an edge-cost $d_1 : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ by*

$$d_1(e) := \begin{cases} d(e_0) - 1 & \text{if } e = e_0, \\ d(e) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (e \in E).$$

Let $p \in \mathbb{G}^n$ be a minimizer of $h_{d,M}$. Then there exists a minimizer $q \in \mathbb{G}^n$ of $h_{d_1,M}$ satisfying $\|p - q\| \leq 2$.

The proof is given in Section 4.2.

3.5 Cost scaling algorithm

The pseudopolynomial-time algorithm we gave in the previous subsection consists of two stages. In the first stage, one tries to minimize the L-convex function $h_{d,M}$ on \mathbb{G}^n by SDA. In the second stage, construct the desired optimal multiflow. Both of them are done by solving a reducible BF. The second stage can be done in strongly polynomial time (Lemma 3.6 and Corollary 3.8). The bottleneck is in the first stage. As we mentioned above, the number of iterations of SDA becomes $O(M)$ in the worst case.

We overcome this issue by the *scaling* method. Without loss of generality, we can assume that M is the power of two, i.e., $M = 2^\mu$ ($\mu \geq 0$). The scaling algorithm consists of $(\mu + 1)$

scaling phases. In t -th phase ($t = 0, 1, \dots, \mu$), we deal with the problem of finding a multifold f that maximizes

$$\frac{M}{2^t} \cdot \text{val}(f) - \left(\left\lceil \frac{d}{2^t} \right\rceil \right) (f),$$

where $(\lceil d/2^t \rceil)(e) := \lceil d(e)/2^t \rceil$ for $e \in E$. Since d is positive, $\lceil d/2^t \rceil$ is also positive. Hence we can apply the same discussion as above to this scaled problem, i.e., the dual objective function, $h_{\lceil d/2^t \rceil, M/2^t}$, is an L-convex function on \mathbb{G}^n and can be minimized via SDA.

In the first phase $t = \mu$, we can find an optimal potential in constant time.

Lemma 3.13. *Let $(x, y) \in \mathbb{G}^n$ a potential for μ -th phase defined by*

$$(x_i, y_i) = \begin{cases} (0, 0) & \text{if } i \in V \setminus S, \\ ((1, s), 0) & \text{if } i = s \in S \end{cases} \quad (i \in V).$$

Then (x, y) is an optimal potential.

Proof. It is easy to see that (x, y) is a potential since the left hand side of (9c) is at most one and the right hand side is at least two. The optimality follows from that its objective function value is zero. \square

We show that given an optimal potential for $(t + 1)$ -st phase, we can find an optimal potential in t -th phase efficiently.

Lemma 3.14. *Given an optimal potential for $(t + 1)$ -st phase ($t = 0, \dots, \mu - 1$), we can obtain an optimal potential in t -th phase by SDA with at most $2m + 4$ iterations.*

Proof. It suffices to show the case $t = 0$. Let $p \in \mathbb{G}^n$ be an optimal potential in the phase $t = 1$, i.e., p is a minimizer of $h_{d'/2, M/2}$, where $d' := 2 \cdot \lceil d/2 \rceil$. Define $2p \in \mathbb{G}^n$ by $(2p)_i := 2p_i$ for each $i \in V$, where $2(x, y) := (2x, 2y) \in \mathbb{G}$ for $(x, y) \in \mathbb{G}$.

Claim. $2p \in \mathbb{G}^n$ is a minimizer of $h_{d', M}$.

Proof. We observe from (9c)–(9e) that $2p$ is a potential under d' and M . Thus we have $h_{d', M}(2p) = 2h_{d'/2, M/2}(p)$. Since p is a minimizer of $h_{d'/2, M/2}$, there exists a multifold f satisfying $h_{d'/2, M/2}(p) = M/2 \cdot \text{val}(f) - d'(f)/2$ by the duality (Theorem 3.3). Hence we have $h_{d', M}(2p) = 2h_{d'/2, M/2}(p) = M \cdot \text{val}(f) - d'(f)$, and again by the duality, $2p$ is a minimizer of $h_{d', M}$. \square

Observe that

$$d(e) = \begin{cases} d'(e) - 1 & \text{if } d(e) \text{ is odd,} \\ d'(e) & \text{if } d(e) \text{ is even} \end{cases}$$

for each $e \in E$. Thus by Theorem 3.12 (and the triangle inequality), there exists a minimizer q of $h_{d, M}$ satisfying $\|2p - q\| \leq 2m$.

We use SDA to obtain such a potential q , but here $2p$ is not always a potential under the edge-cost d . Recall that we can run the iteration of SDA only on a potential. Thus in such a case, we define a new potential $r \in \mathbb{G}^n$ from $2p = (x', y')$ by

$$r_i := \begin{cases} (x'_i, y'_i + 2) & \text{if } i \in V \setminus S, \\ 2p_s & \text{if } i = s \in S \end{cases} \quad (i \in V).$$

Then r is a potential under the edge-cost d (and M), and $\|2p - r\| \leq 2$. Therefore, Theorem 2.2 (and the triangle inequality) implies that by starting SDA from the potential r , a minimizer of $h_{d, M}$ can be obtained with at most $2m + 4$ iterations. \square

Now we obtain a weakly polynomial-time algorithm for MNMF.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By Remarks 3.1 and 3.2, we can take $\mu = O(\log(nCD))$. As noted in Lemma 3.13, an optimal potential for the first phase $t = \mu$ can be obtained in constant time. Lemma 3.14 implies that we can obtain an optimal potential for DMF by $O(m\mu)$ iterations of SDA. Each iteration can be done in $O(\text{SF}(kn, m, k))$ time by Lemma 3.10. Also after SDA, an optimal half-integral multiflow for (8) can be obtained in $O(\text{SF}(kn, m, k))$ time by Lemma 3.6 and Corollary 3.8. Therefore, the overall algorithm runs in $O(m \log(nCD)\text{SF}(kn, m, k))$ time. \square

4 Proofs

4.1 Lift of the node-flowing polytope (Proof of Lemma 3.7)

Let B_c be the set of vectors $x \in \mathbb{R}^{S^\pm}$ satisfying

$$x(S^\pm) = 0, \quad (25)$$

$$x(S^+) \leq 2c, \quad (26)$$

$$x(i^+) + x(S^- \setminus \{i^-\}) \leq 0 \quad (i \in S), \quad (27)$$

$$0 \leq x(i^+) \leq c \quad (i \in S), \quad (28)$$

$$-c \leq x(i^-) \leq 0 \quad (i \in S). \quad (29)$$

Also, let \overline{B}_c be the set of vectors $x \in \mathbb{R}^{S^\pm}$ satisfying (25)–(29) and

$$x(S^-) \leq -2c. \quad (30)$$

We show that B_c and \overline{B}_c are the lifts of the node-flowing polytope P_c and the tight node-flowing polytope \overline{P}_c , respectively.

Lemma 4.1. $\Phi(B_c) = P_c$, $\Psi(P_c) \subseteq B_c$, $\Phi(\overline{B}_c) = \overline{P}_c$, and $\Psi(\overline{P}_c) \subseteq \overline{B}_c$.

Proof. For $z \in P_c$, we have $z(i) \leq c$ by $z(i) + z(i) \leq z(i) + z(S \setminus \{i\}) \leq 2c$. Thus $\Psi(z)$ satisfies (28) and (29). We can check (25)–(27) directly from the definition. Thus $\Psi(z) \in B_c$. This immediately implies $P_c \subseteq \Phi(B_c)$. We show the converse direction. Let $x \in B_c$ and $z := \Phi(x)$. Then z is nonnegative by (28)(29), and satisfies (20)(21) as

$$z(S) = \frac{x(S^+) - x(S^-)}{2} = \frac{2x(S^+) - x(S^\pm)}{2} \leq 2c, \quad (31)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} z(i) - z(S \setminus \{i\}) &= \frac{x(i^+) - x(i^-) - (x(S^+ \setminus \{i^+\}) - x(S^- \setminus \{i^-\}))}{2} \\ &= \frac{x(i^+) + x(S^- \setminus \{i^-\}) - (x(S^+ \setminus \{i^+\}) + x(i^-))}{2} \\ &= \frac{2(x(i^+) + x(S^- \setminus \{i^-\})) - x(S^\pm)}{2} \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

For \overline{P}_c and \overline{B}_c , the proof is almost the same. In fact, by noticing that the conditions (25)(26)(30) imply $x(S^+) = 2c$ (and $x(S^-) = -2c$), (31) holds with equality. \square

Next, we show that B_c and \overline{B}_c are base polyhedra of t-monotone submodular functions. This proves Lemma 3.7.

Table 1: Submodular functions ρ_c (left) and $\bar{\rho}_c$ (right).

		$ X^- $		
		k	$k-1$	$\leq k-2$
$ X^+ $	0	0	0	0
	1	0	0 or c	c
	≥ 2	0	c	$2c$

		$ X^- $		
		k	$k-1$	$\leq k-2$
$ X^+ $	0	$-2c$	$-c$	0
	1	$-c$	0	c
	≥ 2	0	c	$2c$

For $X \subseteq S^\pm$, we denote $X^+ := X \cap S^+$ and $X^- := X \cap S^-$. For $u, v \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, we say $X \subseteq S^\pm$ is of type uv if

$$|X^+| \begin{cases} = u & \text{if } u = 0, 1, \\ \geq u & \text{if } u = 2, \end{cases} \quad |X^-| \begin{cases} = k - v & \text{if } v = 0, 1, \\ \leq k - v & \text{if } v = 2. \end{cases}$$

Additionally, X is of type 11* if $X^+ = \{i^+\}$ and $X^- = S^- \setminus \{i^-\}$ for some $i \in S$. In the below, when we say X is of type 11, we assume that X is not of type 11*.

Define $\rho_c, \bar{\rho}_c : 2^{S^\pm} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\rho_c(X) := \begin{cases} 2c & \text{if } X \text{ is of type 22,} \\ c & \text{if } X \text{ is of type 11, 12, or 21,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (X \subseteq S^\pm),$$

$$\bar{\rho}_c(X) := c \cdot (\min\{|X^+|, 2\} + \min\{k - 2 - |X^-|, 0\}) \quad (X \subseteq S^\pm).$$

We summarize the definition of ρ_c and $\bar{\rho}_c$ in Table 1.

Lemma 4.2. *Both ρ_c and $\bar{\rho}_c$ are t -monotone submodular functions, where $B_c = \mathcal{B}(\rho_c)$ and $\bar{B}_c = \mathcal{B}(\bar{\rho}_c)$.*

Proof. (submodularity) We first consider $\bar{\rho}_c$. Since the minimum of any monotone submodular function and a nonnegative constant is submodular, the functions $\min\{|X^+|, 2\}$ and $\min\{k - 2 - |X^-|, 0\}$ are submodular. Thus $\bar{\rho}_c$ is also submodular.

Next we consider ρ_c . $\rho_c(\emptyset) = 0$ is clear. We denote by $\rho_c(u|X)$ the difference $\rho_c(X \cup \{u\}) - \rho_c(X)$ for $X \subseteq S^\pm$ and $u \in S^\pm$. It is well-known that ρ_c is submodular if and only if it satisfies

$$\rho_c(u|X) \leq \rho_c(u|X') \tag{32}$$

for all $X' \subseteq X \subseteq S^\pm$ and $u \notin X$. From Table 1, we can determine $\rho_c(i^+|X) \in \{0, c\}$ and $\rho_c(i^-|X) \in \{-c, 0\}$ for any $i \in S$.

Suppose that X is of type 00, 10, or 20. Then u must be i^+ for some $i \in S$, and the left hand side of (32) is 0. Thus (32) holds.

Suppose that X is of type 11 or 21. Then $\rho_c(i^+|X) = 0 \leq \rho_c(i^+|X') \in \{0, c\}$ and $\rho_c(j^-|X) = -c \leq \rho_c(j^-|X') \in \{-c, 0\}$ for $i^+, j^- \notin X$.

Suppose that X is of type 01 or 11*. If X is of type 01, then X' must be of type 02. If X is of type 11*, then X' must be of type 01, 02, or 12. In all cases, $\rho_c(i^+|X') = c \geq \rho_c(i^+|X)$ and $\rho_c(j^-|X') = 0 = \rho_c(j^-|X)$ for $i^+, j^- \notin X$.

Suppose that X is of type 02, 12, or 22. Then X' must also be of type 02, 12, or 22. Let $i^+ \notin X$. We may consider the case $\rho_c(i^+|X') = 0$. Then X' and X must be of type 22, and thus $\rho_c(i^+|X) = 0$. Let $j^- \notin X$. We may consider the case $\rho_c(j^-|X') = -c$. Then X' is of type 12 or 22, and $|X'^-| = k - 2$. In both cases, X is of type 22 and $|X^-| = k - 2$, and thus $\rho_c(j^-|X) = -c$.

(t-monotonicity) For any $X \subseteq S^\pm$ with $X \neq \underline{X}$, the type of \underline{X} is 01, 02, 12, 22. If \underline{X} is of type 01, then X is of type 10. If \underline{X} is of type 02, then X is of type 11, 12, 20, 21, or 22. If \underline{X} is of type 12, then X is of type 21 or 22. If \underline{X} is of type 22, then X is also of type 22. In all cases, the t-monotonicity inequality holds for both ρ_c and $\bar{\rho}_c$.

(base polyhedra) Observe that the inequalities (25)–(29) of B_c appear in inequalities (3) of $\mathcal{B}(\rho_c)$. Hence $\mathcal{B}(\rho_c) \subseteq B_c$. To show the converse, it suffices to check that inequalities of $\mathcal{B}(\rho_c)$ are deduced from (25)–(29). This is a routine verification. For example, if X is of type 11*, then $x(X) \leq 0$ is deduced from (27). If X is of type 22, then $x(X) \leq 2c$ is deduced from substituting (26), (28), (29) for $x(X) = x(S^+) - x(S^+ \setminus X^+) + x(X^-)$. $\bar{B}_c = \mathcal{B}(\bar{\rho}_c)$ is similarly shown. \square

By Lemma 2.5, the bisubmodular functions $\beta_c, \bar{\beta}_c : 3^S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in Lemma 3.7 are as follows:

$$\beta_c(Y, Z) := \begin{cases} 2c & \text{if } |Y| \geq 2, \\ c & \text{if } |Y| = 1 \text{ and } |Z| \leq k - 2, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise (} Y = \emptyset \text{ or } |Z| \geq k - 1) \end{cases} \quad (Y, Z) \in 3^S, \quad (33)$$

$$\bar{\beta}_c(Y, Z) := \begin{cases} 2c & \text{if } |Y| \geq 2, \\ c & \text{if } |Y| = 1 \text{ and } |Z| \leq k - 2, \\ -c & \text{if } Y = \emptyset \text{ and } |Z| = k - 1, \\ -2c & \text{if } Y = \emptyset \text{ and } |Z| = k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise (} |Y| = 1 \text{ and } |Z| = k - 1, \\ & \text{or } Y = \emptyset \text{ and } |Z| \leq k - 2) \end{cases} \quad (Y, Z) \in 3^S. \quad (34)$$

4.2 Proof of sensitivity theorem (Theorem 3.12)

For the proof, we introduce a function $\pi : (\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R})^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\pi((x, y), (x', y')) := \text{dist}(x, x') - y - y' \quad ((x, y), (x', y')) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}.$$

We say that $(x, y) \in \mathbb{G}^n$ is *nonnegative* if $y_i \geq 0$ for all $i \in V$. Then a nonnegative point $(x, y) \in \mathbb{G}^n$ is a potential under a positive integral edge-cost d and a positive integer M if and only if it satisfies (9d) and

$$\pi((x_i, y_i), (x_j, y_j)) \leq 2d(ij) \quad (ij \in E). \quad (35)$$

Also, for a positive half-integral edge-cost d and a positive integer M , we say a nonnegative point $(x, y) \in \mathbb{G}^n$ is a *potential* if it satisfies (9d) and (35).

For $u, v \in \mathbb{G}$, let $u \sqcap v := \lceil (u + v)/2 \rceil$ and $u \sqcup v := \lfloor (u + v)/2 \rfloor$. The operators \sqcap, \sqcup are extended naturally to \mathbb{G}^n . We use the following lemmas.

Lemma 4.3 ([15, in Lemmas 3.7 and 3.8]). *Let $u, v, u', v' \in \mathbb{G}$.*

- (1). $\pi(u, v)$ is an integer.
- (2). $\pi((u + u')/2, (v + v')/2)$ is a half-integer and satisfies $\pi(u, v) + \pi(u', v') \geq 2\pi((u + u')/2, (v + v')/2)$.
- (3). Let $\Delta := \pi(u \sqcap u', v \sqcap v') - \pi((u + u')/2, (v + v')/2)$ and $\Delta' := \pi(u \sqcup u', v \sqcup v') - \pi((u + u')/2, (v + v')/2)$. Then $\Delta, \Delta' \in \{-1, -1/2, 0, 1/2, 1\}$.
- (4). If $\pi((u + u')/2, (v + v')/2) \geq 1/2$, then $\Delta = -\Delta'$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $p, q \in \mathbb{G}^n$ with $\|p - q\| \geq 2$. Then $p \sqcap q \notin \{p, q\}$ and $p \sqcup q \notin \{p, q\}$. Moreover, $\|p - p \sqcap q\| < \|p - q\|$ and $\|p - p \sqcup q\| < \|p - q\|$.*

Proof. Let i be any index with $\|p_i - q_i\| \geq 2$. By the definition we have $\|p_i - (p_i + q_i)/2\| = \|p_i - q_i\|/2$. Also we have $\|(p_i + q_i)/2 - (p_i \sqcap q_i)\| \leq 1/2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|p_i - p_i \sqcap q_i\| &\leq \|p_i - (p_i + q_i)/2\| + \|(p_i + q_i)/2 - (p_i \sqcap q_i)\| \\ &\leq \|p_i - q_i\|/2 + 1/2 < \|p_i - q_i\|. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, it holds that $\|p_i - p_i \sqcup q_i\| < \|p_i - q_i\|$. These imply the lemma. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.12. Define an edge-cost $d_{1/2} : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/2$ by

$$d_{1/2}(e) := \begin{cases} d(e_0) - 1/2 & \text{if } e = e_0, \\ d(e) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Our proof consists of two parts: we show that (i) there exists a minimizer $q \in \mathbb{G}^n$ of $h_{d_{1/2}, M}$ satisfying $\|p - q\| \leq 1$, and (ii) there exists a minimizer $r \in \mathbb{G}^n$ of $h_{d_1, M}$ satisfying $\|q - r\| \leq 1$.

(i) Suppose not. Let $q \in \mathbb{G}^n$ be the minimizer of $h_{d_{1/2}, M}$ having the minimum distance from p . Then $\|p - q\| \geq 2$ by the assumption. We have $h_{d, M}(p \sqcap q), h_{d, M}(p \sqcup q) \leq h_{d, M}(q) = h_{d_{1/2}, M}(q)$. Indeed, if $h_{d, M}(p \sqcap q) > h_{d, M}(q)$, then $h_{d, M}(p) + h_{d, M}(q) < h_{d, M}(p \sqcap q) + h_{d, M}(p \sqcup q)$ by the optimality of p ; a contradiction to L-convexity of $h_{d, M}$.

The nonnegativity of $p \sqcap q$ and $p \sqcup q$ is clear. Now we show that at least one of $p \sqcap q$ and $p \sqcup q$ satisfies (35) for $d_{1/2}$. Then such one is a potential under the edge-cost $d_{1/2}$ (since it obviously satisfies (9d)). Moreover, by Lemma 4.4, it is a minimizer of $h_{d_{1/2}, M}$ with a smaller distance from p than q ; a contradiction.

First we observe that both $p \sqcap q$ and $p \sqcup q$ satisfy (35) for $e \neq e_0$ since both of them are potentials under d . For $e = e_0 = ij$, we have $\pi(p_i, p_j) = 2d(ij)$ since p is not a potential under $d_{1/2}$. Also we have $\pi(q_i, q_j) \leq 2d(ij) - 1$ by the definition. Let $p' := (p + q)/2$. By Lemma 4.3 (2), we obtain $\pi(p'_i, p'_j) \leq 2d(ij) - 1/2$. If $\pi(p'_i, p'_j) < 2d(ij) - 1$, then $\pi((p \sqcap q)_i, (p \sqcap q)_j), \pi((p \sqcup q)_i, (p \sqcup q)_j) \leq 2d(ij) - 1$ by Lemma 4.3 (1)(3). Thus both $p \sqcap q$ and $p \sqcup q$ satisfy (35) for $d_{1/2}$. If $\pi(p'_i, p'_j) \geq 2d(ij) - 1$, then $\pi(p'_i, p'_j) = 2d(ij) - 1/2$ or $2d(ij) - 1$. The condition of Lemma 4.3 (4) is satisfied since $d(ij) \geq 2$. Hence at least one of $p \sqcap q$ and $p \sqcup q$ satisfies (35) for $d_{1/2}$.

(ii) The proof is almost the same as (i). The difference lies in that $h_{d_{1/2}, M}$ is not an L-convex function since $d_{1/2}$ is not integral. But we can show that for a potential r under the edge cost d_1 , both $q \sqcap r$ and $q \sqcup r$ satisfy (35) for $d_{1/2}$. Indeed, by Lemma 4.3 (2)(3) and (35) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \pi((q \sqcap r)_i, (q \sqcap r)_j) &\leq 1 + \frac{(\pi(q_i, q_j) + \pi(r_i, r_j))}{2} \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{2d(ij) - 1 + 2d(ij) - 2}{2} \leq 2d(ij) - \frac{1}{2} \end{aligned}$$

for $e_0 = ij$, and thus $\pi((q \sqcap r)_i, (q \sqcap r)_j) \leq 2d(ij) - 1$ by Lemma 4.3 (1). Similarly, $\pi((q \sqcup r)_i, (q \sqcup r)_j) \leq 2d(ij) - 1$. For other edges, since both $q \sqcap r$ and $q \sqcup r$ are potentials under d , they satisfy (35) for $d_{1/2}$. Hence we have $h_{d_{1/2}, M}(q \sqcap r), h_{d_{1/2}, M}(q \sqcup r) < \infty$.

Let $r \in \mathbb{G}^n$ be the minimizer of $h_{d_1, M}$ having the minimum distance from q . Suppose that $\|q - r\| \geq 2$. By the linearity of $\sum_{i \in V \setminus S} c_i y_i$, we have $h_{d_{1/2}, M}(q) + h_{d_{1/2}, M}(r) = h_{d_{1/2}, M}(q \sqcap r) + h_{d_{1/2}, M}(q \sqcup r)$. Then it holds that $h_{d_{1/2}, M}(q \sqcap r), h_{d_{1/2}, M}(q \sqcup r) \leq h_{d_{1/2}, M}(r)$ by the optimality of q under $d_{1/2}$. We can show that at least one of $q \sqcap r$ and $q \sqcup r$ satisfies (35) for d_1 ; its proof is almost the same as (1). Hence by Lemma 4.4 it is a minimizer of $h_{d_1, M}$ with a smaller distance from q than r ; a contradiction. \square

4.3 Finding a steepest descent direction (Proof of Lemma 3.10)

In this subsection, we show that a steepest descent direction at the current potential $p = (x, y) \in \mathbb{G}^n$ can be obtained from a maximum violating cut of an instance $((U, \tilde{E}; \partial), \underline{c}, \bar{c}, \beta)$, where β is defined by (23) (and (33)(34)). The proof is almost a straightforward extension of that given in [15], but is technically and notationally simplified.

For $(Y, Z) \in 3^U$ and $i \in V$, let $(Y, Z)_i := (Y \cap U_i, Z \cap U_i)$. We say that a cut $(Y, Z) \in 3^U$ is *movable* if it satisfies the following condition:

- For $s \in S$, it holds that $(Y, Z)_s = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$.
- For $i \in V \setminus S$ with $y_i = 0$, it holds that $(Y, Z)_i$ is one of

$$(U_i, \emptyset), (\{i^t\}, \emptyset), (\{i^t\}, U_i \setminus \{i^t\}), (\emptyset, \emptyset), \quad (36)$$

where $t \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ if $x_i = 0$, and $t \in \{0, +\}$ if $x_i \neq 0$.

- For $i \in V \setminus S$ with $y_i > 0$, it holds that $(Y, Z)_i$ is one of (36) and

$$(\emptyset, U_i \setminus \{i^t\}), (\emptyset, U_i), \quad (37)$$

where $t \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ if $x_i = 0$, and $t \in \{0, +\}$ if $x_i \neq 0$.

Recall that a violating cut $(Y, Z) \in 3^U$ is called maximum if $\kappa(Y, Z) - \beta(Y, Z)$ is maximum among all violating cuts.

Lemma 4.5. *From a maximum violating cut $(Y, Z) \in 3^U$, we can obtain a movable maximum violating cut by the following procedure:*

- For each $s \in S$, if $Z \cap U_s \neq \emptyset$, then replace Z by $Z \setminus U_s$.
- For each $i \in V \setminus S$ with $y_i = 0$ and $Y \cap U_i = \emptyset$, if $Z \cap U_i \neq \emptyset$, then replace Z by $Z \setminus U_i$.
- For each $i \in V \setminus S$ with $x_i = 0$ and $|Y \cap U_i| \leq 1$, if $1 \leq |Z \cap U_i| \leq k - 2$, then replace Z by $Z \setminus U_i$.
- For each $i \in V \setminus S$ with $x_i = 0$ and $|Y \cap U_i| \geq 2$, replace (Y, Z) by $(Y \cup U_i, Z \setminus U_i)$.

Proof. Let $(Y, Z) \in 3^U$ be a maximum violating cut. Then we have $\kappa(Y, Z) > \beta(Y, Z) > -\infty$. If $Y \cap U_s \neq \emptyset$ for $s \in S$, then $\kappa(Y, Z) = -\infty$; a contradiction. Thus $Y \cap U_s = \emptyset$. If $Z \cap U_s \neq \emptyset$ for $s \in S$, then the removal of s^0 from Z does not change $\kappa(Y, Z)$ (and $\beta(Y, Z)$). Hence after the procedure (A), (Y, Z) is still a maximum violating cut and $(Y, Z)_s = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$.

Consider a nonterminal node $i \in V \setminus S$ with $x_i \neq 0$. If $y_i > 0$, then any pair of distinct subsets of U_i satisfies the condition of movability. So we assume $y_i = 0$. If $i^0 \in Z$ and $i^+ \notin Y$, then the removal of i^0 from Z does not change $\kappa(Y, Z)$. Similarly, if $i^+ \in Z$ and $i^0 \notin Y$, then the removal of i^+ from Z does not change $\kappa(Y, Z)$. Hence after the procedure (B), (Y, Z) is still a maximum violating cut and $(Y, Z)_i$ is one of (36).

Consider a nonterminal node $i \in V \setminus S$ with $x_i = 0$ and $y_i = 0$. If $Y \cap U_i = \emptyset$ and $Z \cap U_i \neq \emptyset$, then the removal of $Z \cap U_i$ from Z does not change $\kappa(Y, Z)$ and $\beta(Y, Z)$ by (33). Similarly, if $1 \leq |Z \cap U_i| \leq k - 2$, then the removal of $Z \cap U_i$ from Z does not change $\kappa(Y, Z)$ and $\beta(Y, Z)$. If $2 \leq |Y \cap U_i| \leq k - 1$, then replacing Y with $Y \cup U_i$ and Z with $Z \setminus U_i$ does not change $\kappa(Y, Z)$ and $\beta(Y, Z)$. Hence after the procedure (B)(C)(D), (Y, Z) is still a maximum violating cut and $(Y, Z)_i$ is one of (36).

Consider a nonterminal node $i \in V \setminus S$ with $x_i = 0$ and $y_i > 0$. As with the previous case, if $1 \leq |Z \cap U_i| \leq k - 2$, then the removal of $Z \cap U_i$ from Z does not change $\kappa(Y, Z)$ and $\bar{\beta}(Y, Z)$ by (34). If $|Y \cap U_i| \geq 2$ and $Z \cap U_i = \emptyset$, then replacing Y with $Y \cup U_i$ does not change $\kappa(Y, Z)$ and $\bar{\beta}(Y, Z)$. Hence after the procedure (C)(D), (Y, Z) is still a maximum violating cut and $(Y, Z)_i$ is one of (36) and (37). \square




Figure 4: The correspondence between $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},i}$ and \mathcal{F}_i^+ .

Next we show that there is a bijection between a subset of all movable cuts and a subset of neighbors $\mathcal{F}_p \cup \mathcal{I}_p$ of the current potential $p = (x, y)$; recall (2) in Section 2.1. Then it turns out that the movable maximum violating cut gives rise to a steepest descent direction at $p = (x, y)$; see Figure 4.

For $x = (x, s) \in \mathbb{T}$, and $\varepsilon \in \{1/2, 1\}$, we use the following simplified notation.

$$\begin{aligned} x + \varepsilon_t &:= (x + \varepsilon, t) \quad \text{if } x \neq 0 \text{ and } t = s, \text{ or } x = 0, \\ x + \varepsilon_0 &:= (x - \varepsilon, s) \quad \text{if } x \geq \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Let $p_i + (\varepsilon_t, \delta) := (x_i + \varepsilon_t, y_i + \delta)$. We divide $\mathbb{G} := \mathbb{G}_e \cup \mathbb{G}_p \cup \mathbb{G}'_e \cup \mathbb{G}'_o$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{G}_e &= \{u \in \mathbb{G} \mid u : \text{even}\}, \\ \mathbb{G}_o &= \{u \in \mathbb{G} \mid u : \text{odd}\}, \\ \mathbb{G}'_e &= \{u \in \mathbb{G} \mid u : \text{non-integral, and } u + ((1/2)_0, 1/2) : \text{even}\}, \\ \mathbb{G}'_o &= \{u \in \mathbb{G} \mid u : \text{non-integral, and } u + ((1/2)_0, 1/2) : \text{odd}\}. \end{aligned}$$

In Figure 1, the points \mathbb{G}'_e and \mathbb{G}'_o are filled in black and white, respectively. Then let $U_{\mathcal{I}}$ and $U_{\mathcal{F}}$ be the subsets of U defined by

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\mathcal{I}} &:= \{i^0 \mid p_i \in \mathbb{G}'_e\} \cup \{i^+ \mid p_i \in \mathbb{G}'_o\} \cup \bigcup_{p_i \in \mathbb{G}_o} U_i, \\ U_{\mathcal{F}} &:= \{i^+ \mid p_i \in \mathbb{G}'_e\} \cup \{i^0 \mid p_i \in \mathbb{G}'_o\} \cup \bigcup_{p_i \in \mathbb{G}_e} U_i. \end{aligned}$$

A movable cut (Y, Z) is said to be \mathcal{F} -movable if $Y \cap U_{\mathcal{I}} = Z \cap U_{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$, and be \mathcal{I} -movable if $Y \cap U_{\mathcal{F}} = Z \cap U_{\mathcal{F}} = \emptyset$. We define the set $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq 3^U$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}} &:= \{(Y, Z) \in 3^U \mid (Y, Z) : \mathcal{F}\text{-movable cut}\}, \\ \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}} &:= \{(Y, Z) \in 3^U \mid (Y, Z) : \mathcal{I}\text{-movable cut}\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $(Y, Z) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}$, let

$$p^{Y,Z}(i) := \begin{cases} p_i + ((1/2)_t, 1/2) & \text{if } (Y, Z)_i = (\{i^t\}, \emptyset), \\ p_i + ((1/2)_t, -1/2) & \text{if } (Y, Z)_i = (\emptyset, U_i \setminus \{i^t\}), \\ p_i + (1_t, 0) & \text{if } (Y, Z)_i = (\{i^t\}, U_i \setminus \{i^t\}), \\ p_i + (0, 1) & \text{if } (Y, Z)_i = (U_i, \emptyset), \\ p_i + (0, -1) & \text{if } (Y, Z)_i = (\emptyset, U_i), \\ p_i & \text{if } (Y, Z)_i = (\emptyset, \emptyset) \end{cases} \quad (38)$$

for each nonterminal node $i \in V \setminus S$, and $p^{Y,Z}(s) := ((M, s), 0)$ for each terminal $s \in S$. Recall that $(x', y') \in \mathbb{G}^n$ is said to be nonnegative if $y'_i \geq 0$ for all $i \in V$. Let $\mathcal{F}_p^+ := \{q \in \mathcal{F}_p \mid q : \text{nonnegative}\}$ and $\mathcal{I}_p^+ := \{q \in \mathcal{I}_p \mid q : \text{nonnegative}\}$.

Lemma 4.6. (1). *The map $(Y, Z) \mapsto p^{Y,Z}$ is a bijection from $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}$ to \mathcal{F}_p^+ and from $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}$ to \mathcal{I}_p^+ .*

(2). *For $(Y, Z) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}$, it holds*

$$h(p^{Y,Z}) - h(p) = -\frac{\kappa(Y, Z) - \beta(Y, Z)}{2}, \quad (39)$$

where h is defined in (24).

(3). *Let $(Y_{\mathcal{F}}, Z_{\mathcal{F}}) := (Y \cap U_{\mathcal{F}}, Z \cap U_{\mathcal{F}})$ and $(Y_{\mathcal{I}}, Z_{\mathcal{I}}) := (Y \cap U_{\mathcal{I}}, Z \cap U_{\mathcal{I}})$ for a movable cut $(Y, Z) \in \mathfrak{3}^U$. Then $(Y_{\mathcal{F}}, Z_{\mathcal{F}})$ is \mathcal{F} -movable, $(Y_{\mathcal{I}}, Z_{\mathcal{I}})$ is \mathcal{I} -movable, and they satisfy*

$$\kappa(Y, Z) - \beta(Y, Z) = \kappa(Y_{\mathcal{F}}, Z_{\mathcal{F}}) - \beta(Y_{\mathcal{F}}, Z_{\mathcal{F}}) + \kappa(Y_{\mathcal{I}}, Z_{\mathcal{I}}) - \beta(Y_{\mathcal{I}}, Z_{\mathcal{I}}).$$

Conversely, for any \mathcal{F} -movable cut (Y', Z') and \mathcal{I} -movable cut (Y'', Z'') , the cut $(Y' \cup Y'', Z' \cup Z'')$ is a movable cut.

We first prove Lemma 3.10 by using Lemma 4.6.

Proof of Lemma 3.10. For a potential p , we construct the bidirected network $((U, \tilde{E}; \partial), \underline{c}, \bar{c})$ as in Section 3.3, and define a reducible bisubmodular function β by (23). By the assumption, there is no feasible bisubmodular flow of this instance. Then by Theorem 2.7 and (25)–(30), we can obtain a maximum violating cut $(Y^*, Z^*) \in \mathfrak{3}^U$ in $O(\text{SF}(kn, m, k))$ time. Applying the procedure of Lemma 4.5, we obtain a movable maximum violating cut (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Z}) . Then by Lemma 4.6, a potential $p^{\tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{Z}_{\mathcal{F}}}$ is a minimizer of h over \mathcal{F}_p , and a potential $p^{\tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}, \tilde{Z}_{\mathcal{I}}}$ is a minimizer of h over \mathcal{I}_p . Thus we can obtain a steepest descent direction at p by comparing $h(p^{\tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{Z}_{\mathcal{F}}})$ and $h(p^{\tilde{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}, \tilde{Z}_{\mathcal{I}}})$. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.6. (1) We claim that (38) is a bijection from $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},i} := \{(Y, Z)_i \mid (Y, Z) : \mathcal{F}\text{-movable}\}$ to $\mathcal{F}_i^+ := \{q \in \mathbb{G} \mid q \succeq p_i, q : \text{nonnegative}\}$. Suppose that p_i is odd, which implies $U_i \subseteq U_{\mathcal{I}}$. Then it holds that $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},i} = \{(\emptyset, \emptyset)\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_i^+ = \{p_i\}$. Thus the claim follows. Suppose that p_i is even, which implies $U_i \subseteq U_{\mathcal{F}}$. Then we can check the claim from Figure 4 for the case $y_i > 0$. For the case $y_i = 0$, we can see the correspondence similarly. Suppose that p_i is non-integral. Note that in this case we have $y_i > 0$. If $p_i \in \mathbb{G}'_e$, we have $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},i} = \{(\emptyset, \emptyset), (\{i^+\}, \emptyset), (\emptyset, \{i^+\})\}$, and $\mathcal{F}_i^+ = \{p_i, p_i + ((1/2)_+, 1/2), p_i + ((1/2)_0, -1/2)\}$. If $p_i \in \mathbb{G}'_o$, we have $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},i} = \{(\emptyset, \emptyset), (\{i^0\}, \emptyset), (\emptyset, \{i^0\})\}$, and $\mathcal{F}_i^+ = \{p_i, p_i + ((1/2)_0, 1/2), p_i + ((1/2)_+, -1/2)\}$. Thus the claim follows. We can similarly show that (38) is a bijection between $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I},i} := \{(Y, Z)_i \mid (Y, Z) : \mathcal{I}\text{-movable}\}$ and $\mathcal{I}_i^+ := \{q \in \mathbb{G} \mid q \preceq p_i, q : \text{nonnegative}\}$.

(2) Let $p' := (x', y') := p^{Y, Z}$. First we show that $h(p') < \infty$ (i.e., p' is a potential) if and only if $\kappa(Y, Z) > -\infty$.

Suppose that $h(p') < \infty$. Consider an edge $e \in E_-$. Then by $d_e > 0$, there exists two nodes i and j with $x_j \neq 0$ such that $e = i^t j^0$ ($t \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ if $x_i = 0$, and $t \in \{0, +\}$ if $x_i \neq 0$). We show that if one of i^t and j^0 belongs to Z , then the other belongs to Y . Suppose that $i^t \in Z$. Recall that $\pi(p_i, p_j) := \text{dist}(x_i, x_j) - y_i - y_j$. By the definition of E_- , we have $\pi(p_i, p_j) = 2d_{ij}$. By $i^t \in Z$ and (38), x'_i goes away from x_j or y'_i decreases, and hence $\pi(p'_i, p_j) = \pi(p_i, p_j) + 1$. Since p' is also a potential, we must have $\pi(p'_i, p'_j) = \pi(p'_i, p_j) - 1$. Thus p'_j must be $p_j + ((1/2)_0, 1/2)$, $p_j + (1_0, 0)$, or $p_j + (0, 1)$. In all cases, j^0 belongs to Y . In the case $j^0 \in Z$, we can also prove $i^t \in Y$ similarly. Now it follows that $\kappa(Y, Z) > -\infty$ from the above and $Y \cap U_s = Z \cap U_s = \emptyset$ for each $s \in S$.

Conversely, suppose that $\kappa(Y, Z) > -\infty$. Since p' is nonnegative, it suffices to show that $\pi(p'_i, p'_j) \leq 2d_{ij}$ for each edge $ij \in E$. We assume that $ij \in E$ is replaced to $i^+ j^0 \in \tilde{E}$. Since both replacements $p_i \rightarrow p'_i$ and $p_j \rightarrow p'_j$ change the value of $\pi(p_i, p_j)$ at most one, we may consider the case of $\pi(p_i, p_j) = 2d_{ij}$ or $2d_{ij} - 1$ by the integrality (Lemma 4.3 (1)). For the case $\pi(p_i, p_j) = 2d_{ij}$, the argument is similar to the above. Indeed, if $\pi(p'_i, p_j) - \pi(p_i, p_j) = 1$, then $i^+ \in Z$ and hence $j^0 \in Y$. So we have $\pi(p'_i, p'_j) - \pi(p'_i, p_j) = -1$.

For the case $\pi(p_i, p_j) = 2d_{ij} - 1$, it is sufficient to show that $\pi(p'_i, p'_j) \neq 2d_{ij} + 1$. Suppose not. Then $p_i \neq p'_i$, $p_j \neq p'_j$. Suppose that both p_i and p_j are integral. By definitions, $\pi(p_i, p_j)$ and $\|p_i - p_j\|$ have the same parity (odd or even), and thus $\|p_i - p_j\|$ is odd. Then exactly one of p_i and p_j is odd and the other is even. Hence at least one of $p_i = p'_i$ and $p_j = p'_j$ must hold; a contradiction. Suppose that p_i is non-integral and p_j is integral. Then it holds $p'_i = p_i + ((1/2)_0, -1/2)$. Since $\pi(p'_i, p_j)$ is even, by the same argument as above, p'_i has the same parity as p_j . This implies $p'_j = p_j$; a contradiction. In the case where p_i is integral and p_j is non-integral, a contradiction can be derived similarly. Suppose that both p_i and p_j are non-integral. Then it holds that $p'_i = p_i + ((1/2)_0, -1/2)$ and $p'_j = p_j + ((1/2)_+, -1/2)$. Also by $\pi(p'_i, p'_j)$ is odd, one of p'_i and p'_j is odd and the other is even; a contradiction.

For other cases, i.e., $ij \in E$ is replaced to $i^s j^0$ or $i^0 j^0$, we can similarly show that $\pi(p'_i, p'_j) \leq 2d_{ij}$. In fact, under the restriction of \mathbb{G} in $((\mathbb{R}_+ \times \{s'\}) \cup (\mathbb{R}_+ \times \{s\})) \times \mathbb{R} \subseteq \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$, where $p_i = ((x_i, s'), y_i)$ and $p_j = ((x_j, s), y_j)$, we can say the above argument for these cases by a slight modification. Thus we have $h(p') < \infty$.

Finally we show (39) for $(Y, Z) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}$ with $h(p') < \infty$ and $\kappa(Y, Z) > -\infty$. By the definition of $((U, \tilde{E}; \partial), \underline{c}, \bar{c})$, we can check that twice the value of the right hand side of (39) is equal to

$$\sum_{i: x_i=0, y_i=0} \beta_{c_i}((Y, Z)_i) + \sum_{i: x_i=0, y_i>0} \bar{\beta}_{c_i}((Y, Z)_i) + \sum_{i: x_i \neq 0} c_i(|Y \cap U_i| - |Z \cap U_i|).$$

Indeed, for $i \in V$ with $x_i \neq 0$, the case $|Z \cap U_i| > |Y \cap U_i|$ only occurs when $y_i > 0$. Thus $\underline{c}(i^0 i^+) = c_i$ by the definition. We can also check that each term is equal to $2c_i(y'_i - y_i)$ by the definitions. Thus we have (39).

(3) Let $(Y, Z) \in 3^U$ be a movable cut. For a nonterminal node $i \in V \setminus S$ with p_i is integral, U_i is completely contained in $U_{\mathcal{F}}$ or $U_{\mathcal{I}}$. We consider $i \in V \setminus S$ such that p_i is non-integral. Then it must hold $y_i > 0$. Thus any subset of U_i satisfies the condition of movability. Hence both $(Y_{\mathcal{F}}, Z_{\mathcal{F}})$ and $(Y_{\mathcal{I}}, Z_{\mathcal{I}})$ are movable. The converse is obvious.

Finally, we show the equality. It is clear that $\beta(Y, Z) = \beta(Y_{\mathcal{F}}, Z_{\mathcal{F}}) + \beta(Y_{\mathcal{I}}, Z_{\mathcal{I}})$ by definition. The contribution of edges in E_- to the value of $\kappa(Y, Z)$ is $-\sum_{i: x_i \neq 0} c_i(|Y \cap U_i| - |Z \cap U_i|)$; thus the equality is clear. So it suffices to consider edges in E_+ . Fix an edge $i^+ j^0 \in E_+$. (For other cases, the similar argument holds.) Since $\bar{c}(i^+ j^0) = \infty$, we check that this capacity contributes to $\kappa(Y, Z)$ if and only if it contributes to $\kappa(Y_{\mathcal{F}}, Z_{\mathcal{F}})$ or $\kappa(Y_{\mathcal{I}}, Z_{\mathcal{I}})$. We have $\text{dist}(x_i, x_j) \geq \pi(p_i, p_j) = 2d_{ij} \geq 2$ and $\pi(p_i, p_j)$ is even. If p_i and p_j are both integral, then p_i has the same

parity (odd or even) as p_j since the parities of $\pi(p_i, p_j)$ and $\|p_i - p_j\|$ are the same. Thus $U_i \cup U_j$ is contained in $U_{\mathcal{I}}$ or $U_{\mathcal{F}}$. If p_i is non-integral and p_j is integral, then $p_i + ((1/2)_0, 1/2)$ has the same parity as p_j since $\pi(p_i + ((1/2)_0, 1/2), p_j) = \pi(p_i, p_j)$ is even. Thus $\{i^+\} \cup U_j$ is contained in $U_{\mathcal{I}}$ or $U_{\mathcal{F}}$. If p_i is integral and p_j is non-integral, we can similarly show that $U_i \cup \{j^0\}$ is contained in $U_{\mathcal{I}}$ or $U_{\mathcal{F}}$. If p_i and p_j are both non-integral, then both $p_i + ((1/2)_0, 1/2)$ and $p_j + ((1/2)_+, 1/2)$ have the same parity. Thus $\{i^+, j^0\}$ is contained in $U_{\mathcal{I}}$ or $U_{\mathcal{F}}$. In any cases, $\langle \partial(i^+ j^0), \chi_{Y,Z} \rangle < 0$ if and only if $\langle \partial(i^+ j^0), \chi_{Y_{\mathcal{F}}, Z_{\mathcal{F}}} \rangle < 0$ or $\langle \partial(i^+ j^0), \chi_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}, Z_{\mathcal{I}}} \rangle < 0$. \square

Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP17K00029.

References

- [1] Ando, K., Fujishige, S., Naitoh, T.: Balanced bisubmodular systems and bidirected flows. *Journal of the Operations Research Society of Japan* **40**(3), 437–447 (1997)
- [2] Babenko, M.A., Karzanov, A.V.: A scaling algorithm for the maximum node-capacitated multiflow problem. In: *Proceedings of the 16th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms*. pp. 124–135. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg (2008)
- [3] Babenko, M.A., Karzanov, A.V.: Min-cost multiflows in node-capacitated undirected networks. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization* **24**(3), 202–228 (2012)
- [4] Cherkassky, B.V.: A solution of a problem of multicommodity flows in a network. *Ekonomika i Matematicheskie Metody* **13**, 143–151 (1977), in Russian
- [5] Frank, A.: Finding feasible vectors of Edmonds-Giles polyhedra. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* **36**(3), 221–239 (1984)
- [6] Frank, A.: *Connections in Combinatorial Optimization*. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2011)
- [7] Fujishige, S.: *Submodular Functions and Optimization*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2nd edition edn. (2005)
- [8] Fujishige, S., Iwata, S.: Algorithms for submodular flows. *IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems* **E83D**(3) (2000)
- [9] Fujishige, S., Zhang, X.: New algorithms for the intersection problem of submodular systems. *Japan Journal of Industrial and Applied Mathematics* **9**, 369–382 (1992)
- [10] Garg, N., Vazirani, V.V., Yannakakis, M.: Multiway cuts in node weighted graphs. *Journal of Algorithms* **50**(1), 49–61 (2004)
- [11] Goldberg, A.V., Karzanov, A.V.: Scaling methods for finding a maximum free multiflow of minimum cost. *Mathematics of Operations Research* **22**(1), 90–109 (1997)
- [12] Hirai, H.: Half-integrality of node-capacitated multiflows and tree-shaped facility locations on trees. *Mathematical Programming, Series A* **137**(1), 503–530 (2013)
- [13] Hirai, H.: L-extendable functions and a proximity scaling algorithm for minimum cost multiflow problem. *Discrete Optimization* **18**, 1–37 (2015)

- [14] Hirai, H.: Discrete convex functions on graphs and their algorithmic applications. In: Fukunaga, T., Kawarabayashi, K. (eds.) *Combinatorial Optimization and Graph Algorithms, Communications of NII Shonan Meetings*, pp. 67–100. Springer Nature, Singapore (2017)
- [15] Hirai, H.: A dual descent algorithm for node-capacitated multifold problems and its applications. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms* **15**(1), 15:1–15:24 (2018)
- [16] Hirai, H.: L-convexity on graph structures. *Journal of the Operations Research Society of Japan* **61**(1), 71–109 (2018)
- [17] Karzanov, A.V.: A minimum cost maximum multifold problem. In: *Combinatorial Methods for Flow Problems*, pp. 138–156. Institute for System Studies, Moscow (1979), in Russian
- [18] Karzanov, A.V.: Maximization over the intersection of two compatible greedy-polyhedra. Research Report 91732-OR, Institut für Diskrete Mathematik, Universität Bonn (1991)
- [19] Karzanov, A.V.: Minimum cost multiflows in undirected networks. *Mathematical Programming* **66**(1), 313–325 (1994)
- [20] Karzanov, A.V.: On 0, ± 1 matrices, odd vectors, and bisubmodular polyhedra. *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **422**(1), 17–21 (2007)
- [21] Lovász, L.: On some connectivity properties of eulerian graphs. *Acta Mathematica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* **28**(1–2), 129–138 (1976)
- [22] Murota, K.: *Discrete Convex Analysis*. SIAM, Philadelphia (2003)
- [23] Nakamura, M.: An intersection theorem for universal polymatroids: Universal polymatroids (ii). *Scientific Papers of the College of Arts and Sciences University of Tokyo* **40**(2), 95–100 (1990)
- [24] Pap, G.: Some new results on node-capacitated packing of A-paths. In: *Proceedings of the Thirty-ninth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. pp. 599–604. ACM (2007)
- [25] Pap, G.: Strongly polynomial time solvability of integral and half-integral node-capacitated multifold problems. EGRES Technical Report TR-2008-12, Egerváry Research Group (2008)
- [26] Schrijver, A.: *Combinatorial Optimization—Polyhedra and Efficiency*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2003)
- [27] Vazirani, V.V.: *Approximation Algorithms*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York (2003)