

# Checking the admissibility of odd-vertex pairings is hard

Florian Hörsch

June 15, 2022

## Abstract

Nash-Williams proved that every graph has a well-balanced orientation. A key ingredient in his proof is admissible odd-vertex pairings. We show that for two slightly different definitions of admissible odd-vertex pairings, deciding whether a given odd-vertex pairing is admissible is co-NP-complete. This resolves a question of Frank. We also show that deciding whether a given graph has an orientation that satisfies arbitrary local arc-connectivity requirements is NP-complete.

## 1 Introduction

This article proves some negative results which are related to the strong orientation theorem of Nash-Williams.

Our graphs are undirected unless specified otherwise. Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph. For some disjoint  $X, Y \subseteq V$ , we use  $d_G(X, Y)$  for the number of edges that are incident to one vertex in  $X$  and one vertex in  $Y$ . We use  $d_G(X)$  for  $d_G(X, V - X)$ . For some integer  $k$ , we say that  $X$  is *k-edge-connected* if  $d_G(X) \geq k$  for all nonempty  $X \subset V$ . We abbreviate 1-edge-connected to *connected*. A *connected component* of  $G$  is a maximal connected subgraph. For some subgraph  $G'$  of  $G$ , we denote by  $G'[X]$  the subgraph of  $G'$  induced by  $X \cap V(G')$ . For a single vertex  $v$ , we use  $d_G(v)$  for  $d_G(\{v\})$  and call this number the *degree* of  $v$ . We call  $G$  *eulerian* if the degree of every vertex in  $V$  is even. For  $s, t \in V$  and  $X \subseteq V$ , we say that  $X$  is an  *$s\bar{t}$ -set* if  $s \in X$  and  $t \in V - X$ . We use  $\lambda_G(s, t)$  for the minimum of  $d_G(X)$  over all  $s\bar{t}$ -sets  $X$ . By the undirected edge version of Menger's theorem [6], this is the same as the maximum size of a set of edge-disjoint  $st$ -paths in  $G$ . For some nonempty  $X \subset V$ , we use  $R_G(X)$  for  $\max\{2\lfloor \frac{\lambda_G(s, t)}{2} \rfloor : X \text{ is an } s\bar{t}\text{-set}\}$ . We

define  $R_G(\emptyset) = R_G(V) = 0$ . For two graphs  $G_1 = (V, E_1)$  and  $G_2 = (V, E_2)$  on the same vertex set  $V$ , we use  $G_1 + G_2$  for  $(V, E_1 \cup E_2)$ .

Let  $D = (V, A)$  be a directed graph. For some  $X \subseteq V$ , we use  $d_D^-(X)$  for the number of arcs in  $A$  entering  $X$  and  $d_D^+(X)$  for  $d_D^-(V - X)$ . For a single vertex  $v$ , we use  $d_D^-(v)$  and  $d_D^+(v)$  for  $d_D^-(\{v\})$  and  $d_D^+(\{v\})$ , respectively. We call  $D$  *eulerian* if  $d_D^-(v) = d_D^+(v)$  for all  $v \in V$ . For  $s, t \in V$ , we use  $\lambda_D(s, t)$  for the minimum of  $d_D^+(X)$  over all  $s\bar{t}$ -sets  $X$ . By the directed arc version of Menger's theorem [6], this is the same as the maximum size of a set of arc-disjoint  $st$ -paths in  $D$ . For two directed graphs  $D_1 = (V, A_1)$  and  $D_2 = (V, A_2)$  on the same vertex set  $V$ , we use  $D_1 + D_2$  for  $(V, A_1 \cup A_2)$ . A directed graph  $\vec{G}$  that is obtained from a graph  $G = (V, E)$  by choosing an orientation for each of its edges is called an *orientation* of  $G$ . The orientation  $\vec{G}$  is called *well-balanced* if  $\lambda_{\vec{G}}(s, t) \geq \lfloor \frac{\lambda_G(s, t)}{2} \rfloor$  for all  $s, t \in V$ .

In 1960, Nash-Williams proved the following celebrated theorem on well-balanced orientations [7].

**Theorem 1.** *Every graph has a well-balanced orientation.*

The key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1 is the consideration of a new graph  $F$  on  $V$  such that  $F$  is a perfect matching on the vertices in  $V$  that are of odd degree in  $G$ . We call such a graph an *odd-vertex pairing* of  $G$ . Observe that if  $F$  is an odd-vertex pairing of  $G$ , then  $G + F$  is eulerian. Nash-Williams proves the existence of an odd-vertex pairing  $F$  such that for every eulerian orientation  $\vec{G} + \vec{F}$  of  $G + F$ , the restricted orientation  $\vec{G}$  is a well-balanced orientation of  $G$ . We call an odd-vertex pairing  $F$  with this property *orientation-admissible*.

Actually, Nash-Williams proves the existence of an odd-vertex pairing with a somewhat stronger property: the odd-vertex pairings he finds satisfy the cut condition  $d_G(X) - d_F(X) \geq R_G(X)$  for all  $X \subseteq V$ . We call such an odd-vertex pairing *cut-admissible*. It is easy to prove that every cut-admissible odd-vertex pairing is orientation-admissible. On the other hand, not every orientation-admissible odd-vertex pairing is cut-admissible. An example can be found in Figure 1.

The main difficulty in the proof of Theorem 1 is to show that for every graph, there is a cut-admissible odd-vertex pairing. This part of the proof is quite involved.

Király and Szigeti use the existence of an orientation-admissible pairing to prove the existence of well-balanced orientations with some extra properties [5]. Nevertheless, most algorithmic considerations related to well-balanced orientations remain hard to deal with due to the difficulty of the proof of Theorem 1. In [1], Bernáth et al. provide a collection of negative results for questions concerning well-balanced orientations with extra properties.




Figure 1: The edges of  $G$  are marked in solid and those of  $F$  are marked in dashed. The set  $X$  shows that  $F$  is not cut-admissible but  $F$  is trivially orientation-admissible.

This naturally raises the following question which is asked by Frank in [2] as Research Problem 9.8.1. For a given odd-vertex pairing, can its admissibility properties be checked efficiently? The purpose of this work is to give a negative answer to this question. More formally, we consider the following two problems:

**CUT-ADMISSIBILITY (CA):**

Instance: A graph  $G$  and an odd-vertex pairing  $F$  of  $G$ .

Question: Is  $F$  cut-admissible in  $G$ ?

**ORIENTATION-ADMISSIBILITY (OA):**

Instance: A graph  $G$  and an odd-vertex pairing  $F$  of  $G$ .

Question: Is  $F$  orientation-admissible in  $G$ ?

While it is not clear whether CA and OA are in  $NP$ , they can easily be seen to be in  $co-NP$ . As our main results, we prove the following two theorems.

**Theorem 2.** *CA is co-NP-complete.*

**Theorem 3.** *OA is co-NP-complete.*

In the last part of this article, we consider another problem on graph orientation. Given a graph  $G$ , we aim to find an orientation of  $G$  that meets arbitrary local arc-connectivity requirements. Formally, we consider the following problem:

**LOCAL ARC-CONNECTIVITY ORIENTATION (LACO):**

Instance: A graph  $G$  and a requirement function  $r : V^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ .

Question: Is there an orientation  $\vec{G}$  of  $G$  such that  $\lambda_{\vec{G}}(u, v) \geq r(u, v)$  for all  $u, v \in V^2$ ?

We were surprised not to find any previous work on the algorithmic tractability of this problem. By a reduction using one of the negative results in [1], we fill this gap.

**Theorem 4.** *LACO is NP-complete.*

While the proof of Theorems 2 and 3 is slightly involved, the proof of Theorem 4 is quite simple.

In Section 2, we give some preparatory results for the proof of Theorems 2 and 3. In Section 3, we give a reduction that serves as a proof for both Theorem 2 and Theorem 3. Finally, in Section 4, we prove Theorem 4.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section, we collect some preliminary results we need in our reduction.

### 2.1 A modified MAXCUT problem

The unweighted MAXCUT problem can be formulated as follows:

**MAXCUT:**

Instance: A graph  $H = (V, E)$  and a positive integer  $k$ .

Question: Is there some  $X \subseteq V$  such that  $d_H(X) > k$ ?

A proof of the following theorem can be found in [4].

**Theorem 5.** *MAXCUT is NP-hard.*

For our reduction in Section 3, we need a slightly adapted version of MAXCUT.

**ADAPTED MAXCUT (AMAXCUT):**

Instance: A graph  $H = (V, E)$  such that  $|E| \geq 6$  is even and  $d_H(v)$  is even for every  $v \in V$  and an even integer  $k$ .

Question: Is there some  $X \subseteq V$  such that  $d_H(X) > k$ ?

**Lemma 1.** *AMAXCUT is NP-hard.*

*Proof.* We show this by a reduction from MAXCUT. Let  $(H = (V, E), k)$  be an instance of MAXCUT. We may obviously suppose that  $|E| \geq 3$ . Let  $H' = (V, E')$  be the graph which is obtained from  $H$  by replacing every edge of  $E$  by 2 parallel copies of itself. Observe that  $|E'| = 2|E| \geq 6$  is even and

$d_{H'}(v) = 2d_H(v)$  is even for all  $v \in V$ . Further, for every  $X \subseteq V$ , we have  $d_{H'}(X) = 2d_H(X)$ . This yields that  $(H, k)$  is a positive instance of MAXCUT if and only if  $(H', 2k)$  is a positive instance of AMAXCUT.  $\square$

## 2.2 Augmented $(\alpha, \beta)$ -grids

In this subsection, we introduce a class of grid-like graphs which will be used as a gadget in our reduction. A *grid* is a graph on ground set  $\{1, \dots, \mu\} \times \{1, \dots, \nu\}$  for some positive integers  $\mu, \nu$  where two vertices  $(i_1, j_1)$  and  $(i_2, j_2)$  are adjacent if  $|i_1 - i_2| + |j_1 - j_2| = 1$ . For some  $i \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ , we call  $\{(i, 1), \dots, (i, \nu)\}$  the *row*  $i$ . Similarly, for some  $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$ , we call  $\{(1, j), \dots, (\mu, j)\}$  the *column*  $j$ .

In order to define augmented  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -grids for an odd integer  $\alpha \geq 3$  and an integer  $\beta \geq 2$ , we first consider a grid with  $\alpha\beta$  rows and  $\frac{\alpha+1}{2}$  columns. Now, for some  $1 \leq \gamma \leq \beta$ , let  $L_\gamma = \{l_1, \dots, l_\gamma\} = \{(\alpha, 1), (2\alpha, 1), \dots, (\gamma\alpha, 1)\}$  and  $P_\gamma = \{p_1, \dots, p_\gamma\} = \{(\alpha, \frac{\alpha+1}{2}), (2\alpha, \frac{\alpha+1}{2}), \dots, (\gamma\alpha, \frac{\alpha+1}{2})\}$ . We use  $L$  for  $L_\beta$  and  $P$  for  $P_\beta$ . We now create the *augmented  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -grid*  $W$  by adding an edge from  $(1, j)$  to  $(\alpha\beta, j)$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, \frac{\alpha+1}{2}$  and by adding parallel edges in the columns 1 and  $\frac{\alpha+1}{2}$  in a way that none of them is incident to a vertex in  $L \cup P$  and that every vertex in  $V(W) - (L \cup P)$  has degree 4 in  $W$ . Observe that this is possible because both  $\alpha - 1$  and  $\alpha + 1$  are even. An example can be found in Figure 2.




Figure 2: An augmented  $(5, 3)$ -grid.

Later, when  $W$  is not clear from the context, we use  $L(W)$  for the set  $L$  etc. We now collect some properties of augmented  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -grids.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $W = (V, E)$  be an augmented  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -grid for some odd integer  $\alpha \geq 3$  and some integer  $\beta \geq 2$ . Then  $W$  is 3-edge-connected and if  $d_W(X) =$*

3 for some nonempty  $X \subset V$ , then  $X = \{v\}$  or  $X = V - \{v\}$  for some  $v \in L(W) \cup P(W)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\emptyset \subset X \subset V$  such that  $d_W(X) \leq 3$ . Observe that every row that intersects both  $X$  and  $V - X$  contributes at least 1 to  $d_W(X)$  and every column that intersects both  $X$  and  $V - X$  contributes at least 2 to  $d_W(X)$ . It follows that one of  $X$  or  $V - X$  is contained in one row and in one column. We obtain that  $|X| = 1$  or  $|V - X| = 1$  and so the statement follows by construction.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $W = (V, E)$  be an augmented  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -grid for some odd integer  $\alpha \geq 3$  and some integer  $\beta \geq 2$ . Further, let  $X \subseteq V$  such that both  $W[X]$  and  $W[V - X]$  have a connected component containing at least two vertices of  $L(W) \cup P(W)$ . Then  $d_W(X) > \alpha$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose for the sake of a contradiction that there is some  $X \subseteq V$  such that both  $W[X]$  and  $W[V - X]$  have a connected component containing at least two vertices of  $L(W) \cup P(W)$  and  $d_W(X) \leq \alpha$ . We choose  $X$  with this property so that the total number of connected components of  $W[X]$  and  $W[V - X]$  is minimized. First suppose that  $W[X]$  is disconnected. It follows from the assumption that  $W[X]$  has a connected component  $C$  such that  $W[X] - C$  has a connected component containing at least two vertices in  $L(W) \cup P(W)$ . Let  $X' = X - V(C)$ . We obtain  $d_W(X') \leq d_W(X) \leq \alpha$ , a contradiction to the minimal choice of  $X$ . It follows that  $W[X]$  is connected. Similarly,  $W[V - X]$  is connected.

If every column contains an element of  $X$  and an element of  $V - X$ , each column contributes 2 to  $d_W(X)$  and so  $d_W(X) \geq 2 \frac{\alpha+1}{2} > \alpha$ . We may hence suppose by symmetry that there is a column that is completely contained in  $X$  and that there are two vertices  $l_{i_1}, l_{i_2} \in (V - X) \cap L$ . Observe that every path from  $l_{i_1}$  to  $l_{i_2}$  intersects at least  $|i_1 - i_2| \alpha + 1 > \alpha$  rows. Each of these rows contributes 1 to  $d_W(X)$ , so  $d_W(X) > \alpha$ .  $\square$

## 2.3 Eulerian orientations

For the proof of the co-NP completeness of OA, we need the following result on eulerian orientations which can be found in [3].

**Theorem 6.** *Let  $G, F$  be graphs on the same vertex set  $V$  such that  $G + F$  is an eulerian graph and let  $\vec{F}$  be an orientation of  $F$ . Then there is an orientation  $\vec{G}$  of  $G$  such that  $\vec{G} + \vec{F}$  is eulerian if and only if  $d_G(X) \geq d_{\vec{F}}^+(X) - d_{\vec{F}}^-(X)$  for all  $X \subseteq V$ .*

### 3 The reduction for admissibility

This section is dedicated to giving a reduction proving that CA and OA are co-NP-complete. In a first step, we reduce AMAXCUT to a problem which is somewhat similar to CA but has a more local cut condition. Next, we modify this construction to obtain a reduction for CA. Finally we show that the obtained instance is positive for OA if and only if it is positive for CA.

#### 3.1 The intermediate cut problem

Let  $(H = (V_H, E_H), k)$  be an instance of AMAXCUT. We abbreviate  $|V_H|$  and  $|E_H|$  to  $n$  and  $m$ , respectively. Let  $M = mn - k$ . We now create a graph  $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$  with  $V_1 = V_H \cup \{q, s, t\}$  where  $q, s$  and  $t$  are 3 new vertices. Let  $E_1$  consist of  $M$  edges from  $q$  to  $s$ ,  $m$  edges from  $s$  to every  $v \in V_H$  and  $m$  edges from  $t$  to every  $v \in V_H$ . A schematic drawing of  $G_1$  can be found in Figure 3.




Figure 3: A schematic drawing of  $G_1$ .

**Lemma 4.** *There is some  $q\bar{t}$ -set  $X \subseteq V_1$  such that  $d_{G_1}(X) - d_H(X \cap V_H) < M$  if and only if  $(H, k)$  is a positive instance of AMAXCUT.*

*Proof.* First suppose that  $(H, k)$  is a positive instance of AMAXCUT, so there is some  $X \subseteq V_H$  such that  $d_H(X) > k$ . Let  $X' = \{q, s\} \cup X$ . Observe that  $X'$  is a  $q\bar{t}$ -set and  $d_{G_1}(X') = mn$ . This yields  $d_{G_1}(X') - d_H(X' \cap V_H) = d_{G_1}(X') - d_H(X) < M$ .

Now suppose that there is some  $q\bar{t}$ -set  $X \subseteq V_1$  such that  $d_{G_1}(X) - d_H(X \cap V_H) < M$ .

**Claim 1.**  $s \in X$ .

*Proof.* Suppose otherwise. If  $X = \{q\}$ , then  $d_{G_1}(X) - d_H(X \cap V_H) = M - 0 \not\leq M$ , a contradiction. We may hence suppose that  $X$  contains some  $v \in V_H$ . It follows from  $d_H(X \cap V_H) \leq m$  and construction that  $d_{G_1}(X) - d_H(X \cap V_H) \geq d_{G_1}(q, s) + d_{G_1}(v, t) - m = M + m - m \not\leq M$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

By Claim 1 and construction, we obtain  $d_{G_1}(X) = mn$ . This yields  $d_H(X \cap V_H) > d_{G_1}(X) - M = mn - M = k$ , so  $(H, k)$  is a positive instance of AMAXCUT.  $\square$

### 3.2 The main construction

We now construct an instance  $(G_2, F)$  of CA. The graph  $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$  is obtained from  $G_1$  by replacing all vertices in  $V_1 - \{q, t\}$  by certain gadgets.

For every  $v \in V_H$ ,  $G_2$  contains an augmented  $(M + m + 1, m + \frac{d_H(v)}{2})$ -grid  $W^v$ . Further,  $G_2$  contains an augmented  $(M + m + 1, M + \frac{k}{2})$ -grid  $W^s$ . Observe that  $W^v$  for all  $v \in V_H$  and  $W^s$  are well-defined because  $m, k, M$  and  $d_H(v)$  for all  $v \in V_H$  are even. Let  $V_2 = \cup_{v \in V_H} V(W^v) \cup V(W^s) \cup \{q, t\}$ . We now add an edge from  $q$  to each vertex in  $L_M(W^s)$ . We next add a perfect matching between  $(L(W^s) - L_M(W^s)) \cup P(W^s)$  and  $\cup_{v \in V_H} L_m(W^v)$ . Observe that this is possible because  $|(L(W^s) - L_M(W^s)) \cup P(W^s)| = \frac{k}{2} + M + \frac{k}{2} = mn = |\cup_{v \in V_H} L_m(W^v)|$ . Finally, we add an edge from every vertex in  $\cup_{v \in V_H} P_m(W^v)$  to  $t$ . Observe that  $G_1$  can be obtained from  $G_2$  by contracting each  $W^v$  and  $W^s$  into single vertices.

We now prove an important property of  $G_2$ .

**Lemma 5.** *For any  $\emptyset \subset X \subset V_2$ , we have*

$$R_{G_2}(X) = 2 \lfloor \frac{\min\{\max\{d_{G_2}(v) : v \in X\}, \max\{d_{G_2}(v) : v \in V_2 - X\}\}}{2} \rfloor.$$

*Proof.* As  $G_1$  is 4-edge-connected and by Lemma 2 applied to  $W^s$  and  $W^v$  for all  $v \in V_H$ , we obtain that  $\lambda_{G_2}(u, v) = \min\{d_{G_2}(u), d_{G_2}(v)\}$  for all  $u, v \in V_2$  with  $\{u, v\} \neq \{q, t\}$ . This shows the statement for all  $\emptyset \subset X \subset V_2$  such that  $\{q, t\} \subseteq X$  or  $\{q, t\} \subseteq V_2 - X$ . On the other hand, if  $X$  is a  $q\bar{t}$ -set or a  $t\bar{q}$ -set, we have  $\min\{\max\{d_{G_2}(v) : v \in X\}, \max\{d_{G_2}(v) : v \in V_2 - X\}\} = M$ . As  $M$  is even, it hence suffices to prove that  $\lambda_{G_2}(q, t) = M$ .

We have  $\lambda_{G_2}(q, t) \leq d_{G_2}(q) = M$ . Next, there is an edge linking  $q$  and  $l_{i_1}(W^s)$  for all  $i_1 = 1, \dots, M$  which can be concatenated to a path from  $l_{i_1}(W^s)$  to  $p_{i_1}(W^s)$  using only vertices of a single row of  $W^s$ . Now there is an edge from  $p_{i_1}(W^s)$  to a vertex  $l_{i_2}(W^v)$  for some  $i_2 \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  and some



$v \in V_H$ . Finally, there is a path from  $l_{i_2}(W^v)$  to  $p_{i_2}(W^v)$  and an edge from  $p_{i_2}(W^v)$  to  $t$ . This yields a set of  $M$  edge-disjoint  $qt$ -paths, so  $\lambda_{G_2}(q, t) \geq M$ .  $\square$

For some  $v \in V_H$ , let  $B_v$  denote  $(L(W^v) - L_m(W^v)) \cup (P(W^v) - P_m(W^v))$ . Now we define  $F$  to be an odd-vertex pairing of  $G_2$  in the following way: For every  $uv \in E_H$ ,  $F$  contains an edge linking  $B_u$  and  $B_v$ . This is possible because for every  $v \in V_H$ , the set of vertices in  $V(W^v)$  which are of odd degree in  $G_2$  is exactly  $B_v$  and  $|B_v| = d_H(v)$ .

### 3.3 Reduction for CA

This subsection is dedicated to proving the following lemma which gives a relation of the cut sizes in  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ .

**Lemma 6.**  *$(G_2, F)$  is a negative instance of CA if and only if there is some  $q\bar{t}$ -set  $X \subseteq V_1$  such that  $d_{G_1}(X) - d_H(X \cap V_H) < M$ .*

*Proof.* First suppose that there is some  $q\bar{t}$ -set  $X \subseteq V_1$  such that  $d_{G_1}(X) - d_H(X \cap V_H) < M$ . Let  $X' \subseteq V_2$  be the set that contains  $q \cup \cup_{v \in X \cap V_H} V(W^v)$  and that contains  $V(W^s)$  if  $X$  contains  $s$ . Then Lemma 5 yields  $d_{G_2}(X') - d_F(X') = d_{G_1}(X) - d_H(X \cap V_H) < M = R_{G_2}(X')$ , so  $(G_2, F)$  is a negative instance of AC.

Now suppose that  $(G_2, F)$  is a negative instance of CA, so there is some  $X \subset V_2$  such that  $d_{G_2}(X) - d_F(X) < R_{G_2}(X)$ . We choose  $X$  among all such sets such that  $d_{G_2}(X)$  is minimal.

**Claim 2.** *Let  $W \in W^s \cup \{W^v : v \in V_H\}$ . Then each connected component of  $W[X]$  or  $W[V_2 - X]$  contains at least two vertices of  $L(W) \cup P(W)$ .*

*Proof.* By symmetry and as  $d_{G_2}(X) = d_{G_2}(V_2 - X)$ , it suffices to prove the statement for  $W[X]$ . For the sake of a contradiction, suppose that for the vertex set  $C$  of a connected component of  $W[X]$ , we have  $|C \cap (L(W) \cup P(W))| \leq 1$ .

First suppose that  $X = C$ . If  $X$  consists of a single vertex  $v$  with  $d_F(v) = 1$ , Lemma 5 yields  $d_{G_2}(X) - d_F(X) = 3 - 1 = 2 = R_{G_2}(X)$ , a contradiction. Otherwise, Lemma 2 yields  $d_{G_2}(X) \geq 4$  and so, as  $d_F(X) \leq 1$  and  $G + F$  is eulerian, we obtain by Lemma 5 that  $d_{G_2}(X) - d_F(X) \geq 4 = R_{G_2}(X)$ , a contradiction.

We may hence suppose that  $X' = X - C$  is nonempty, so, by Lemma 5 and as  $q, t \notin V(W)$ , we have  $R_{G_2}(X) - R_{G_2}(X') \leq 4 - 2 = 2$ . If  $C$  consists of a single vertex  $v$  with  $d_F(v) = 0$ , we obtain  $d_{G_2}(X') - d_F(X') \leq d_{G_2}(X) -$

$2 - d_F(X) < R_{G_2}(X) - 2 \leq R_{G_2}(X')$ , a contradiction to the minimality of  $X$ . Otherwise, Lemma 2 yields  $d_{G_2}(X) - d_{G_2}(X') \geq d_W(X) - 1 \geq 4 - 1 = 3$  and  $d_F(X') - d_F(X) \leq 1$ . This yields  $d_{G_2}(X') - d_F(X') \leq (d_{G_2}(X) - 3) - (d_F(X) - 1) < R_{G_2}(X) - 2 \leq R_{G_2}(X')$ , a contradiction to the minimality of  $X$ .  $\square$

We are now ready to show that  $V(W) \subseteq X$  or  $V(W) \cap X \neq \emptyset$  for every  $W \in W^s \cup \{W^v : v \in V_H\}$ . Suppose otherwise, then by Claim 2, both  $W[X]$  and  $W[V_2 - X]$  have a connected component each containing at least two vertices of  $L(W) \cup P(W)$ . By Lemmas 3 and 5, this yields  $d_{G_2}(X) - d_F(X) \geq M + m + 1 - m > M \geq R_{G'}(X)$ , a contradiction.

Now let  $X^* \subseteq V_1$  be the set of vertices that contains  $v$  whenever  $V(W^v) \subseteq X$  and  $s$  if  $V(W^s) \subseteq X$ . Observe that  $d_{G_2}(X) = d_{G_1}(X^*) \geq 2m$  by construction. Also, observe that  $d_F(X) = d_H(X^* \cap V_H)$ . By symmetry, we may suppose that  $q \in X$ . If  $X$  is not a  $q\bar{t}$ -set, Lemma 5 yields  $d_{G_2}(X) - d_F(X) \geq d_{G_1}(X^*) - m \geq 2m - m = m > 4 \geq R_{G_2}(X)$ , a contradiction. If  $X^*$  is a  $q\bar{t}$ -set, by Lemma 5, we obtain  $d_{G_1}(X^*) - d_H(X^* \cap V_H) = d_{G_2}(X) - d_F(X) < R_{G_2}(X) = M$ .  $\square$

### 3.4 Reduction for OA

The following result can be obtained by analogous methods to the proof of Lemma 6.

**Lemma 7.** *There is no  $X \subseteq V_2$  such that  $d_{G_2}(X) < d_F(X)$ .*

We here prove the following result that allows for a reduction for OA. While this proof does not require any new arguments apart from Lemma 7, we include it here for the sake of self-containment. The first implication is part of the proof of Nash-Williams of Theorem 1 in [7] while the arguments for the second implication can be found in a similar form in [5].

**Lemma 8.**  *$(G_2, F)$  is a negative instance of OA if and only if  $(G_2, F)$  is a negative instance of CA.*

*Proof.* First suppose that  $(G_2, F)$  is a negative instance of OA. Then there is an eulerian orientation  $\vec{G}_2 + \vec{F}$  of  $G_2 + F$  such that  $\vec{G}_2$  is not well-balanced. This means that there are some  $u, v \in V_2$  such that  $\lambda_{\vec{G}_2}(u, v) < \lfloor \frac{\lambda_{G_2}(u, v)}{2} \rfloor$ . Therefore there is some  $u\bar{v}$ -set  $X \subset V_2$  such that  $d_{\vec{G}_2}^+(X) < \lfloor \frac{\lambda_{G_2}(u, v)}{2} \rfloor$ . As  $G_2 + F$  is eulerian, we obtain that  $d_F(X) \geq d_{\vec{G}_2}^-(X) - d_{\vec{G}_2}^+(X) = d_{G_2}(X) -$

$2d_{\vec{G}_2}^+(X) > d_{G_2}(X) - 2\lfloor \frac{\lambda_{G_2}(u,v)}{2} \rfloor \geq d_{G_2}(X) - R_{G_2}(X)$ , so  $(G_2, F)$  is a negative instance of CA.

For the other direction, suppose that  $(G_2, F)$  is a negative instance of CA, so there is some  $X \subset V_2$  such that  $d_{G_2}(X) - d_F(X) < R_{G_2}(X)$ . Let  $u \in X$  and  $v \in V_2 - X$  such that  $R_{G_2}(X) = 2\lfloor \frac{\lambda_{G_2}(u,v)}{2} \rfloor$ . Let  $\vec{F}$  be an orientation of  $F$  such that all the edges with exactly one endvertex in  $X$  are directed away from  $X$ . By Lemma 7 and Theorem 6, there is an orientation  $\vec{G}_2$  of  $G_2$  such that  $\vec{G}_2 + \vec{F}$  is eulerian. This yields  $\lambda_{\vec{G}_2}(u, v) \leq d_{\vec{G}_2}^+(X) = \frac{1}{2}(d_{G_2}(X) + d_F(X)) - d_{\vec{F}}^+(X) = \frac{1}{2}(d_{G_2}(X) + d_F(X)) - d_F(X) = \frac{1}{2}(d_{G_2}(X) - d_F(X)) < \frac{1}{2}R_{G_2}(X) = \lfloor \frac{\lambda_{G_2}(u,v)}{2} \rfloor$ . We obtain that  $\vec{G}_2$  is not well-balanced, so  $(G_2, F)$  is a negative instance of OA.  $\square$

### 3.5 Conclusion

By Lemmas 4 and 6, we obtain that  $(G_2, F)$  is a negative instance of CA if and only if  $(H, k)$  is a positive instance of AMAXCUT. By Lemma 1 and as the size of  $(G_2, F)$  is polynomial in the size of  $(H, k)$ , we obtain Theorem 2.

By Lemmas 4, 6 and 8, we obtain that  $(G_2, F)$  is a negative instance of OA if and only if  $(H, k)$  is a positive instance of AMAXCUT. By Lemma 1 and as the size of  $(G_2, F)$  is polynomial in the size of  $(H, k)$ , we obtain Theorem 3.

## 4 Local arc-connectivity orientation

This section is dedicated to proving Theorem 4. We need to consider the following algorithmic problem.

*Bounded well-balanced orientation (BWBO)*

**Instance** A graph  $G = (V, E)$  and two functions  $l^+, l^- : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ .

**Question** Is there a well-balanced orientation  $\vec{G}$  of  $G$  such that  $d_{\vec{G}}^+(v) \geq l^+(v)$  and  $d_{\vec{G}}^-(v) \geq l^-(v)$  for all  $v \in V$ ?

The following result is proven in [1].

**Lemma 9.** *BWBO is NP-hard.*

We are now ready to give the reduction for Theorem 4.

*Proof.* (of Theorem 4)

We prove this by a reduction from BWBO. Let  $(G = (V, E), l^+, l^-)$  be an instance of BWBO. We add two vertices  $x$  and  $y$  and for every  $v \in V$ ,

we add  $d_G(v)$  edges linking  $v$  and each of  $x$  and  $y$ . We denote this graph by  $G' = (V', E')$ . Observe that  $|V'| = |V| + 2$  and  $|E'| = 5|E|$ , so the size of  $G'$  is polynomial in the size of  $G$ . We now define  $r : (V')^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  by  $r(u, v) = \lfloor \frac{\lambda_G(u, v)}{2} \rfloor$  for all  $u, v \in V^2$ ,  $r(x, v) = d_G(v) + l^-(v)$ ,  $r(v, x) = 0$ ,  $r(y, v) = 0$  and  $r(v, y) = d_G(v) + l^+(v)$  for all  $v \in V$  and  $r(x, y) = 2|E|$ .

We prove that  $(G', r)$  is a positive instance of LACO if and only if  $(G, l^+, l^-)$  is a positive instance of BWBO. First suppose that  $(G', r)$  is a positive instance of LACO, so there is an orientation  $\vec{G}'$  of  $G'$  such that  $\lambda_{\vec{G}'}(u, v) \geq r(u, v)$  for all  $u, v \in (V')^2$ . Observe that  $d_{G'}(x) = r(x, y) = d_{G'}(y)$ , so  $x$  is a source and  $y$  is a sink in  $\vec{G}'$ . We show that  $\vec{G}$ , the restriction of  $\vec{G}'$  to  $G$ , is a well-balanced orientation of  $G$  such that  $d_{\vec{G}}^+(v) \geq l^+(v)$  and  $d_{\vec{G}}^-(v) \geq l^-(v)$  for all  $v \in V$ . As  $x$  is a source and  $y$  is a sink in  $\vec{G}'$ , for any  $u, v \in V^2$ , we have  $\lambda_{\vec{G}'}(u, v) = \lambda_{\vec{G}}(u, v) \geq r(u, v) = \lfloor \frac{\lambda_G(u, v)}{2} \rfloor$ , so  $\vec{G}$  is well-balanced. Further, for any  $v \in V$ , we have  $d_{\vec{G}}^-(v) = d_{\vec{G}'}^-(v) - d_{\vec{G}'}(x, v) \geq \lambda_{\vec{G}'}(x, v) - d_{\vec{G}'}(x, v) \geq r(x, v) - d_{\vec{G}'}(x, v) = d_G(v) + l^-(v) - d_G(v) = l^-(v)$ . Similarly,  $d_{\vec{G}}^+(v) \geq l^+(v)$ , so  $(G, l^+, l^-)$  is a positive instance of BWBO.

Now suppose that  $(G, l^+, l^-)$  is a positive instance of BWBO, so there is a well-balanced orientation  $\vec{G}$  of  $G$  such that  $d_{\vec{G}}^+(v) \geq l^+(v)$  and  $d_{\vec{G}}^-(v) \geq l^-(v)$  for all  $v \in V$ . We complete this to an orientation  $\vec{G}'$  of  $G'$  by orienting all edges incident to  $x$  away from  $x$  and all edges incident to  $y$  toward  $y$ . As  $\vec{G}$  is well-balanced, we have  $\lambda_{\vec{G}'}(u, v) = \lambda_{\vec{G}}(u, v) \geq \lfloor \frac{\lambda_G(u, v)}{2} \rfloor = r(u, v)$  for all  $u, v \in V^2$ . By construction, we have  $\lambda_{\vec{G}'}(x, y) = \sum_{v \in V} d_G(v) = 2|E| = r(x, y)$ . For any  $v \in V$ , we have  $d_G(v)$  arc-disjoint  $xv$ -paths of length 1. Further, for every arc  $uv$  entering  $v$  in  $\vec{G}$ , we have a path  $xuv$ . As all these paths can be chosen to be arc-disjoint, we obtain that  $\lambda_{\vec{G}'}(x, v) \geq d_{\vec{G}}(x, v) + d_{\vec{G}}^-(v) \geq d_G(v) + l^-(v) = r(x, v)$ . Similarly,  $\lambda_{\vec{G}'}(v, y) \geq r(v, y)$ , so  $(G', r)$  is a positive instance of LACO.  $\square$

## Acknowledgement

I wish to thank Zoltán Szigeti. He first suggested the problems. Later, he carefully proofread the article and proposed some simplifications.

## References

- [1] A. Bernáth, S. Iwata, T. Király, Z. Király, Z. Szigeti, Recent results on well-balanced orientations, *Discrete Optimization* 5:663-676, 2008,

- [2] A. Frank, *Connections in Combinatorial Optimization*, Oxford University Press, 2011,
- [3] L.R. Ford, D.R. Fulkerson, *Flows in Networks*, Princeton Univ. Press, PrincetonNJ., 1962,
- [4] M. Garey, D. Johnson, *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*, W.H. Freeman, 1979,
- [5] Z. Király, Z. Szigeti, Simultaneous well-balanced orientations of graphs, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 96(5):684-692, 2006,
- [6] K. Menger, Zur allgemeinen Kurventheorie, *Fund. Math.*10:96-155, 1927,
- [7] C.St.J.A. Nash–Williams, On orientations, connectivity, and odd-vertex pairings in finite graphs, *Canad. J. Math.*, 12:555–567, 1960.