

# Bounded indegree $k$ -forests problem and a faster algorithm for directed graph augmentation

Pavel Arkhipov      Vladimir Kolmogorov  
Institute of Science and Technology Austria  
{pavel.arkhipov,vnk}@ist.ac.at

## Abstract

We consider two problems for a directed graph  $G$ , which we show to be closely related. The first one is to find  $k$  edge-disjoint forests in  $G$  of maximal size such that the indegree of each vertex in these forests is at most  $k$ . We describe a min-max characterization for this problem and show that it can be solved in  $O(k\delta m \log n)$  time, where  $(n, m)$  is the size of  $G$  and  $\delta$  is the difference between  $k$  and the edge connectivity of the graph. The second problem is the directed edge-connectivity augmentation problem, which has been extensively studied before: find a smallest set of directed edges whose addition to the graph makes it strongly  $k$ -connected. We improve the complexity for this problem from  $O(k\delta(m + \delta n) \log n)$  [Gabow, STOC 1994] to  $O(k\delta m \log n)$ , by exploiting our solution for the first problem. A similar approach with the same complexity also works for the undirected version of the problem.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a directed unweighted graph with  $n$  vertices and  $m$  edges (with parallel edges allowed), and  $k = O(\text{poly}(n))$  be a positive integer. Let  $\tau$  be a vector  $V \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$ . In this paper, we consider the following two problems.

**Problem 1.1** (Bounded Indegree  $k$ -Forest Problem). *Given an input  $(G, k, \tau)$ , find  $k$  edge-disjoint forests  $F_1, \dots, F_k$ , such that the size of their union is maximized, subject to the constraint: for each vertex  $v$ ,  $\text{indeg}_F(v) \leq k - \tau(v)$ .*

Here,  $\text{indeg}_F(v)$  is the indegree of  $v$  inside  $F = F_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup F_k$ . Note, when deciding whether  $F_i$  is a forest in  $G$ , edge directions are ignored.

**Problem 1.2** (Directed Edge Connectivity Augmentation Problem). *Given an input  $(G, k)$ , find a smallest set of directed edges whose addition to  $G$  makes  $G$  strongly  $k$ -connected.*

A polynomial-time algorithm for Problem 1.2 was first given by Frank [7], who also provided a min-max characterization. The complexity of Frank’s algorithm has been improved by Gabow in [8, 9]. Let  $k_G$  be the maximum integer in  $\{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$  such that  $G$  is strongly  $k_G$ -connected, and let  $\delta = k - k_G \geq 1$  be the desired increase in the connectivity. To simplify expressions for complexities, we assume that  $m = \Omega(n)$ ; if it is not the case, then  $m$  would need to be replaced by  $m + n$  in the runtimes. With this notation, Gabow’s algorithm in [9] runs in  $O(k\delta(m + \delta n) \log n)$  time. [9] also presented a strongly polynomial algorithm with complexity  $O(n^2 m \log(n^2/m))$  (assuming that parallel edges are represented by a single edge with a weight, i.e. for directed weighted graphs).

To our knowledge, Problem 1.1 has not been explicitly considered before. We will present a deterministic algorithm with complexity  $O(k\delta m \log n)$  for the case  $\tau = \mathbf{0}$ , as well as a min-max characterization for arbitrary  $\tau$ .<sup>1</sup> We will then show that it is closely related to the Edge

<sup>1</sup>Our algorithm for  $\tau = \mathbf{0}$  can be generalized to work for arbitrary  $\tau$  with the same complexity, but the analysis would require some extra work. For the sake of clarity and brevity, we focus on the special case  $\tau = \mathbf{0}$ , which is sufficient for the application that we consider.

Connectivity Augmentation Problem. In particular, we will use our solution for Problem 1.1 to design an algorithm for Problem 1.2 with complexity  $O(k\delta m \log n)$ .

We will also consider a version of Problem 1.2 for an undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$ .

**Problem 1.3** (Undirected Edge Connectivity Augmentation Problem). *Given an input  $(G, k)$ , find a smallest set of undirected edges whose addition to  $G$  makes  $G$   $k$ -connected.*

Polynomial-time algorithms for this problem have been given in [19, 3, 16, 8, 9, 15, 1, 4]. The best known deterministic algorithms have complexity  $O(k\delta(m + \delta n) \log n)$  [9] and  $\tilde{O}(mn)$  [15], while the fastest randomized (Monte-Carlo) algorithm runs in  $\tilde{O}(m)$  [4]. As before,  $\delta = k - k_G$  where  $k_G$  is the maximum integer in  $\{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$  such that  $G$  is  $k_G$ -connected. We will present a deterministic algorithm for this problem with complexity  $O(k\delta m \log n)$  (again by exploiting our solution for Problem 1.1).

Below in Sections 1.1-1.3 we provide more details about Problems 1.1-1.3. Throughout the paper we use the following notation. If  $E$  is a set of edges, then  $E^{\text{rev}}$  is the set obtained from  $E$  by reversing edge orientations. Similarly, for graph  $G = (V, E)$  we denote  $G^{\text{rev}} = (V, E^{\text{rev}})$ . For a subset  $A \subseteq V$  we define the following sets of edges:

$$\rho(A) = \{(u, v) \in E : u \notin A, v \in A\} \quad (1)$$

$$\rho^{\text{rev}}(A) = \{(u, v) \in E : u \in A, v \notin A\} \quad (2)$$

$$\lambda(A) = \{(u, v) \in E : u \in A, v \in A\} \quad (3)$$

For singleton sets we usually write  $\rho(v)$ ,  $\rho^{\text{rev}}(v)$ ,  $A+v$ ,  $A-v$  instead of  $\rho(\{v\})$ ,  $\rho^{\text{rev}}(\{v\})$ ,  $A \cup \{v\}$ ,  $A - \{v\}$ . We say that a collection of sets  $\mathcal{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_t)$  is a *subpartition* of a set  $V$  if  $X_i \subseteq V$  for all  $i$ , and  $X_i \cap X_j = \emptyset$  for all  $i \neq j$ . This subpartition is called *proper* if  $\mathcal{X} \neq \{V\}$ .

For a node  $a \in V$ , we define  $\tau^{a:k}$  to be the vector with  $\tau^{a:k}(a) = k$  and  $\tau^{a:k}(v) = 0$  for  $v \in V - a$ .

## 1.1 Bounded Indegree $k$ -forest Problem

The problem can be stated in matroid terms as follows. Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the graphic matroid corresponding to  $G$ , and let  $\mathcal{G}^k$  be the  $k$ -fold union of  $\mathcal{G}$ . The independent sets of matroid  $\mathcal{G}^k$  correspond to the subgraphs of  $G$  that decompose into  $k$  forests. Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be the matroid on the edge set of  $G$ , where  $H \subseteq E$  is independent if  $\text{indeg}_H(v) \leq k - \tau(v)$  for each vertex  $v$ . Problem 1.1 then asks to find a set  $F \in \mathcal{G}^k \cap \mathcal{D}$  of maximum cardinality. Clearly, it can be solved in polynomial time by applying an algorithm for the matroid intersection problem. It requires oracles that test for a given  $F \subseteq E$  whether  $F \in \mathcal{G}^k$  and  $F \in \mathcal{D}$ ; the first one can be implemented using a matroid union algorithm.

Gabow presented in [10] an efficient algorithm with complexity  $O(km \log n)$  for finding  $k$  edge-disjoint **spanning** trees such that each vertex has indegree at most  $k$ , while one special vertex has indegree zero. If  $G$  does not have parallel edges, the complexity is  $O(km \log(n^2/m))$ . We will generalize this algorithm, and obtain

**Theorem 1.4.** *Problem 1.1 for  $\tau = \mathbf{0}$  can be solved in  $O(k\delta m \log n)$  time. Consequently, it can be solved with the same time for  $\tau = \tau^{a:k}$  (by applying the algorithm for  $\tau = \mathbf{0}$  to the graph obtained from  $G$  by removing all edges pointing to  $a$ ).*

We will also establish the following min-max characterization (here we denote  $\tau(A) = \sum_{v \in A} \tau(v)$ ).

**Theorem 1.5.** *If  $F$  is an optimal solution of Problem 1.1 then*

$$nk - \tau(V) - |F| = \max_{\mathcal{X}: \text{ a subpartition of } V} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{X}} (k - \tau(A) - |\rho(A)|) \quad (4)$$

This characterization can be related to the Edmonds' classical result about *complete k-intersections*. Recall that  $G$  is said to have a *complete k-intersection for a node*  $a \in V$  if it has a subgraph that can be partitioned into  $k$  spanning trees (and thus has  $nk - k$  edges), each node except for  $a$  has indegree  $k$ , and  $a$  has indegree 0.

**Theorem 1.6** (Edmonds, [5, 6]). *Fix a node  $a \in V$ , and let  $F$  be an optimal solution of Problem 1.1 for  $(G, k, \tau^{a:k})$ . Then  $|F| = nk - k$  (equivalently,  $G$  has a complete  $k$ -intersection for  $a$ ) if and only if*

$$\min\{|\rho(A)| : \emptyset \neq A \subseteq V - a\} \geq k \quad (5)$$

This result can be easily derived from Theorem 1.5: it essentially says that the LHS of eq. (4) is zero if and only if the RHS is zero.

## 1.2 Directed Edge Connectivity Augmentation Problem

Frank gave the following the min-max characterization.

**Theorem 1.7** ([7, Theorem 3.1]). *Let  $\gamma(G, k)$  be the optimal value of Problem 1.2, i.e. the minimum number of directed edges that should be added to  $G$  to make it strongly  $k$ -connected. Then*

$$\gamma(G, k) = \max\{\alpha_{\text{in}}(G, k), \alpha_{\text{out}}(G, k)\}, \quad (6)$$

where

$$\alpha_{\text{in}}(G, k) = \max_{\mathcal{X}: \text{ a proper subpartition of } V} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{X}} (k - |\rho(A)|) \quad (7)$$

$$\alpha_{\text{out}}(G, k) = \max_{\mathcal{X}: \text{ a proper subpartition of } V} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{X}} (k - |\rho^{\text{rev}}(A)|) = \alpha_{\text{in}}(G^{\text{rev}}, k) \quad (8)$$

One can now see a connection between Problem 1.1 with zero vector  $\tau = \mathbf{0}$  and Problem 1.2: the right-hand sides of (4) and (7) look almost identical, except that in (4) the maximization is over all subpartitions  $\mathcal{X}$  while in (7) it is over **proper** subpartitions.<sup>2</sup> This means, in particular, the following: if we compute an optimal solution  $F$  for  $(G, k, \mathbf{0})$  and this solution happens to contain a disconnected forest (equivalently, if  $|F| < nk - k$ ) then  $\alpha_{\text{in}}(G, k) = nk - |F| > k$ , since the optimal subpartition in (4) cannot be  $\{V\}$ . Otherwise we have  $\alpha_{\text{in}}(G, k) \leq k$ , and some other method is needed.

In the general case we solve Problem 1.1 for  $(G, k, \tau^{a:k})$  and then do some simple postprocessing to the solution. We no longer claim that this computes  $\alpha_{\text{in}}(G, k)$ ; instead, we claim to correctly compute  $\gamma(G, k) = \max\{\alpha_{\text{in}}(G, k), \alpha_{\text{out}}(G, k)\}$ .

Computing the actual set of edges to be added requires more work.

**Definition 1.8.** *A graph  $G' = (V + s, E')$  is  $(k, s)$ -connected if, for every pair of vertices  $u, v \in V$ , the size of a minimum  $u$ - $v$  cut is at least  $k$ . It is a  $(k, s)$ -connected extension of  $G = (V, E)$  if in addition  $E \subseteq E'$  and all edges in  $E' - E$  are incident to  $s$ .*

**Theorem 1.9** (Frank, [7, Lemma 3.3]). *For a directed graph  $G$ , there exists a  $(k, s)$ -connected extension  $G' = (V + s, E')$  with  $\text{indeg}(s) = \text{outdeg}(s) = \gamma(G, k)$ .*

The next theorem was originally proved by Mader in paper [14] written in German. For an English source, one can see [7, Theorem 3.4].

---

<sup>2</sup>Condition  $\mathcal{X} \neq \{V\}$  is missing in the formulation of [7, Theorem 3.1], but is explicitly stated in [17, Theorem 63.1].

**Theorem 1.10** (Mader, [14]). *Suppose that graph  $G' = (V + s, E')$  is  $(k, s)$ -connected, and  $\text{indeg}(s) = \text{outdeg}(s)$ . Then for every edge  $(u, s) \in E'$  there exists  $(s, v) \in E'$  such that graph  $G'' = (V + s, E' - \{(u, s), (s, v)\} + \{(u, v)\})$  is also  $(k, s)$ -connected.*

The operation of replacing edges  $(u, s), (s, v)$  with  $(u, v)$  that preserves  $(k, s)$ -connectivity is called *edge splitting*. The theorems above imply that Problem 1.2 can be solved as follows:

1. Generate a  $(k, s)$ -connected extension  $G' = (V + s, E')$  with  $\text{indeg}(s) = \text{outdeg}(s) = \gamma(G, k)$ .
2. Perform edge splittings while  $s$  is not isolated.

In Section 3 we show the following.

**Theorem 1.11.** *The first subproblem, computing  $G'$ , can be solved in  $O(k\delta m \log n)$  time.*

The second subproblem, edge splitting, can be done in  $O(km' \log n)$  time [2] where  $m' \leq m + 2\delta n$  is the number of edges in  $G'$ . This yields an algorithm for Problem 1.2 with overall complexity  $O(k\delta m \log n + km \log n + k\delta n \log n) = O(k\delta m \log n)$ .

### 1.3 Undirected Edge Connectivity Augmentation Problem

Frank showed in [7] that Problem 1.3 can be solved by the same approach as in the previous section: first construct an appropriate  $(k, s)$ -extension  $G'$  of  $G$  and then perform edge splittings in  $G'$ . In Section 4 we show that  $G'$  can be constructed in  $O(k\delta m \log n)$  time. For an undirected graph with  $n$  nodes and  $m'$  edges, a single vertex can be split in  $O((k^2n + m') \log n)$  time [2].  $G'$  has  $m' = O(m + \delta n)$  edges. Notice that  $\delta m = \Omega(\delta k_G n) = \Omega(\delta(k - \delta)n)$ , which is  $\Omega(kn)$  for  $\delta$  between 1 and  $k - 1$ . If  $\delta = k$ , then again  $\delta m = \Omega(kn)$ , since  $m = \Omega(n)$ . We conclude that Problem 1.3 can be solved in  $O(k\delta m \log n + (k^2n + m + \delta n) \log n) = O(k(\delta m + kn) \log n) = O(k\delta m \log n)$  time.

## 2 Bounded indegree $k$ -forests problem

In this section we discuss an algorithm that, given a directed graph  $G = (V, E)$ , computes a set of edges  $F = F_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup F_k \subseteq E$  of maximum cardinality such that  $F_1, \dots, F_k$  are edge-disjoint forests of  $G$ , and  $\text{indeg}_F(v) \leq k - \tau(v)$  for each node  $v \in V$ , where  $\tau$  is a fixed vector  $V \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$ . Note, whenever we write  $F = F_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup F_k$ , we assume with some abuse of notation that integer  $k$  and forests  $F_1, \dots, F_k$  can be recovered from  $F$ .

In Section 2.1 we describe a generic scheme for solving the problem, which is based on performing augmentations in a certain auxiliary graph. Then in Section 2.3 we present an efficient way of organizing these augmentations (for  $\tau = \mathbf{0}$ ).

We will use the following terminology and notation. The edges of  $E - F$  will be called *uncovered*. If edge  $e \notin F_i$  can be added to  $F_i$  without creating any cycles (i.e. it joins different components of  $F_i$ ), we will call  $e$  *joining* for  $F_i$ . The *deficit* of a vertex  $v$  in  $F = F_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup F_k$  is defined as

$$\text{def}_F(v) = k - \tau(v) - \text{indeg}_F(v) \tag{9}$$

Vertices with  $\text{def}_F(v) > 0$  are called *deficient*. For a subset  $A \subseteq V$ , we also denote  $\text{def}_F(A) = \sum_{v \in A} \text{def}_F(v)$ .

### 2.1 Auxiliary graph and augmentations

**Definition 2.1** (auxiliary graph). *For given forests  $F_1, \dots, F_k$  with  $F = F_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup F_k$ , the auxiliary graph  $D(F)$  is a directed graph with a vertex set  $V \sqcup E \sqcup \{t\}$ , and the following edges (below  $v \in V$ ,  $e, f \in E$ ):*

1.  $(v, e)$  is an edge if  $\text{indeg}_F(v) < k - \tau(v)$ ,  $\text{head}(e) = v$  and  $e \notin F$ .
2.  $(e, t)$  is an edge if  $e$  is joining for some  $F_i$ .
3.  $(e, f)$  with  $f \notin F$  is an edge if  $e \in F$  and  $\text{head}(e) = \text{head}(f)$ .
4.  $(f, e)$  with  $e \in F$  is an edge if  $e \in F_i$ ,  $f \notin F_i$  and  $F_i - e + f \in \mathcal{G}$  for some  $F_i$ .

Let  $P = (v, e_1, \dots, e_r, t)$  be a  $V$ - $t$  path in the auxiliary graph. We will need the procedure of *augmentation*<sup>3</sup>. We assume below that solution  $F = F_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup F_k$  is represented by labels  $\ell(e) \in [k] \cup \{\emptyset\}$  for edges  $e \in E$ , where  $\ell(e) = i$  if  $e \in F_i$ , and  $\ell(e) = \emptyset$  if  $e \notin F$ .

---

**Algorithm 1:**  $\text{Augment}(P: (v, e_1, \dots, e_r, t) - \text{a } V\text{-}t \text{ path})$ .

---

- 1  $p \leftarrow \min\{j \mid e_r \text{ is joining for } F_j\}$
  - 2 let  $(\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_r)$  be the labels of  $(e_1, \dots, e_r)$  in  $F$  (then  $\ell_1 = \emptyset$ )
  - 3 update  $F$  by setting the labels of these edges to  $(\ell_2, \dots, \ell_r, p)$
- 

**Theorem 2.2.** (a) *Algorithm 1 does not change the sizes of forests  $F_i$  for  $i \neq p$ , and increases the size of  $F_p$  by one. Furthermore, it increases  $\text{indeg}_F(v)$  by 1, and does not change indegrees of other vertices.*

(b) *If  $P$  is a  $V$ - $t$  path in the auxiliary graph without shortcuts, then augmenting  $P$  produces feasible forests  $F' = F'_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup F'_k$  (with  $|F'| = |F| + 1$ ).*

(c) *If the auxiliary graph does not have  $V$ - $t$  paths, then  $F$  is optimal.*

*Proof.* Parts (b,c) follow from standard arguments in the matroid theory; see Appendix A for details. Part (a) can be shown as follows. The first claim can be verified by comparing how many times  $i$  occurs in  $(\ell(e_1), \dots, \ell(e_r))$  before and after the update. Let us show the second claim. By the definition of the auxiliary graph, if  $\ell_{i+1} = \emptyset$  for some  $i \in [r-1]$  (i.e. if  $e_{i+1} \notin F$ ) then  $\text{head}(e_i) = \text{head}(e_{i+1})$ . Suppose that  $\ell_i = \ell_{i+1} = \emptyset$  for some  $i \in [r-1]$ . Let us remove  $e_i$  from  $P$ . The new path  $P'$  is valid  $V$ - $t$  path (if  $i > 1$ , then this holds since  $\text{head}(e_{i-1}) = \text{head}(e_i) = \text{head}(e_{i+1})$ , and hence  $(e_{i-1}, e_{i+1})$  is in the auxiliary graph). Furthermore,  $\text{Augment}(P)$  and  $\text{Augment}(P')$  yield the same result. By repeatedly applying such operation, we can assume w.l.o.g. that  $(\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_r)$  does not contain two consecutive  $\emptyset$ 's. Augmenting  $P$  changes the set of edges in  $F$  as follows:  $e_1$  is added to  $F$ , and for every  $i \in [2, r-1]$  with  $\ell_{i+1} = \emptyset$ ,  $e_i$  is removed from  $F$  and  $e_{i+1}$  is added to  $F$ . The claim can now be easily verified.  $\square$

Theorem 2.2 implies that Problem 1.1 can be solved by repeatedly finding and augmenting paths.

## 2.2 Min-max characterization

In this section, we establish some properties of optimal solutions of Problem 1.1.

**Definition 2.3.** *Consider forests  $F = F_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup F_k$ . A subset  $A \subseteq V$  is  $F$ -closed if  $\rho(A) \subseteq F$  and each  $F_i$  is a spanning tree in  $A$  (i.e. subgraph  $(A, F_i \cap \lambda(A))$  is connected).*

Such  $A$  satisfies  $\text{indeg}_F(A) = |\rho(A)| + k(|A| - 1)$ . This yields the following equation:

$$\text{def}_F(A) = k - \tau(A) - |\rho(A)| \quad \forall A \subseteq V, A \text{ is } F\text{-closed} \quad (10)$$

---

<sup>3</sup>This ‘‘augmentation’’ has nothing to do with ‘‘augmentations’’ in the Augmentation Problem 1.2, but both are conventional terminology. We hope this will not cause confusion.

**Lemma 2.4.** (a) Let  $F = F_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup F_k$  be a feasible solution of Problem 1.1, and suppose that there is no  $v$ - $t$  path in the auxiliary graph for  $F$  for some node  $v$  with  $\text{def}_F(v) > 0$ . Then there exists an  $F$ -closed set  $Q_v \ni v$  which is contained in some component of forest  $F_i$  for every  $i \in [k]$ . (b) Let  $F = F_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup F_k$  be an optimal solution of Problem 1.1. There exists a subpartition  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $V$  with the following properties: (i) Every set  $A \in \mathcal{S}$  is  $F$ -closed, satisfies  $\text{def}_F(A) > 0$ , and is contained in some component of forest  $F_i$  for every  $i \in [k]$ . (ii) Every vertex  $v \in V$  with  $\text{def}_F(v) > 0$  belongs to some  $A \in \mathcal{S}$ .

*Proof.* Note that part (b) easily follows from part (a). Indeed, the desired subpartition  $\mathcal{S}$  can be obtained algorithmically as follows: (i) start with the family of sets  $\{Q_v : \text{def}_F(v) > 0\}$ ; (ii) while there are overlapping sets  $A, B$  in the family, replace them with  $A \cup B$ . (Clearly, if  $A$  and  $B$  are  $F$ -closed, then so is their union).

We thus focus on proving (a). Let  $L \subseteq E$  be the set of elements reachable from  $v$  in the auxiliary graph for  $F$ . Note that for every  $i \in [k]$  we have  $L \subseteq \lambda(C)$  where  $C$  is the component of  $F_i$  containing  $v$ , otherwise there would be a path  $(v, \dots, e, t)$  in the auxiliary graph where edge  $e$  is joining for  $F_i$ . Let  $Q_v$  be the set of vertices of  $L$  (or just  $\{v\}$  if  $L$  is empty, but this is a trivial case). To prove the lemma, it suffices to show  $Q_v$  is  $F$ -closed.

The proof of this fact will closely follow the argument from [10, Section 2.1]. First, let us show that each  $F_i \cap L$  is spanning in  $Q_v$ . Assume the contrary. Let  $Q_v = A \sqcup B$ , where  $A$  and  $B$  are not connected in  $F_i \cap L$ . The structure of the auxiliary graph implies that  $L$  is connected. Thus, there exists an edge  $e \in (L - F_i)$  connecting  $A$  and  $B$ . We know that  $e$  is not joining for  $F_i$  (otherwise **Search** would find an augmenting path, and  $F$  would not be optimal). Therefore, there is a path in  $F_i$  between  $\text{head}(e)$  and  $\text{tail}(e)$ . Every edge  $f$  of this path belongs to  $L$  (since  $(e, f)$  is in the auxiliary graph by construction). Then  $A$  and  $B$  are connected in  $F_i \cap L$ , which is a contradiction.

It remains to show that  $\rho(Q_v) \subseteq F$ . Suppose not, i.e. there exists  $e \in \rho(Q_v) - F$ . Condition  $\text{tail}(e) \notin Q_v$  implies that  $e \notin L$ . Denote  $u = \text{head}(e)$ . If  $u = v$  then  $e \in L$  by the definition of the auxiliary graph - a contradiction. If there exists  $f \in F_i \cap L$  with  $\text{head}(f) = u$  then  $(f, e)$  is in the auxiliary graph and hence  $e \in L$  - a contradiction. This shows that  $u \neq v$  and  $\text{indeg}_{F \cap L}(u) = 0$ . We can write  $\text{indeg}_{F \cap L}(Q_v) = \text{indeg}_{F \cap L}(Q_v - \{u, v\}) + \text{indeg}_{F \cap L}(u) + \text{indeg}_{F \cap L}(v) \leq k(|Q_v| - 2) + 0 + (k - 1) = k(|Q_v| - 1) - 1$ . On the other hand, each  $F_i \cap L$  is spanning in  $Q_v$  and hence  $\text{indeg}_{F \cap L}(Q_v) \geq k(|Q_v| - 1)$ . We obtained a contradiction.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.5** (Min-max characterization). *If  $F$  is an optimal solution of Problem 1.1 then,*

$$\text{def}_F(V) = \max_{\mathcal{X}: \text{ a subpartition of } V} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{X}} (k - \tau(A) - |\rho(A)|) \quad (11)$$

*Furthermore, the maximum in (11) is achieved by subpartition  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{S}$  constructed in Lemma 2.4.*

*Proof.* Consider subpartition  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $V$  as in Lemma 2.4. Summing eq. (10) over  $A \in \mathcal{S}$  and using the fact that sets  $A \in \mathcal{S}$  cover all deficient vertices, we get

$$\text{def}_F(V) = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{S}} (k - \tau(A) - |\rho(A)|) \quad (12)$$

On the other hand, consider an optimal subpartition  $\mathcal{X}$  of  $V$  that maximizes (11). For each  $A \in \mathcal{X}$  we have  $\text{indeg}_F(A) \leq k(|A| - 1) + |\rho(A)|$  and therefore  $\text{def}_F(A) \geq k - \tau(A) - |\rho(A)|$ . This gives

$$\text{def}_F(V) \geq \sum_{A \in \mathcal{X}} \text{def}_F(A) \geq \sum_{A \in \mathcal{X}} (k - \tau(A) - |\rho(A)|)$$

$\square$

Note that Corollary 2.5 implies Theorem 1.5 since  $\text{def}_F(V) = nk - \tau(V) - |F|$ .

## 2.3 Main algorithm

Throughout this subsection,  $\tau = \mathbf{0}$ .

We will store a collection of forests  $F = F_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup F_k$ , and increase  $|F|$  by augmenting  $V$ - $t$  paths. Initially,  $F_k$  is empty.

We also maintain the *nestedness condition*: for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$ ,  $F_{i+1} \subseteq \text{span}(F_i)$ . This is equivalent to the following: for any  $j > i$  and any component  $C \subseteq V$  of  $F_j$ , there exists a component  $C' \subseteq V$  of  $F_i$  such that  $C \subseteq C'$ .

One can observe that after executing  $\text{Augment}(P)$ , two components of  $F_p$  get merged, and all the other components of each forest remain the same. (Here  $p$  is the index chosen at line 1 of Algorithm 1). Moreover,  $\text{Augment}(P)$  preserves the nestedness condition.

Recall that an augmenting path can start only at a vertex with  $\text{indeg}_F(v) < k$ , or equivalently with  $\text{def}_F(v) > 0$ . We will maintain an integer  $\widetilde{\text{def}}(v) \in \{\text{def}_F(v), 0\}$  for each  $v \in V$ , where condition  $\widetilde{\text{def}}(v) = 0$  indicates that either  $\text{def}_F(v) = 0$ , or searching for an augmenting path from  $v$  has previously failed. The following lemma shows that augmenting paths from such  $v$  will never appear again, so it suffices to search for augmenting paths only from vertices  $v$  with  $\widetilde{\text{def}}(v) > 0$ .

**Lemma 2.6.** *If there is no  $v$ - $t$  path in the auxiliary graph for a given vertex  $v$ , then, after any valid augmentation, there still will be no  $v$ - $t$  path.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.4, if there are no augmenting paths starting from  $v$ , then there exists a set  $Q \subseteq V$ ,  $v \in Q$ , such that each forest is a spanning tree inside  $Q$ , and  $\rho(Q) \subseteq F$ . Then  $\text{indeg}_F(Q)$  cannot increase. Since augmentations do not decrease indegrees of any vertex, indegree of any vertex in  $Q$  (including  $v$ ) cannot increase.  $\square$

For a subset  $A \subseteq V$ , we will denote  $\widetilde{\text{def}}(A) = \sum_{v \in A} \widetilde{\text{def}}(v)$ . We can now describe the  $\text{Search}$  procedure (see Algorithm 2). Note that it decreases  $\widetilde{\text{def}}(v)$  by at least one, and does not change  $\widetilde{\text{def}}(u)$  for nodes  $u \neq v$ .

---

**Algorithm 2:**  $\text{Search}(C$ : component of  $F_k$  with  $\widetilde{\text{def}}(C) > 0$ ).

---

```

1  $v \leftarrow$  any vertex in  $C$  with  $\widetilde{\text{def}}(v) > 0$ 
2 search for a  $v$ - $t$  augmenting path  $P = (v, e_1, \dots, e_r, t)$ 
  /* if exists, then we must have  $e_1, \dots, e_{r-1} \in \lambda(C)$  and  $e_r \notin \lambda(C)$  */
3 if search is successful then
4   Augment( $P$ )
5   decrease  $\widetilde{\text{def}}(v)$  by 1 to preserve equality  $\widetilde{\text{def}}(v) = \text{def}_F(v)$ 
6 else
7    $\widetilde{\text{def}}(v) \leftarrow 0$ 

```

---

Using a standard *cyclic scanning search* approach [11, 10], Algorithm 2 can be implemented in time  $O(|\lambda(C)|)$ , plus the time to compute  $p = \min\{j \mid e_r \text{ is joining for } F_j\}$  in the augmentation procedure if the search is successful. We refer to [10, Section 2.3-2.5] for a detailed description of the cyclic scanning search (the fact that Gabow deals with spanning trees for  $F_1, \dots, F_{k-1}$  does not change the validity of this approach).

The following result is crucial to the complexity analysis of our algorithm. As the proof is somewhat complicated, the theorem will be proved in a separate section.

**Theorem 2.7.** *Let  $\widetilde{F} = \widetilde{F}_1 \cup \dots \cup \widetilde{F}_{k-1}$  be an optimal solution of Problem 1.1 for  $k-1$ , and suppose that it obeys the nestedness condition and  $\text{def}_{\widetilde{F}}(C) \leq k-1$  for each component  $C$  of  $\widetilde{F}_{k-1}$ . Consider Problem 1.1 for  $k$  with initial configuration equal to  $\widetilde{F}_1, \dots, \widetilde{F}_{k-1}$  and the empty  $k$ -th forest. Then, after any sequence of augmentations, each component  $C$  of  $F_k$  satisfies  $\text{def}_F(C) \leq k$ .*

Now we can describe the final algorithm (see Algorithm 3).

---

**Algorithm 3:** Solving Problem 1.1 for a given graph  $G$  and value  $k \geq 1$ .

---

```

1 if  $k > 1$  then recursively compute an optimal solution  $F_1, \dots, F_{k-1}$  of Problem 1.1 for  $k - 1$ 
2  $F_k \leftarrow$  empty forest
3 while  $\widetilde{\text{def}}(V) > 0$  do
4    $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow$  set of all components  $C$  of  $F_k$  with  $\widetilde{\text{def}}(C) > 0$ 
5   for  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  do
6     Search( $C$ )
7     if  $C$  got merged with some  $B \in \mathcal{C}$ , delete  $B$  from  $\mathcal{C}$ 

```

---

The algorithm is correct, because it keeps looking for an augmenting path until there are no augmenting paths. Note, if  $F_k$  becomes a spanning tree then we can stop – then all forests must be spanning trees and so  $F$  is optimal.

**Theorem 2.8.** *Algorithm 3 can be implemented in  $O(k\delta m \log n)$  time.*

*Proof.* Let  $k_G$  be a fixed positive integer such that  $G$  is strongly  $k_G$ -connected. There are two phases: growing forests for  $k \leq k_G$ , and growing forests for  $k > k_G$ . Below we analyze the times for these operations excluding the time for computing indices  $p$  in Algorithm 1.

(1) *Growing  $k$ -th forest for  $k \leq k_G$ .* All forests  $F_1, \dots, F_{k-1}$  are spanning trees. We claim that there will be no unsuccessful searches during this phase. (If some search from node  $v$  is unsuccessful, then Lemma 2.4 gives an  $F$ -closed set  $Q_v \ni v$  with  $Q_v \neq V$ ; the latter holds since  $F_k$  is not a spanning tree. Eq. (10) gives  $|\rho(Q_v)| = k - \tau(Q_v) - \text{def}_F(Q_v) < k \leq k_G$ , which is a contradiction.) Therefore, at each round of the **while** loop, the number of components of  $F_k$  halves, so there will be  $O(\log n)$  rounds of the loop. This yields  $O(m \log n)$  time for the  $k$ -th forest.

(2) *Growing  $k$ -th forest for  $k > k_G$ .* At line 4 each component  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  satisfies  $\widetilde{\text{def}}(C) = \text{def}_F(C) \leq k$  (by Theorem 2.7), implying that  $|\mathcal{C}| \geq \frac{\widetilde{\text{def}}(V)}{k}$ . At least half of the components in  $\mathcal{C}$  will be **Search**'ed, hence each round of the **while** loop decreases  $\widetilde{\text{def}}(V)$  by at least  $\frac{\widetilde{\text{def}}(V)}{2k}$ . Therefore, there will be at most  $-\log_{1-\frac{1}{2k}}(kn) = O(k \log(kn)) = O(k \log n)$  such rounds (since  $k = O(\text{poly}(n))$ , as assumed in Section 1). Each round takes  $O(\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} |\lambda(C)|) = O(m)$  time. This sums to  $O(km \log n)$  time for growing  $k$ -th forest (lines 2-7).

In total, the operations above take  $k_G \cdot O(m \log n) + \delta \cdot O(km \log n) = O(k\delta m \log n)$  time for the final value of  $k$ . It remains to discuss the time for computing indices  $p = \min\{j \mid e_r \text{ is joining for } F_j\}$  during augmentations. There are  $k_G(n-1)$  augmentations in the first phase and  $O(\delta n)$  augmentations in the second phase. In the first phase we need  $O(1)$  time per augmentation (since we always have  $p = k$ ). In the second phase for each augmentation we need to perform the following operation  $k$  times<sup>4</sup>: determine whether a given edge  $e$  is joining for a given forest  $F_j$ . If we maintain a disjoint sets data structure for each forest, then each such operation takes  $O(\alpha(n))$  amortized time [18] (where  $\alpha(\cdot)$  is the inverse Ackermann function). In total, this yields  $k_G(n-1) \cdot O(1) + O(\delta n) \cdot O(k\alpha(n))$  time, which is dominated by  $O(k\delta m \log n)$ .  $\square$

## 2.4 Proof of Theorem 2.7

In this subsection, like in the previous one,  $\tau = \mathbf{0}$ .

Let us fix forests  $\widetilde{F} = \widetilde{F}_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \widetilde{F}_{k-1}$  which is an optimal solution for  $k-1$ , and let  $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_q\}$  be the corresponding  $\widetilde{F}$ -closed sets constructed in Lemma 2.4. We denote  $S = S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_q$  and  $\overline{S} = V - S$ . In the rest of the proof, we also let  $F = F_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup F_k$  be a solution

---

<sup>4</sup>With a binary search one could improve this to  $O(\log k)$  times, but the looser bound suffices for our purposes.



for  $k$  (not necessarily optimal) that is obtained from  $\widetilde{F}$  via some sequence of augmentations. We will use the following notation:

- Let  $F_{1\dots k-1} = F_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup F_{k-1}$ .
- Let  $\langle F_k \rangle$  be the set of components of forest  $F_k$ ; it forms a partition of  $V$ .
- Let  $\langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle = \{C \in \langle F_k \rangle : C \subseteq \overline{S}\}$  be the set of components in  $\langle F_k \rangle$  not intersecting  $S$ .
- Finally, define  $\langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle_d = \{C \in \langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle : \text{def}_F(C) = d\}$ .

**Lemma 2.9.** *Solution  $F = F_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup F_k$  satisfies the following:*

- (a)  $\text{indeg}_{F_{1\dots k-1}}(C) \geq \text{indeg}_{\widetilde{F}}(C)$  for every  $C \in \langle F_k \rangle$ .
- (b) Each  $C \in \langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle$  satisfies  $\text{def}_F(C) \leq 1$  (and hence  $\langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle_0 \cup \langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle_1$ ).
- (c)  $|F_{1\dots k-1}| \geq |\widetilde{F}| + |\langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle_0|$ .

*Proof.* We use induction on  $|F|$ . After initialization we have  $F_{1\dots k-1} = \widetilde{F}$  and  $F_k = \emptyset$ . By construction,  $\langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle = \{\{v\} : v \in \overline{S}\}$ , every  $\{v\} \in \langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle$  satisfies  $\text{def}_F(v) = k - (k - 1) = 1$ , and  $\langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle_0 = \emptyset$ , implying (a)-(c). Now suppose that the claim holds for  $F$ , and solution  $F'$  is obtained from  $F$  by a single augmentation that starts at vertex  $v$  of component  $C \in \langle F_k \rangle$  and ends at edge  $e$  which is joining for forest  $p \in [k]$ . Note that we have  $\text{indeg}_{F'}(v) = \text{indeg}_F(v) + 1$  and  $\text{indeg}_{F'}(u) = \text{indeg}_F(u)$  for  $u \in V - \{v\}$ . This means, in particular, that components  $C' \in \langle F'_k \rangle$  not containing  $v$  have the same deficits in  $F$  and  $F'$ . Also,  $\text{def}_F(C) \geq \text{def}_F(v) \geq 1$ . By Theorem 2.2(a),  $|F'_p| = |F_p| + 1$  and  $|F'_i| = |F_i|$  for  $i \in [k] - p$ . Two cases are possible.

- $p < k$ . Then we have  $\langle F'_k \rangle = \langle F_k \rangle$ ,  $\text{def}_{F'}(C) = \text{def}_F(C) - 1$ , and  $|F'_{1\dots k-1}| = |F_{1\dots k-1}| + 1$ . Note that  $|\langle\langle F'_k \rangle\rangle_0| \leq |\langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle_0| + 1$ . It can now be checked that (b,c) cannot become violated for  $F'$ . Only edges in  $\lambda(C) \cup \{e\}$  could have changed their memberships, therefore  $\text{indeg}_{F'_{1\dots k-1}}(C) - \text{indeg}_{F_{1\dots k-1}}(C) \geq |F'_{1\dots k-1}| - |F_{1\dots k-1}| - 1 \geq 0$ , which implies property (a) for  $F'$ .
- $p = k$ . Then  $C$  is merged with some component  $D \in \langle F_k \rangle - \{C\}$  into  $C' = C \cup D$ . We have  $\langle F'_k \rangle = (\langle F_k \rangle - \{C, D\}) \cup \{C'\}$ ,  $\text{def}_{F'}(C') = \text{def}_F(C) + \text{def}_F(D) - 1$ , and  $|F'_{1\dots k-1}| = |F_{1\dots k-1}|$ . Only edges inside  $\lambda(C')$  could have changed their memberships, therefore  $\text{indeg}_{F'_{1\dots k-1}}(C') - \text{indeg}_{F_{1\dots k-1}}(C') = |F'_{1\dots k-1}| - |F_{1\dots k-1}| = 0$ . Using induction hypothesis, we obtain  $\text{indeg}_{F'_{1\dots k-1}}(C') = \text{indeg}_{F_{1\dots k-1}}(C) + \text{indeg}_{F_{1\dots k-1}}(D) \geq \text{indeg}_{\widetilde{F}}(C) + \text{indeg}_{\widetilde{F}}(D) = \text{indeg}_{\widetilde{F}}(C')$ , which shows (a). To show (b,c), we consider two subcases:  
Case 1:  $C' \in \langle\langle F'_k \rangle\rangle$ , or equivalently  $C' \subseteq \overline{S}$ . We then have  $C, D \in \langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle$ , and so the induction hypothesis yields  $\text{def}_F(C) = 1$  and  $\text{def}_F(D) \leq 1$ . Thus, (b) still holds (since  $\text{def}_{F'}(C') = \text{def}_F(D) \leq 1$ ), and so does (c) (since  $|F'_{1\dots k-1}| = |F_{1\dots k-1}|$  and  $|\langle\langle F'_k \rangle\rangle_0| = |\langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle_0|$ ).  
Case 2:  $C' \notin \langle\langle F'_k \rangle\rangle$ . Then (b) cannot become violated, and (c) also cannot become violated since  $|F'_{1\dots k-1}| = |F_{1\dots k-1}|$  and  $|\langle\langle F'_k \rangle\rangle_0| \leq |\langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle_0|$ .

□

**Lemma 2.10.** *Each component  $C \in \langle F_k \rangle$  intersects at most one of the sets  $S_i \in \mathcal{S}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $t = |\{(S_i, C) \in \mathcal{S} \times \langle F_k \rangle : S_i \cap C \neq \emptyset\}|$  be the number of non-empty intersections between sets  $S_i$  and components of  $F_k$ . Clearly, we have  $|\langle F_k \rangle| \leq |\langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle| + t$ . Furthermore, if the lemma is false (i.e. some  $C \in \langle F_k \rangle$  has non-empty intersections with two distinct sets  $S_i, S_{i'} \in \mathcal{S}$ ) then  $|\langle F_k \rangle| \leq |\langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle| + (t - 1)$ . To show the lemma, it thus suffices to prove that  $|\langle F_k \rangle| \geq |\langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle| + t$ .

Let us split the edges into three sets:

$$\begin{cases} E_1 = \lambda(S_1) \cup \dots \cup \lambda(S_q), \\ E_2 = \rho(S_1) \cup \dots \cup \rho(S_q), \\ E_3 = \{e \in E : \text{head}(e) \in \overline{S}\}. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Clearly,  $E = E_1 \sqcup E_2 \sqcup E_3$ . Denote  $\Delta_i = |F \cap E_i| - |\tilde{F} \cap E_i|$ , then  $|F| - |\tilde{F}| = \Delta_1 + \Delta_2 + \Delta_3$ . We claim that quantities  $\Delta_i$  can be upper-bounded as follows.

- $\Delta_1 \leq |S| - t$ . Indeed, for each  $S_i$  we have  $|F_k \cap \lambda(S_i)| \leq |S_i| - t_i$  where  $t_i$  is the number of components  $C \in \langle F_k \rangle$  that intersect  $S_i$ . Furthermore,  $|F_{1\dots k-1} \cap \lambda(S_i)| \leq |\tilde{F} \cap \lambda(S_i)|$  since  $\tilde{F}_1, \dots, \tilde{F}_{k-1}$  are already spanning in  $S_i$ . This yields the desired claim as follows:

$$\Delta_1 = \sum_i \left( |F_k \cap \lambda(S_i)| + |F_{1\dots k-1} \cap \lambda(S_i)| - |\tilde{F} \cap \lambda(S_i)| \right) \leq \sum_i (|S_i| - t_i) = |S| - t$$

- $\Delta_2 \leq 0$ . This holds since each  $S_i$  is  $\tilde{F}$ -closed and hence all edges in  $E_2$  are already covered by  $\tilde{F}$ .
- $\Delta_3 \leq |\overline{S}| - r + |F_{1\dots k-1}| - |\tilde{F}|$ . Indeed, for  $v \in \overline{S}$  let us denote  $\Delta_3^v = \text{indeg}_F(v) - \text{indeg}_{\tilde{F}}(v)$ , then  $\Delta_3^v \leq k - (k-1) = 1$ . Each component  $C \in \langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle_1$  contains  $|C| - 1$  nodes  $v$  with  $\Delta_3^v = 1$  and one node  $v$  with  $\Delta_3^v = 0$ . Using Lemma 2.9(b,c), we can now obtain the desired claim as follows:

$$\Delta_3 = \sum_{v \in \overline{S}} \Delta_3^v \leq |\overline{S}| - |\langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle_1| = |\overline{S}| - |\langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle| + |\langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle_0| \leq |\overline{S}| - |\langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle| + |F_{1\dots k-1}| - |\tilde{F}|$$

Putting together the bounds above gives

$$\begin{aligned} |F| - |\tilde{F}| &= \Delta_1 + \Delta_2 + \Delta_3 \leq (|S| - t) + 0 + (|\overline{S}| - |\langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle| + |F_{1\dots k-1}| - |\tilde{F}|) \\ &= |V| - t - |\langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle| + |F_{1\dots k-1}| - |\tilde{F}| \end{aligned}$$

and therefore  $|F_k| = |F| - |F_{1\dots k-1}| \leq |V| - t - |\langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle|$ . On the other hand,  $|F_k| = |V| - |\langle F_k \rangle|$ , and hence  $|\langle F_k \rangle| \geq |\langle\langle F_k \rangle\rangle| + t$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 2.7.

*Proof of Theorem 2.7.* Assume there exists component  $C \in \langle F_k \rangle$  with  $\text{def}_F(C) > k$ , or equivalently  $\text{indeg}_F(C) < k|C| - k$ . Since there are  $|C| - 1$  edges of  $F_k$  in this component, we have  $\text{indeg}_{F_k}(C) = |C| - 1$ . Using Lemma 2.9(a), we conclude that  $\text{indeg}_{\tilde{F}}(C) \leq \text{indeg}_{F_{1\dots k-1}}(C) < (k|C| - k) - (|C| - 1) = (k-1)|C| - k + 1$  and hence  $\text{def}_{\tilde{F}}(C) > k - 1$ . By Lemma 2.10, there exists  $S_i \in \{S_1, \dots, S_q, \emptyset\}$  such that each vertex from  $C - S_i$  has zero deficit in  $\tilde{F}$ , and so  $\text{def}_{\tilde{F}}(S_i) = \text{def}_{\tilde{F}}(C) > k - 1$ . By the definition of  $\mathcal{S}$ , we have  $S_i \subseteq \tilde{C}$  for some component  $\tilde{C}$  of  $\tilde{F}_{k-1}$ . We obtain that  $\text{def}_{\tilde{F}}(\tilde{C}) \geq \text{def}_{\tilde{F}}(S_i) > k - 1$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

### 3 Directed edge connectivity augmentation problem

In this section, we describe an algorithm for computing a  $(k, s)$ -connected extension  $G'$  of a given directed graph  $G$  with  $\text{indeg}(s) = \text{outdeg}(s) = \gamma(G, k) = \max\{\alpha_{\text{in}}(G, k), \alpha_{\text{out}}(G, k)\}$ ; such an extension will be called *optimal*. Recall that given optimal  $G'$  with  $m'$  edges, Problem 1.2 can be solved in  $O(m'k \log n)$  time using edge splitting algorithms of [2] (see Section 1.2).

We say that a vector  $\eta : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  is a  $k$ -half-extension of  $G$  if

$$|\rho(A)| + \eta(A) \geq k \quad \forall A \subsetneq V, A \neq \emptyset \quad (14)$$

It is *minimal* if there is no  $k$ -half-extension  $\eta' \neq \eta$  with  $\eta' \leq \eta$ . Equivalently,  $\eta$  is a minimal  $k$ -half-extension if and only if it can be obtained by the greedy algorithm that initializes  $\eta = (k, \dots, k)$  and then keeps doing the following step while possible:

- pick some  $v \in V$  with  $\eta(v) > 0$ , decrease  $\eta(v)$  by 1 if this preserves (14).

Frank showed that this greedy procedure can be used to construct an optimal  $(k, s)$ -connected extension as follows.

**Theorem 3.1** (Frank, reformulation of [7, Theorem 3.9]). *Let  $\eta$  and  $\eta^{\text{rev}}$  be minimal  $k$ -half-extensions of  $G$  and  $G^{\text{rev}}$ , respectively. Then  $(k, s)$ -connected extension  $G'$  of  $G$  with  $\text{indeg}(s) = \text{outdeg}(s) = \gamma(G, k)$  can be obtained from  $G$  as follows:*

- (i) add new node  $s$ ;
- (ii) for each  $v \in A$  with  $\eta(v) > 0$  add  $\eta(v)$  edges  $(s, v)$ ;
- (iii) for each  $v \in A$  with  $\eta^{\text{rev}}(v) > 0$  add  $\eta^{\text{rev}}(v)$  edges  $(v, s)$ ;
- (iv) if  $\eta(V) > \eta^{\text{rev}}(V)$  then add  $\eta(V) - \eta^{\text{rev}}(V)$  arbitrary edges of the form  $(v, s)$ , otherwise add  $\eta^{\text{rev}}(V) - \eta(V)$  arbitrary edges of the form  $(s, v)$ .

Thus, it suffices to show how to compute a minimal  $k$ -half-extension of a given graph  $G$ . The next two theorems give two approaches for solving this problem. Note that the first approach is applicable only in a special case.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $F$  be an optimal solution of Problem 1.1 for  $(G, k, \mathbf{0})$ . Then  $\alpha_{\text{in}}(G, k) \leq \text{def}_F(V)$ . Now suppose that  $\text{def}_F(V) > k$  (equivalently, not all forests in  $F$  are spanning trees). Then the vector  $\eta$  with  $\eta(v) = \text{def}_F(v)$  for  $v \in V$  is a minimal  $k$ -half-extension of  $G$ , and furthermore  $\alpha_{\text{in}}(G, k) = \text{def}_F(V) > k$ .*

**Theorem 3.3.** *Fix node  $a \in V$ , and let  $F$  be an optimal solution of Problem 1.1 for  $(G, k, \tau^{a:k})$ . Define the vector  $\eta$  as follows:  $\eta(v) = \text{def}_F(v)$  for  $v \in V - a$ , and  $\eta(a)$  is the minimum value for which*

$$\min\{|\rho(A)| + \eta(A) : \forall A \subsetneq V, a \in A\} \geq k \quad (15)$$

*Then  $\eta$  is a minimal  $k$ -half-extension of  $G$ .*

*Proof of Theorems 3.2 and 3.3.* The claim  $\alpha_{\text{in}}(G, k) \leq \text{def}_F(V)$  in Theorem 3.2 follows directly from Corollary 2.5. From now on, we assume that  $\text{def}_F(V) > k$  in this theorem.

Let us define  $a = \perp$  and  $\tau = \mathbf{0}$  in the case of Theorem 3.2, and  $\tau = \tau^{a:k}$  in the case of Theorem 3.3. Thus, in both cases we have  $a \in V \cup \{\perp\}$ , and  $F$  is an optimal solution of Problem 1.1 for  $(G, k, \tau)$ .

First, we show that the vector  $\eta$  is a  $k$ -half-extension, i.e. it satisfies (14). Consider set  $A \subsetneq V$  with  $a \notin A$ . We have  $\text{indeg}_F(A) \leq |\rho(A)| + k(|A| - 1)$  and hence

$$|\rho(A)| + \eta(A) = |\rho(A)| + \text{def}_F(A) = |\rho(A)| + k|A| - \text{indeg}_F(A) \geq k$$

If  $a \in A$  then we are in the case of Theorem 3.3 and the claim holds since  $\eta$  satisfies (15).

Now let  $\mathcal{S}$  be the subpartition constructed in Lemma 2.4 for optimal solution  $F$  of input  $(G, k, \tau)$ . We claim that every  $A \in \mathcal{S}$  satisfies the following:

- $a \notin A$  (otherwise we are in the case of Theorem 3.3, and  $0 < \text{def}_F(A) = k - \tau(A) - |\rho(A)| \leq k - k - |\rho(A)| \leq 0$  by eq. (10) and the properties of  $\mathcal{S}$  - a contradiction).

- $A \neq V$ . If  $a \neq \perp$  then this holds by the previous claim, and if  $a = \perp$  then this holds since  $F_i$  is not a spanning tree for some  $i$ , and  $A$  is contained in a connected component of  $F_i$ .

Consider node  $v \in V - a$  with  $\eta(v) = \text{def}_F(v) > 0$ , and let  $A$  be the set in  $\mathcal{S}$  containing  $v$ . Eq. (10) gives  $\eta(A) = \text{def}_F(A) = k - |\rho(A)|$  and hence  $|\rho(A)| + \eta(A) = k$ . Thus, decreasing  $\eta(v)$  will make (14) false. Decreasing  $\eta(a)$  (in the case of Theorem 3.3) will also make (14) false by the choice of  $\eta(a)$ . This shows that  $\eta$  is a minimal  $k$ -half-extension.

It remains to observe that in Theorem 3.2 we have  $\eta(V) = \text{def}_F(V) = \alpha_{\text{in}}(G, k)$  by Corollary 2.5 and the fact that subpartition  $\mathcal{S}$  is proper.  $\square$

Next, we discuss how to implement the approach in Theorem 3.3. We will use Algorithm 4 to compute the minimum value  $\eta(a)$  for which (15) holds. The structure of Algorithm 4 is inspired by Gabow's paper [9].

---

**Algorithm 4:** CompleteEta( $G, k, \eta$ ) for partial vector  $\eta : V - a \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$

---

- 1 let  $G'$  be the graph obtained from  $G$  by adding nodes  $s, t$ , edges  $(s, v)$  with capacity  $\eta(v)$  for  $v \in V - a$ , and edge  $(a, t)$  with capacity  $k$
  - 2 compute maximum  $s$ - $t$  flow in  $G'$ ; let  $\bar{G}'$  be the residual graph and  $f \in [0, k]$  be the value of the flow
  - 3 **if** edge  $(a, t)$  is saturated (i.e.  $f = k$ ) or some edge  $(s, v)$  is not saturated **then**
  - 4      $\lfloor$  set  $\eta(a) = k - f$
  - 5 **else**
  - 6      $\lfloor$  let  $\bar{G}$  be the graph obtained from  $\bar{G}'$  by removing  $s, t$  and incident edges
  - 7      $\lfloor$  compute maximum  $\ell \in [0, k - f]$  s.t. graph  $\bar{G}^{\text{rev}}$  has a complete  $\ell$ -intersection for node  $a$
  - 8      $\lfloor$  set  $\eta(a) = k - f - \ell$
- 

**Theorem 3.4.** Algorithm 4 sets  $\eta(a)$  to the minimum value for which (15) holds. It can be implemented in  $O(km \log(n))$  time.

*Proof.* Below, an  $s$ - $t$  cut is a set of nodes  $U$  containing  $t$  but not  $s$ , and its cost in a given graph is the total cost of edges entering  $U$ .

Let  $A^*$  be a set that minimizes the expression in (15), and let  $\theta = |\rho(A^*)| + \eta(A^* - a)$ . Clearly,  $\eta(a)$  should be set to value  $\eta^*(a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\{k - \theta, 0\}$ . Set  $A^* + t$  is an  $s$ - $t$  cut in  $G'$  of cost  $\theta$ , therefore  $f \leq \theta$ . In particular, if  $f = k$  then  $\theta \geq k$  and  $\eta^*(a) = 0$ . Let us assume that  $f < k$ , then edge  $(a, t)$  is not saturated in a maximum flow and hence we can assume w.l.o.g. that we chose  $t = a$  when constructing  $G'$ , and did not add edge  $(a, t)$ . Also,  $\bar{G}$  is obtained from  $\bar{G}'$  by removing  $s$  and incident edges. Note that  $A^*$  is a minimum  $s$ - $a$  cut in  $G'$  among cuts satisfying  $A^* \neq V$ .

Suppose that some edge  $(s, v)$  is not saturated. Then any minimum  $s$ - $a$  cut in  $G'$  does not equal  $V$  (since it does not contain  $v$ ), thus  $A^*$  must be a minimum  $s$ - $a$  cut in  $G'$ .  $f$  equals the cost of  $A^*$  in  $G'$  which is  $\theta$ , therefore  $\eta^*(a) = \max\{k - f, 0\} = k - f$ , as desired.

Finally, let us assume that all edges  $(s, v)$  are saturated. In that case we have  $|\rho(A)| + \eta(A - a) = f + |\bar{\rho}(A)|$  for any  $A \subseteq V$  containing  $a$ , where  $\bar{\rho}(A)$  are the edges of  $\bar{G}$  entering  $A$ . Therefore,

$$\theta = f + \ell^*, \quad \ell^* = \min\{|\bar{\rho}(A)| : A \subsetneq V, a \in A\} = \min\{|\bar{\rho}^{\text{rev}}(\bar{A})| : \emptyset \neq \bar{A} \subseteq V - a\}$$

By Theorem 1.6, line 7 of Algorithm 4 outputs  $\ell = \min\{\ell^*, k - f\} = \min\{\theta - f, k - f\}$ , and thus

$$\eta(a) = k - f - \min\{\theta - f, k - f\} = k - \min\{\theta, k\} = \max\{k - \theta, 0\} = \eta^*(a)$$

It remains to discuss the complexity of Algorithm 4. Maximum flow in line 2 can be computed in time  $O(km)$  since there are  $f \leq k$  augmentations and each augmentation can be found in  $O(m)$  time. Value  $\ell$  in line 7 can be computed in  $O(km \log(n))$  time by the algorithm of Gabow [10]. This concludes the proof.  $\square$

## 4 Undirected edge connectivity augmentation problem

The approach in the previous section can be easily adapted to solve Problem 1.3: given an undirected graph  $G$ , find a smallest set of undirected edges whose addition to  $G$  makes  $G$   $k$ -connected. Let  $\gamma(G, k)$  be the number of new edges. Below, we always assume that  $k \geq 2$  (for  $k = 1$  the algorithm is trivial).

For  $A \subseteq V$  let  $\partial A$  be the set of edges between  $A$  and  $V - A$  in  $G$ . We say that a vector  $\eta : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  is a  $k$ -extension of  $G$  if

$$|\partial A| + \eta(A) \geq k \quad \forall A \subsetneq V, A \neq \emptyset \quad (16)$$

It is *minimal* if there is no  $k$ -extension  $\eta' \neq \eta$  with  $\eta' \leq \eta$ . Clearly,  $\eta$  is a minimal  $k$ -extension of  $G$  if and only if it is a minimal  $k$ -half-extension of  $\vec{G}$  where  $\vec{G}$  is a directed graph obtained from  $G$  by replacing each edge  $uv$  with two directed edges  $(u, v), (v, u)$ . Thus,  $\eta$  can be computed in  $O(k\delta m \log n)$  time by the approach in the previous section.

To solve Problem 1.3, we can now use the following algorithm.

1. Compute a minimal  $k$ -extension  $\eta$  of  $G$ . If  $\eta(V)$  is odd, then pick arbitrary  $v \in V$  and increase  $\eta(v)$  by 1. Frank's proof of [7, Lemma 4.2] shows that we now have  $\eta(V) = 2\gamma(G, k)$ . Note that  $\eta(V) \leq \delta n + 1$ .
2. Construct an undirected graph  $G'$  with  $m' = m + \eta(V)$  edges by adding node  $s$  to  $G$  and  $\eta(v)$  edges  $vs$  for each  $v \in V$ . Clearly,  $G'$  is  $(k, s)$ -connected, where we  $(k, s)$ -connectivity is defined by applying Definition 1.8 to undirected graphs.
3. Repeat the following step while  $s$  has incident edges in  $G' = (V + s, E')$ : find a pair of edges  $us, vs$  in  $G'$  for which graph  $G'' = (V + s, E' - \{us, vs\} + \{uv\})$  is  $(k, s)$ -connected, replace  $G'$  with  $G''$ . The existence of such a pair was shown by Lovász [12, 13], see also [7, Theorem 4.5]. An efficient algorithm with complexity  $O((k^2n + m') \log n)$  for performing all edge splittings has been given in [2].

The overall complexity of this algorithm is  $O(k(\delta m + kn) \log n)$ , as stated in Section 1.3.

We remark that in the undirected case, the min-max characterization for Problem 1.3 has been established by Cai and Sun [3]; a simplified proof can be found in [7].

**Theorem 4.1** ([3]). *If  $k \geq 2$  then*

$$\gamma(G, k) = \left\lceil \frac{1}{2} \max_{\mathcal{X}: \text{a proper subpartition of } V} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{X}} (k - |\partial A|) \right\rceil \quad (17)$$

## A Proof of Theorem 2.2(b,c)

Unless noted otherwise, in this section  $F = F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_k \in \mathcal{G}^k \cap \mathcal{D}$  always denotes a feasible solution of Problem 1.1,  $e, f, x, y$  denote elements of  $E$ , and  $s, t$  denote special elements that are not in  $E$ .

Below, we will define several directed graphs. For all of them, the set of nodes will be  $E \sqcup \{s, t\}$ , so we will view these graphs as subsets of edges. For such a graph  $D$ , we define  $D^{\text{inv}}$  to be the graph obtained from  $D$  by reversing edge orientations and additionally swapping nodes  $s$  and  $t$ . For example,  $(s, e) \in D$  if and only if  $(e, t) \in D^{\text{inv}}$ .

For a matroid  $\mathcal{M}$  on  $E$  and independent set  $X \in \mathcal{G}$  define a graph  $D_{\mathcal{M}}(X)$  via

$$D_{\mathcal{M}}(X) = \{(x, y) : x \notin X, y \in X, X + x - y \in \mathcal{M}\} \cup \{(x, t) : x \notin X, X + x \in \mathcal{M}\}$$

Using this notation, we now define the following graphs:

$$\begin{aligned} D^{\text{union}}(F) &= D_{\mathcal{G}}(F_1) \cup \dots \cup D_{\mathcal{G}}(F_k) \\ D^{\text{intersection}}(F) &= D_{\mathcal{G}^k}(F) \cup [D_{\mathcal{D}}(F)]^{\text{inv}} \end{aligned}$$

It can be checked that

$$\begin{aligned} D(F) &= D^{\text{union}}(F) \cup \{(v, e) : F(v) < k, \text{head}(e) = v, e \notin F\} \\ &\quad \cup \{(e, f) : e \in F, f \notin F, \text{head}(e) = \text{head}(f)\} \end{aligned}$$

The following are classical results about matroid union and intersection problems, see e.g. [17].

**Theorem A.1** ([17, Theorem 42.4]). *For any  $F \in \mathcal{G}^k$  and  $f \notin F$  the following holds:  $F + f \in \mathcal{G}^k$  if and only if  $D^{\text{union}}(F)$  has an  $f$ - $t$  path.*

**Theorem A.2** ([17, Theorems 41.2-41.3]).  *$F \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{G}^k$  is not optimal if and only if  $D^{\text{intersection}}(F)$  has an  $s$ - $t$  path.*

From these facts, we can infer Theorem 2.2(c) as follows.

**Lemma A.3.** *If  $F \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{G}^k$  is not optimal, then  $D(F)$  has a  $V$ - $t$  path.*

*Proof.* By Theorem A.2,  $D^{\text{intersection}}(F)$  has an  $s$ - $t$  path  $P$ . Consider a shortest such path. It may contain edges of the following types.

- $(s, e)$  with  $e \notin F$  and  $F + e \in \mathcal{D}$ . Let  $v = \text{head}(e)$ , then  $\text{indeg}_F(v) < k$ , and hence  $(v, e) \in D(F)$ .
- $(e, f)$  with  $f \notin F$ ,  $e \in F$  and  $F - e + f \in \mathcal{D}$ . Since  $P$  is shortest, we have  $(s, f) \notin D^{\text{intersection}}(F)$  and thus  $F + f \notin \mathcal{D}$ . This implies that  $\text{head}(e) = \text{head}(f)$ , and hence  $(e, f) \in D(F)$ .
- $(x, y)$  with  $x \notin F$ ,  $y \in F$  and  $F - y + x \in \mathcal{G}^k$ . We claim that  $D(F)$  contains either an  $x$ - $y$  path or an  $x$ - $t$  path. Indeed, graph  $D^{\text{union}}(F - y)$  contains an  $x$ - $t$  path  $P'$  (by Theorem A.1). The claim will now follow from the two facts below.
  - If  $(f, e) \in P'$ ,  $y \neq f$  then either  $(f, e) \in D(F)$  or  $(f, y) \in D(F)$ . Indeed, we have  $f \notin F_i - y$ ,  $e \in F_i - y$  and  $(F_i - y) - e + f \in \mathcal{G}$  for some  $i \in [k]$ . Assume that  $y \in F_i$  (otherwise  $F_i - e + f \in \mathcal{G}$  and hence  $(f, e) \in D(F)$ ). Applying the matroid exchange axiom to sets  $F_i - y - e + f$  and  $F_i$  yields that either  $F_i - e + f \in \mathcal{G}$  (in which case  $(f, e) \in D(F)$ ) or  $F_i - y + f \in \mathcal{G}$  (in which case  $(f, y) \in D(F)$ ).
  - If  $(e, t) \in P'$ , then either  $(e, y) \in D(F)$  or  $(e, t) \in D(F)$ . Indeed, we have  $e \notin F_i - y$ ,  $(F_i - y) + e \in \mathcal{G}$  for some  $i \in [k]$ . If  $y \in F_i$  then  $(e, y) \in D(F)$ , otherwise  $F_i + e \in \mathcal{G}$  and hence  $(e, t) \in D(F)$ .
- $(e, t)$  with  $e \notin F$  and  $F + e \in \mathcal{G}^k$ . Then the graph  $D^{\text{union}}(F) \subseteq D(F)$  contains an  $e$ - $t$  path (by Theorem A.1).

From these facts, we can conclude that  $D(F)$  contains a  $V$ - $t$  path. □

It remains to prove Theorem 2.2(b). For that we introduce the following definition:

**Definition A.4.** *Given independent set  $X \in \mathcal{G}$ , an  $X$ -path is a sequence of distinct elements  $Q = (x_1, y_1, \dots, x_r, y_r)$  where  $r \geq 1$ ,  $y_r \in E \cup \{t\}$ , all other elements of  $Q$  belong to  $E$ , and the following holds:*

- (1)  $(x_i, y_i) \in D_G(X)$  for  $i \in [r]$ .
- (2)  $(x_i, t) \notin D_G(X)$  for all  $i \in [r]$  with  $y_i \neq t$ .
- (3)  $(x_i, y_j) \notin D_G(X)$  for all  $i, j \in [r]$  with  $i < j$ .

For such  $Q$  we define  $X \oplus Q = X + \{x_1, \dots, x_r\} - \{y_1, \dots, y_r\} \subseteq E$ .

It can be seen that if  $P$  is a  $V$ - $t$  path in  $D(F)$  without shortcuts, then operation **Augment**( $P$ ) changes forest  $F_i$  to  $F_i \oplus Q_i$  for some  $F_i$ -path  $Q_i$ . Thus, Theorem 2.2(b) will follow from the result below.

**Lemma A.5.** *If  $Q = (x_1, y_1, \dots, x_r, y_r)$  is an  $X$ -path then  $X + \{x_1, \dots, x_r\} - \{y_1, \dots, y_r\} \in \mathcal{G}$ .*

*Proof.* We use induction on  $r$ . For  $r = 1$  the claim follows directly from definitions; suppose that  $r \geq 2$ . Denote  $X' = X + x_1 - y_1 \in \mathcal{G}$ . It suffices to show that  $Q' = (x_2, y_2, \dots, x_r, y_r)$  is an  $X'$ -path; the claim will then follow from the induction hypothesis.

Consider  $i \in [2, r]$ . Applying the matroid exchange axiom to sets  $X + x_1 - y_1 - y_i \subseteq X + x_1 - y_1$  and  $X + x_i - y_i$  (that are both in  $\mathcal{G}$ ) gives that either  $X + x_1 - y_i \in \mathcal{G}$  or  $X + x_1 - y_1 + x_i - y_i \in \mathcal{G}$ . The former is impossible since  $(x_1, y_j) \notin D_G(X)$ , hence  $X' + x_i - y_i \in \mathcal{G}$ , i.e.  $(x_i, y_i) \in D_G(X')$ .

Suppose that  $(x_i, t) \in D_G(X')$  for some  $i \in [2, r]$  with  $y_i \neq t$ , i.e.  $X' + x_i \in \mathcal{G}$ . Applying the matroid exchange axiom to sets  $X$  and  $X + x_1 - y_1 + x_i$  gives that either  $X + x_1 \in \mathcal{G}$  or  $X + x_i \in \mathcal{G}$ . We thus have either  $(x_1, t) \in D_G(X)$  or  $(x_i, t) \in D_G(X)$ , which both contradict condition (2).

Finally, suppose that  $(x_i, y_j) \in D_G(X')$  for some  $i, j \in [2, r]$  with  $i < j$ . As shown above, we must have  $y_j \neq t$ . Applying the matroid exchange axiom to sets  $X - y_j$  and  $X + x_1 - y_1 + x_i - y_j$  gives that either  $X + x_1 - y_j \in \mathcal{G}$  or  $X + x_i - y_j \in \mathcal{G}$ . We thus have either  $(x_1, y_1) \in D_G(X)$  or  $(x_1, y_j) \in D_G(X)$ , which both contradict condition (2).  $\square$

## References

- [1] András A. Benczúr and David R. Karger. Augmenting undirected edge connectivity in  $\tilde{O}(n^2)$  time. *J. Algorithms*, 37(1):2–36, 2000.
- [2] Anand Bhalgat, Ramesh Hariharan, Telikepalli Kavitha, and Debmalya Panigrahi. Fast edge splitting and Edmonds’ arborescence construction for unweighted graphs. In *SODA*, pages 455–464, 2008.
- [3] Guo-Ray Cai and Yu-Geng Sun. The minimum augmentation of any graph to a  $k$ -edge-connected graph. *Networks*, 19(1):151–172, 1989.
- [4] Ruoxu Cen, Jason Li, and Debmalya Panigrahi. Edge connectivity augmentation in near-linear time. In *STOC*, pages 137–150, 2022.
- [5] Jack Edmonds. Submodular functions, matroids, and certain polyhedra. In *Calgary International Conf. on Combinatorial Structures and their Applications*, pages 69–87. Gordon & Breach, New York, 1969.
- [6] Jack Edmonds. Edge-disjoint branchings. In R. Ruskin, editor, *Combinatorial Algorithms*, pages 91–96. Algorithmics Press, New York, 1972.
- [7] András Frank. Augmenting graphs to meet edge-connectivity requirements. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 5(1):25–53, 1992.
- [8] Harold N. Gabow. Applications of a poset representation to edge connectivity and graph rigidity. In *STOC*, 1991.

- [9] Harold N. Gabow. Efficient splitting off algorithms for graphs. In *STOC*, 1994.
- [10] Harold N. Gabow. A matroid approach to finding edge connectivity and packing arborescences. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 50(2):259–273, 1995.
- [11] Harold N. Gabow and Herbert H. Westermann. Forests, frames, and games: Algorithms for matroid sums and applications. *Algorithmica*, 7:465–497, 1992.
- [12] László Lovász. *Conference on Graph Theory*. Lecture, Prague, 1974.
- [13] László Lovász. *Combinatorial Problems and Exercises*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1979.
- [14] W. Mader. Konstruktion aller  $n$ -fach kantenzusammenhängenden digraphen. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 3(1):63–67, 1982.
- [15] Hiroshi Nagamochi and Toshihide Ibaraki. Deterministic  $\tilde{O}(nm)$  time edge-splitting in undirected graphs. *J. Comb. Optim.*, 1(1):5–46, 1997.
- [16] Dalit Naor, Dan Gusfield, and Charles U. Martel. A fast algorithm for optimally increasing the edge connectivity. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 26(4):1139–1165, 1997.
- [17] A. Schrijver. *Combinatorial Optimization - Polyhedra and Efficiency (Volume B)*. Springer, 2003.
- [18] Robert E. Tarjan and Jan van Leeuwen. Worst-case analysis of set union algorithms. *Journal of the ACM*, 31(2):245–281, 1984.
- [19] Toshimasa Watanabe and Akira Nakamura. Edge-connectivity augmentation problems. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 35(1):96–144, 1987.