

# Decomposition of Trees and Paths via Correlation

Jan-Hendrik Lange  
jlange@mpi-inf.mpg.de

Bjoern Andres  
andres@mpi-inf.mpg.de

Max Planck Institute for Informatics  
Saarland Informatics Campus · Saarbrücken, Germany

## Abstract

We study the problem of decomposing (clustering) a tree with respect to costs attributed to pairs of nodes, so as to minimize the sum of costs for those pairs of nodes that are in the same component (cluster). For the general case and for the special case of the tree being a star, we show that the problem is NP-hard. For the special case of the tree being a path, we show (i) the objective function is not necessarily submodular, (ii) the problem can be solved in quasi-polynomial time by divide-and-conquer, (iii) the problem can be solved in polynomial time by polyhedral optimization techniques. To establish (iii), we offer a totally dual integral (TDI) description of path partition polytopes.

## 1 Introduction

We study the problem of decomposing (clustering) a tree with respect to costs attributed to pairs of nodes, so as to minimize the sum of costs for those pairs of nodes that are in the same component (cluster). This *tree partition problem* is stated rigorously in Def. 1. One instance and its solution are depicted in Fig. 1.

On the one hand, the tree partition problem lacks a complexity of clustering problems for general graphs: Its feasible set, the set of all decompositions of a tree, is trivial to characterize. For example, the decompositions of any tree  $T = (V, E)$  relate one-to-one to the binary edge labelings  $y \in \{0, 1\}^E$  that indicate whether neighboring nodes  $\{u, v\} \in E$  are in the same component ( $y_{uv} = 1$ ) or distinct components ( $y_{uv} = 0$ ).


On the other hand, the tree partition problem exhibits a complexity not commonly found in clustering problems for general graphs: Its objective function has a multilinear form in the coordinates of  $y$  (in the standard unit basis) whose polynomial degree is the length of the longest path in  $T$ . This form arises from the fact that any two distinct nodes  $\{u, v\} \in \binom{V}{2}$  are in the same component iff  $y_e = 1$  for all edges  $e$  on the unique path  $P_{uv}$  in  $T$  from  $u$  to  $v$ , that is, iff  $\prod_{e \in P_{uv}} y_e = 1$ . Hence, the tree partition problem can be stated rigorously as follows:

**Definition 1.** For any (finite, simple, undirected) tree  $T = (V, E)$  and any  $c: \binom{V}{2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the optimization problem (1) is called the instance of the *tree partition problem* w.r.t.  $T$  and  $c$ . If  $T$  is a path, it is also called the instance of the *path partition problem* w.r.t.  $T$  and  $c$ .

$$\min_{y \in \{0, 1\}^E} \sum_{\{u, v\} \in \binom{V}{2}} c_{uv} \prod_{e \in P_{uv}} y_e \quad (1)$$

### 1.1 Contribution

In Section 3, we characterize the class of pseudo-Boolean functions  $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that arise as the objective func-



**Figure 1** Depicted above is an instance of the tree partition problem with costs associated to pairs of nodes. Edges of the tree are depicted as straight bold lines (dotted or solid). Additional pairs of nodes are connected by thin curves (dotted or solid). The solution decomposes the tree into two components, depicted with a shaded background, leaving some pairs of nodes in the same component (solid lines and curves) and some pairs of lines in distinct components (dotted lines and curves).

tion of the tree partition problem. We show that this class is not subsumed by the class of permuted submodular functions [Schlesinger, 2007], even if  $T$  is a path.

In Section 4, we study the computational complexity of the tree partition problem. For the general case and for the special case of the tree being a star, we show that the problem is NP-hard. For the special case of the tree being a path, we show that a divide-and-conquer algorithm establishes (only) quasi-polynomial time complexity.

In Section 5, the resistance of the path partition problem to submodular optimization and the divide-and-conquer technique motivates us to study the polyhedral geometry of its feasible set. To this end, we identify the tree partition problem as a special case of the minimum cost lifted multicut problem [Hornáková et al., 2017]. By offering a totally dual integral (TDI) description of the lifted multicut polytope for paths, we show that the path partition problem is solvable in polynomial time by efficient algorithms for linear programs. To establish TDI, we resort to

a characterization of TDI in terms of Hilbert bases.

### 1.2 Notation

Throughout the paper, we consider  $T = (V, E)$  to be a (finite, simple, undirected) tree with  $n = |E|$  edges. For any pair  $\{u, v\} \in \binom{V}{2}$  of distinct nodes, we denote by  $P_{uv}$  the unique path in  $T$  connecting  $u$  and  $v$ . Moreover, we denote by  $\text{dist}(u, v)$  the distance of  $u$  and  $v$  in  $T$ , i.e. the length of  $P_{uv}$ . To ease notation, we take the liberty of identifying any graph  $G = (V_G, E_G)$  with its edge set  $E_G$ . Hence, we may write  $e \in G$  instead of  $e \in E_G$ . For any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we denote by  $[k] := \{1, \dots, k\}$  the set of integers from 1 through  $k$ .

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Pseudo-Boolean Optimization

The optimization of pseudo-Boolean functions plays an important role in machine learning, for instance, in MAP-inference for computer vision models. The general problem can be reduced to the quadratic case [Boros and Hammer, 2002, Boros and Gruber, 2012], which is responsible for the NP-hardness of the problem. The combinatorial polytope associated with the linearization of quadratic pseudo-Boolean functions was extensively studied by Padberg [1989]. Computational approaches to pseudo-Boolean optimization based on the roof duality bound [Hammer et al., 1984, Kahl and Strandmark, 2012] have been quite successful in practice [Rother et al., 2007]. The important class of submodular functions allows for efficient optimization [Cunningham, 1985, Schrijver, 2000, Iwata et al., 2001, Orlin, 2009, Iwata and Orlin, 2009]. Some functions can be cast as a submodular variant by flipping the encoding of some of its input variables and can be minimized efficiently as well [Schlesinger, 2007].

### 2.2 Correlation Clustering and Multicut Polytopes

Decompositions of graphs into an unknown number of components based on (dis-)similarities between *neighboring* nodes is referred to as weighted correlation clustering. It has been studied for the complete graph [Bansal et al., 2004] as well as general graphs [Demaine et al., 2006]. As any decomposition of a graph is characterized by the mathematical notion of a multicut, the study of multicuts is closely related to correlation clustering. The combinatorial polytopes associated with the multicuts of a graph have been studied, among others, most notably by Grötschel and Wakabayashi [1989], Chopra and Rao [1993], Deza and Laurent [1997]. The more general case where correlations between *non-neighboring* nodes are taken into account as well has been introduced by Hornáková et al. [2017].

## 3 Pseudo-Boolean Optimization

In this section, we show that the objective function of the tree partition problem (Def. 1) need not be permuted

submodular [Schlesinger, 2007] even if  $T$  is a path. Consequently, the problem is not generally accessible to algorithms for minimizing submodular functions.

### 3.1 Preliminaries

To start with, we recall from [Boros and Hammer, 2002] some preliminaries: For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , any  $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called an  $n$ -variate *pseudo-Boolean* function (PBF). Any  $n$ -variate PBF  $f$  has a unique multi-linear polynomial form<sup>1</sup>:

$$f(y) = \sum_{I \subseteq [n]} c_I \prod_{i \in I} y_i, \quad \text{with} \quad c: 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}. \quad (2)$$

An  $n$ -variate PBF  $f$  is called *submodular* iff

$$\forall y, z \in \{0, 1\}^n: \quad f(y \wedge z) + f(y \vee z) \leq f(y) + f(z), \quad (3)$$

where  $y \wedge z, y \vee z$  are defined as the coordinate-wise minimum, respectively maximum. A PBF  $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is submodular iff all second order derivatives of its multi-linear polynomial form (2) are non-positive, i.e., iff

$$\forall i, j \in [n], i \neq j, \quad \forall y \in \{0, 1\}^n: \quad \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y_i \partial y_j}(y) \leq 0. \quad (4)$$

An  $n$ -variate PBF  $f$  is called *permuted submodular* [Schlesinger, 2007] iff there exists an  $I \subseteq [n]$  such that, for the label transform  $t_I: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n: y \mapsto z$  defined by (5), the function  $f \circ t_I$  is submodular.

$$\forall j \in [n]: \quad z_j = \begin{cases} 1 - y_j & \text{if } j \in I \\ y_j & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Permuted submodular PBFs can be minimized in polynomial time [Schlesinger, 2007].

### 3.2 Tree-Sparseness and Path-Sparseness

We observe that the objective functions of the tree partition problem form a class of sparse PBFs whose set  $\{I \subseteq [n]: c_I \neq 0\}$  of non-zero coefficients is constrained by a tree.

**Definition 2.** An  $n$ -variate PBF is called *tree-sparse* w.r.t. a tree  $T = (V, [n])$  iff its multi-linear polynomial form (2) is such that, for every  $I \subseteq [n]$  with  $c_I \neq 0$ , the set  $I$  induces a path in  $T$ . The function is called *path-sparse* w.r.t. a path  $P = (V, [n])$  iff it is tree-sparse w.r.t.  $P$ .

**Lemma 1.** *There exist path-sparse pseudo-Boolean functions that are not permuted submodular.*

*Proof.* Consider the path-sparse pseudo-Boolean function  $f: \{0, 1\}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by the form

$$f(y) = -y_1 - y_2 - y_3 + y_1 y_2 + y_2 y_3 + y_1 y_2 y_3.$$

Applying criterion (4), it is obvious that  $f$  is not submodular. To verify that  $f$  is not permuted submodular, we check that for any  $\emptyset \neq I \subseteq [n]$ , the function  $f \circ t_I$  is not

<sup>1</sup>In line with the literature on pseudo-Boolean optimization, we call the form (2) *multi-linear* despite its constant term  $c_\emptyset$ .

submodular either. We list all remaining 7 transforms of  $f$  and assert by (4) that none of these is submodular:

$$\begin{aligned} f(t_{\{1\}}(y)) &= -1 + y_1 - y_3 - y_1y_2 + 2y_2y_3 - y_1y_2y_3 \\ f(t_{\{f\}}(y)) &= -1 + y_2 - y_1y_2 - y_2y_3 + y_1y_3 - y_1y_2y_3 \\ f(t_{\{3\}}(y)) &= -1 + y_3 - y_1 - y_2y_3 + 2y_1y_2 - y_1y_2y_3 \\ f(t_{\{1,2\}}(y)) &= -1 + y_3 + y_1y_2 - 2y_2y_3 - y_1y_3 + y_1y_2y_3 \\ f(t_{\{2,3\}}(y)) &= -1 + y_1 + y_2y_3 - 2y_1y_2 - y_1y_3 + y_1y_2y_3 \\ f(t_{\{1,3\}}(y)) &= -2 + y_1 + 2y_2 + y_3 - 2y_1y_2 - 2y_2y_3 + y_1y_2y_3 \\ f(t_{\{1,2,3\}}(y)) &= -y_1 - 2y_2 - y_3 + 2y_1y_2 + 2y_2y_3 + y_1y_3 - y_1y_2y_3. \end{aligned}$$

□

## 4 Computational Complexity

In this section, we study the computational complexity of the tree partition problem. Firstly, in Lemma 2, we show that the problem is NP-hard, even if the tree is a star. Secondly, we study the complementary case in which the tree is a path. An obvious strategy to approach this problem is divide-and-conquer, more specifically, splitting the path in two sub-paths of (roughly) equal size. This strategy is pursued in the proof of Theorem 1. It establishes a quasi-polynomial bound on the time complexity of the path partition problem.

**Lemma 2.** *The tree partition problem is NP-hard. It remains NP-hard if  $T$  is a star.*

*Proof.* For a path-sparse pseudo-Boolean function defined on a star with  $n$  leaves, problem (1) is equivalent to the unconstrained binary quadratic program with  $n$  variables, which is well-known to be NP-hard. □

**Theorem 1.** *The path partition problem can be solved in time  $\mathcal{O}(n^{\log n})$  by divide-and-conquer.*

*Proof.* We consider the path partition problem w.r.t. the path  $P = (V, E)$  and costs  $c$ . For any edge  $e = \{w, w'\} \in E$ , let  $P^e$  be the path obtained from  $P$  by contracting edge  $e$ . This operation fixes the variable  $y_e$  to 1. The instance of the path partition problem w.r.t.  $P^e$  and  $c$  is given by redefining the costs such that they account for the merged edge  $e$ , i.e. via  $c_{vw} := c_{vw} + c_{vw'}$  if  $e \in P_{vw}$  and similarly for  $c_{vw'}$ .

Denote by  $\text{LMP}(P)$  the value of the solution to the path partition problem w.r.t.  $P$  and  $c$  and let  $n' := \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ . We can split the problem w.r.t.  $P$  into problems of smaller size by considering the two possible values of  $y_{n', n'+1}$ :

$$\text{LMP}(P) = \min \left\{ c_{ww'} + \text{LMP}(P^{\{n', n'+1\}}), \text{LMP}(P_{0, n'}) + \text{LMP}(P_{n'+1, n}) \right\}. \quad (6)$$

Here, the first term in the minimum (6) arises from the choice  $y_{n', n'+1} = 1$  and contracting edge  $\{n', n'+1\}$ , while the second term corresponds to  $y_{n', n'+1} = 0$ . The path  $P^{\{n', n'+1\}}$  is of length  $n - 1$  and  $P_{0, n'}$ ,  $P_{n'+1, n}$  are both of length at most  $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor \leq n/2$ . Using (6) recursively on  $\text{LMP}(P^{\{n', n'+1\}})$ , we eventually obtain, after  $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1$  splits, a decomposition into  $2(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1) + 1 \leq n + 3$  problems each of size at most  $n/2$ . Note that the number of subproblems grows linearly in  $n$  while their (maximal)

size drops exponentially. Hence, the problem w.r.t.  $P$  can be split into  $\mathcal{O}(n^{\log n})$  problems of constant size 1. □

The splitting-scheme (6) gives rise to a simple branch-and-bound algorithm whose runtime is at most quasi-polynomial in  $n$ . The branching is performed on an edge central on each subpath and fast lower bounds are given by, for instance, the sum of negative costs  $\sum_{uv: c_{uv} < 0} c_{uv}$ .

## 5 Polyhedral Geometry

In this section, we identify the tree partition problem (Def. 1) as the special case of *minimum cost lifted multicut problem* [Horňáková et al., 2017] for trees. In Section 5.1, we introduce this problem for general graphs, following Horňáková et al. [2017]. In Section 5.2, we establish the connection to the tree partition problem, offering a tighter description of the lifted multicut polytope than Horňáková et al. [2017] in the special case of trees. In Section 5.3, we study the lifted multicut problem for paths, an equivalent formulation of the path partition problem, offering a complete totally dual integral (TDI) description of the lifted multicut polytope for paths. Consequently, the lifted multicut problem for paths can be solved in polynomial time. In Section 5.4, we reduce the lifted multicut problem for a single cycle to the lifted multicut problem for a path, establishing polynomial solvability for this problem as well. The rather technical proofs for our claims are deferred to the appendix.

### 5.1 Lifted Multicut Problem

For any connected graph  $G = (V, E)$ , any supergraph  $G' = (V, E')$  with  $E' = E \cup F$  and any  $c : E' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  the instance of the *minimum cost lifted multicut problem* w.r.t.  $G$ ,  $G'$  and  $c$  is the binary linear program

$$\min_{x \in X_{GG'}} \sum_{e \in E'} c_e x_e \quad (7)$$

with

$$X_{GG'} = \left\{ x \in \{0, 1\}^{E \cup F} \mid \forall C \in \text{cycles}(G) \forall \hat{e} \in C : x_{\hat{e}} \leq \sum_{e \in C \setminus \{\hat{e}\}} x_e, \quad (8)$$

$$\forall uv \in F \forall P \in uv\text{-paths}(G) : x_{uv} \leq \sum_{e \in P} x_e, \quad (9)$$


$$\forall uv \in F \forall C \in uv\text{-cuts}(G) : 1 - x_{uv} \leq \sum_{e \in C} 1 - x_e \}. \quad (10)$$

The inequalities (8), (9) and (10) are referred to as *cycle*, *path* and *cut* inequalities, respectively. The convex hull

$$\Xi_{GG'} = \text{conv } X_{GG'} \quad (11)$$

of  $X_{GG'}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{E'}$  is called the *lifted multicut polytope* w.r.t.  $G$  and  $G'$ . It was shown by Horňáková et al. [2017] that  $\Xi_{GG'}$  has dimension  $|E'|$ .

For any  $x \in X_{GG'}$ , the set  $M := \{e \in E \mid x_e = 1\}$  of those edges of the graph  $G$  that are labeled 1 is a so-called



**Figure 2** 2a: A tree with additional lifted edges (thin blue curves) between non-neighboring nodes corresponding to long range variables. 2b: A star with three leaves lifted to the complete graph. 2c: A path of length 3 lifted to the complete graph. 2d: A cycle of length 5 lifted to the complete graph. Since a cycle is 2-connected, the decomposition problem w.r.t. a cycle cannot be expressed in the form of problem (1).

*multicut* of  $G$ . Hence, there exists a decomposition of  $G$  such that  $M$  is precisely the set of those edges that span across distinct components. In addition, the set  $M' := \{e \in E' \mid x_e = 1\}$  of those edges  $\{u, v\} = e \in E'$  of the graph  $G'$  that are labeled 1 is a multicut of  $G'$  lifted from the multicut  $M$  of  $G$ . A multicut  $M'$  of  $G'$  lifted from  $G$  makes explicit for all pairs  $\{u, v\} \in E'$  of nodes (not only those neighboring in  $G$ ) whether  $u$  and  $v$  are in the same component. By choosing  $E' := \binom{V}{2}$ , we achieve this for *any* pair of distinct nodes  $u, v \in V$ , just as required for the tree partition problem.

5.2 Lifted Multicut Problem for Trees

Let  $m = |\binom{V}{2}|$ . Apparently, since  $T$  is a tree, for the particular choice  $G := T$  and  $G' := (V, \binom{V}{2})$ , we can write  $X_{GG'}$  and  $\Xi_{GG'}$  more compactly as

$$X_T = \left\{ x \in \{0, 1\}^m \mid \begin{aligned} x_{uv} &\leq \sum_{e \in P_{uv}} x_e \quad \forall u, v \in V, \text{dist}(u, v) \geq 2, \end{aligned} \right. \quad (12)$$

$$x_e \leq x_{uv} \quad \forall u, v \in V, \text{dist}(u, v) \geq 2, \forall e \in P_{uv} \} \quad (13)$$

and

$$\Xi_T = \text{conv } X_T. \quad (14)$$

We refer to (12) and (13) as *path* and *cut* inequalities, respectively, and write  $\Theta_T^0$  for the naive linear relaxation of  $\Xi_T$ , i.e. the set of vectors  $x \in [0, 1]^m$  that satisfy (12) - (13). Note that we can replace  $X_T$  by  $\Xi_T$  in problem (7), which motivates the study of the lifted multicut polytope.

**Lemma 3.** Consider any instance of the tree partition problem defined by a  $T = (V, E)$  and costs  $c : \binom{V}{2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

Then, the vector  $y \in \{0, 1\}^n$  is a solution to the instance of the tree partition problem iff the unique  $x \in X_T$  such that  $x_e = 1 - y_e$  for all  $e \in E$  is a solution to the instance of the minimum cost lifted multicut problem w.r.t. the graphs  $T, G = (V, \binom{V}{2})$  and the cost function  $-c$ .

*Proof.* For any distinct pair of nodes  $u, v \in V$ , we introduce a binary variable  $x_{uv} \in \{0, 1\}$  via

$$x_{uv} = 1 - \prod_{e \in P_{uv}} y_e \quad (15)$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} x_{uv} = 0 &\Leftrightarrow \forall e \in P_{uv}: y_e = 1 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \forall e \in P_{uv}: x_e = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Therefore, we can reformulate problem (1) in terms of the variables  $x_{uv}$  by transforming the objective function according to

$$\begin{aligned} c_{uv} \prod_{e \in P_{uv}} y_e &= -c_{uv} \left( 1 - \prod_{e \in P_{uv}} y_e \right) + c_{uv} \\ &= -c_{uv} x_{uv} + c_{uv}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

This leads to a linear objective function of the combinatorial optimization problem

$$\min_{x \in X_T} \sum_{\substack{u, v \in V, \\ u \neq v}} -c_{uv} x_{uv} + c_{uv}, \quad (18)$$

where  $X_T \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m$  captures the relationship (16).  $\square$

5.2.1 Tighter Relaxation of the Lifted Multicut Polytope

We give another simple, yet tighter relaxation of  $\Xi_T$ . To this end, define  $\bar{u}(v)$  to be the first node on the path  $P_{uv}$  that is different from both  $u$  and  $v$  and consider the polytope

$$\Theta_T^1 = \left\{ x \in [0, 1]^m \mid \begin{aligned} x_{uv} &\leq x_{u, \bar{u}(v)} + x_{\bar{u}(v), v} \quad \forall u, v \in V, \text{dist}(u, v) \geq 2, \end{aligned} \right. \quad (19)$$

$$x_{\bar{u}(v), v} \leq x_{uv} \quad \forall u, v \in V, \text{dist}(u, v) \geq 2 \} \quad (20)$$

This description is canonical in the sense that it only considers a quadratic number of node triplets, namely those which feature two neighboring nodes and an arbitrary third node. The following lemma states that  $\Theta_T^1$  is indeed an outer relaxation of  $\Xi_T$  which is at least as tight as  $\Theta_T^0$ .

**Lemma 4.** It holds that  $\Xi_T \subseteq \Theta_T^1 \subseteq \Theta_T^0$ .

### 5.2.2 Trivial Facets

It can be characterized exactly which inequalities of (19), (20) and  $0 \leq x_{uv} \leq 1$  define facets of  $\Xi_T$ . These elementary results are closely related to the more general study in [Hornáková et al., 2017].

**Lemma 5.** *The inequality (19) defines a facet of  $\Xi_T$  if and only if  $\text{dist}(u, v) = 2$ .*

**Lemma 6.** *The inequality (20) defines a facet of  $\Xi_T$  if and only if  $v$  is a leaf of  $T$ .*

**Lemma 7.** *For any  $u, v \in V$ ,  $u \neq v$ , the inequality  $x_{uv} \leq 1$  defines a facet of  $\Xi_T$  if and only if both  $u$  and  $v$  are leaves of  $T$ . Moreover, none of the inequalities  $0 \leq x_{uv}$  define facets of  $\Xi_T$ .*

### 5.2.3 Non-Trivial Facets

We further present a large class of non-trivial facets of  $\Xi_T$ . Consider the set of inequalities given by

$$x_{uv} + x_{\bar{u}(v), \bar{v}(u)} \leq x_{u, \bar{v}(u)} + x_{\bar{u}(v), v} \quad (21)$$

$$\forall u, v \in V, \text{dist}(u, v) \geq 3.$$

We shall refer to (21) as *square* inequalities. As an example consider the graph depicted in Figure 2c and  $u = 0, v = 3$ . Any square inequality is valid and facet-defining for  $\Xi_T$ .

**Lemma 8.** *The inequalities (21) are valid for  $\Xi_T$ .*

**Lemma 9.** *The inequalities (21) define facets of  $\Xi_T$ .*

### 5.2.4 Valid Inequalities Related to the Boolean Quadric Polytope

The argument to show Lemma 2 also implies that the lifted multicut polytope for a star with  $n$  leaves is isomorphic to the *Boolean Quadric Polytope* [Padberg, 1989] of order  $n$ . Therefore, insights about the facial structure of the Boolean quadric polytope can be used to derive valid inequalities and facets for the more general polytope  $\Xi_T$ . In fact, any tree-sparse pseudo-Boolean function for a tree with nodes of degree larger than 2 repeatedly admits substructures similar to the quadratic case. As this connection is beyond the scope of our paper, we only illustrate it with the following example. Consider the star graph depicted in Figure 2b. It is known from [Padberg, 1989] that the “triangle” inequality

$$x_{01} + x_{23} \leq x_{12} + x_{13} \quad (22)$$

is valid and facet-defining for  $\Xi_T$ . Observe that, similarly, for the tree in Figure 2a

$$x_{02} + x_{56} \leq x_{05} + x_{06} \quad (23)$$

holds true, but in this case  $x_{02}, x_{05}$  and  $x_{06}$  correspond to cubic instead of quadratic terms of the associated pseudo-Boolean function.

### 5.3 Lifted Multicut Problem for Paths

Let the node set  $V = \{0, \dots, n\}$  be linearly ordered and consider the path  $P = (V, E)$ , where the edge set is given by  $E = \{\{i, i+1\} \mid i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}\}$ . We show that the facets arising from (19) - (21) yield a complete description of  $\Xi_P$ .

### 5.3.1 Complete TDI Description

For this section, we consider only paths of length  $n \geq 2$ , since for  $n = 1$  the polytope  $\Xi_P = [0, 1]$  is trivial. Let  $\Theta_P^{\text{Path}}$  be the polytope defined by

$$\Theta_P^{\text{Path}} = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \begin{array}{l} x_{0n} \leq 1, \\ x_{in} \leq x_{i-1, n} \end{array} \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, \right. \quad (24)$$

$$x_{0i} \leq x_{0, i+1} \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, \quad (26)$$

$$x_{i-1, i+1} \leq x_{i-1, i} + x_{i, i+1} \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, \quad (27)$$

$$x_{j, k} + x_{j+1, k-1} \leq x_{j+1, k} + x_{j, k-1}$$

$$\forall j, k \in \{0, \dots, n\}, j < k - 2 \}. \quad (28)$$

Note that the system (24) - (28) consists precisely of those trivial and square inequalities which we have shown to define facets of  $\Xi_P$  in Section 5.2. We first prove that  $\Theta_P^{\text{Path}}$  indeed yields an outer relaxation of  $\Xi_P$ .

**Lemma 10.** *It holds that  $\Xi_P \subseteq \Theta_P^{\text{Path}} \subseteq \Theta_P^1$ .*

As our main result, we prove that  $\Theta_P^{\text{Path}}$  is in fact a complete description of  $\Xi_P$ . To derive this, we utilize some tools from polyhedral geometry, which we briefly review in the next paragraph. For an extensive reference we refer the reader to [Schrijver, 1986].

**Definition 3** ([Giles and Pulleyblank, 1979]). A *Hilbert basis* of a cone  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  is a finite set of vectors  $a_1, \dots, a_\ell \in \mathcal{C}$  such that every  $h \in \mathcal{C} \cap \mathbb{Z}^m$  can be written as a non-negative integer combination of the  $a_j$ .

For the sake of brevity, we do not introduce the original definition of total dual integrality, but only state the following characterization thereof.

**Fact 1** ([Giles and Pulleyblank, 1979]). A system of linear inequalities  $Ax \leq b$  is *totally dual integral* (TDI) if and only if for every minimal face  $\mathcal{F}$  of the polytope defined by  $Ax \leq b$  the following holds. The rows of  $A$  which correspond to the inequalities active at  $\mathcal{F}$  form a Hilbert basis of the cone that they span.

Total dual integrality is an important concept in polyhedral geometry as it serves as a sufficient condition on the integrality of polyhedra according to the following fact.

**Fact 2** ([Edmonds and Giles, 1977]). If  $Ax \leq b$  is totally dual integral and  $b$  is integral, then the polytope defined by  $Ax \leq b$  is integral.

**Theorem 2.** *The system (24) - (28) is totally dual integral.*

**Corollary 1.** *It holds that  $\Xi_P = \Theta_P^{\text{Path}}$ .*

*Proof.* This is immediate from Lemma 10, Fact 2 and Theorem 2.  $\square$

**Remark 1.** The constraint matrix corresponding to the system (24) - (28) is in general *not* totally unimodular. A minimal example is the path of length 4.

By Corollary 1, we can describe  $\Xi_P$  via a linear system of inequalities of quadratic size. Therefore, we can solve (18) and thus (1) efficiently via linear programming, which is summarized in the following corollaries.

**Corollary 2.** *The minimum cost lifted multicut problem for paths is polynomial-time solvable.*

**Corollary 3.** *The class of path-sparse pseudo-Boolean functions can be optimized in polynomial time.*

#### 5.4 Lifted Multicut Problem for Cycles

Let  $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$  and consider the cycle  $C = (V, E)$ , where the edge set is given by  $E = \{\{n, 1\}\} \cup \{\{i, i+1\} \mid i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}\}$ . Our result from the previous section concerning the complexity of minimum cost lifted multicuts can be extended to the slightly more general case of simple cycles. Note that the decomposition of cycles via lifted multicuts (cf. Figure 2d) cannot be formulated via problem (1), because a cycle is 2-connected. However, similar to paths, the maximal node degree in a cycle is still 2 and we can reduce the associated minimum cost lifted multicut problem to a linear number of path partition problems.

**Theorem 3.** *The minimum cost lifted multicut problem for cycles is polynomial-time solvable.*

*Proof.* We reduce the minimum cost lifted multicut problem for a cycle  $C$  to  $n$  independent minimum cost lifted multicut problems for paths of equal length  $n-1$ . Choose some edge  $e \in E$  and consider the path  $P_e = (V, E \setminus \{e\})$ . Denote by  $X_C$  the set of binary vectors that encode multicuts of  $C$  lifted to the complete graph on  $V$  according to (8) - (10). It holds that

$$X_{P_e} = \{0\} \cup \{x \in X_C \mid x_e = 1\} \quad (29)$$

and thus

$$X_C = \bigcup_{e \in E} X_{P_e}. \quad (30)$$

This implies that the optimal solution w.r.t.  $C$  can be found by solving (at most)  $|E| = n$  minimum cost lifted multicut problems w.r.t.  $P_e$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.** In practice it is advisable to choose  $e \in E$  such that its cost  $-c_e \in \mathbb{R}$  is low, since, if the optimal solution  $x^*$  w.r.t.  $C$  exhibits  $x_e^* = 1$ , then it is also optimal w.r.t.  $P_e$ .

## 6 Conclusion

We have shown that the the minimum cost lifted multicut problem for paths can be solved in polynomial time. To achieve this result, we have established a complete totally dual integral (TDI) description of the associated lifted multicut polytope for paths. By a connection we

have emphasized with an unconstrained pseudo-Boolean optimization problem, our polyhedral description makes a non-trivial class of non-submodular pseudo-Boolean functions amenable to efficient minimization by standard algorithms for linear programs. Complementary to these findings, we have shown that the the minimum cost lifted multicut problem for star graphs and, more generally, for trees is NP-hard. Intermediate problems for trees with bounded degree are an obvious direction of future research.

## References

- Nikhil Bansal, Avrim Blum, and Shuchi Chawla. Correlation clustering. *Machine Learning*, 56(1-3):89-113, 2004. doi: 10.1023/B:MACH.0000033116.57574.95.
- Endre Boros and Aritanan Gruber. On quadratization of pseudo-boolean functions. In *International Symposium on Artificial Intelligence and Mathematics, ISAIM 2012, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, USA, January 9-11, 2012*, 2012.
- Endre Boros and Peter L. Hammer. Pseudo-boolean optimization. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 123(13):155 - 225, 2002. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-218X\(01\)00341-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-218X(01)00341-9).
- Sunil Chopra and M.R. Rao. The partition problem. *Mathematical Programming*, 59(1-3):87-115, 1993. doi: 10.1007/BF01581239.
- William H. Cunningham. On submodular function minimization. *Combinatorica*, 5(3):185-192, 1985. doi: 10.1007/BF02579361.
- Erik D. Demaine, Dotan Emanuel, Amos Fiat, and Nicole Immorlica. Correlation clustering in general weighted graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 361(2-3):172-187, 2006. doi: 10.1016/j.tcs.2006.05.008.
- Michel Marie Deza and Monique Laurent. *Geometry of Cuts and Metrics*. Springer, 1997.
- Jack Edmonds and Frederick Richard Giles. A min-max relation for submodular functions on graphs. *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, 1:185 - 204, 1977. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0167-5060\(08\)70734-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0167-5060(08)70734-9).
- Frederick Richard Giles and William R. Pulleyblank. Total dual integrality and integer polyhedra. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 25:191 - 196, 1979. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0024-3795\(79\)90018-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0024-3795(79)90018-1).
- Martin Grötschel and Yoshiko Wakabayashi. A cutting plane algorithm for a clustering problem. *Mathematical Programming*, 45(1):59-96, 1989. doi: 10.1007/BF01589097.
- Peter L. Hammer, Pierre Hansen, and Bruno Simeone. Roof duality, complementation and persistency in quadratic 0-1 optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 28(2):121-155, 1984. doi: 10.1007/BF02612354.

Andrea Horňáková, Jan-Hendrik Lange, and Bjoern Andres. Analysis and optimization of graph decompositions by lifted multicuts. In *ICML, 2017*. (Forthcoming).

Satoru Iwata and James B. Orlin. A simple combinatorial algorithm for submodular function minimization. In *SODA*, pages 1230–1237, 2009.

Satoru Iwata, Lisa Fleischer, and Satoru Fujishige. A combinatorial strongly polynomial algorithm for minimizing submodular functions. *J. ACM*, 48(4):761–777, July 2001. doi: 10.1145/502090.502096.

Fredrik Kahl and Petter Strandmark. Generalized roof duality. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 160(16-17):2419–2434, 2012. doi: 10.1016/j.dam.2012.06.009.

James B. Orlin. A faster strongly polynomial time algorithm for submodular function minimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 118(2):237–251, 2009. doi: 10.1007/s10107-007-0189-2.

Manfred Padberg. The boolean quadric polytope: Some characteristics, facets and relatives. *Mathematical Programming*, 45(1):139–172, 1989. doi: 10.1007/BF01589101.

Carsten Rother, Vladimir Kolmogorov, Victor S. Lempitsky, and Martin Szummer. Optimizing binary mrfs via extended roof duality. In *CVPR, 2007*.

Dmitrij Schlesinger. Exact solution of permuted submodular minsum problems. In *Energy Minimization Methods in Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition: 6th International Conference, EMMCVPR 2007. Proceedings*, pages 28–38, 2007. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-74198-5\_3.

Alexander Schrijver. *Theory of Linear and Integer Programming*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 1986. ISBN 0-471-90854-1.

Alexander Schrijver. A combinatorial algorithm minimizing submodular functions in strongly polynomial time. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 80(2):346–355, 2000. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jctb.2000.1989.

## A Proofs for Section 5.2

**Proof of Lemma 4.** We show first that  $\Xi_T \subseteq \Theta_T^1$ . For this purpose, let  $x \in \Xi_T$ . If  $x$  violates (19), then  $x_{uv} = 1$  and  $x_{u,\bar{u}(v)} = x_{\bar{u}(v),v} = 0$ . This contradicts the fact that  $x$  satisfies all cut inequalities w.r.t.  $\bar{u}(v), v$  and the path inequality w.r.t.  $u, v$ . If  $x$  violates (20), then  $x_{\bar{u}(v),v} = 1$  and  $x_{uv} = 0$ . This contradicts the fact that  $x$  satisfies all cut inequalities w.r.t.  $u, v$  and the path inequality w.r.t.  $\bar{u}(v), v$ . Hence,  $x$  satisfies (19)-(20) and therefore  $x \in \Theta_T^1$ .

Now, we show that  $\Theta_T^1 \subseteq \Theta_T^0$ . Let  $x \in \Theta_T^1$ . We need to show that  $x$  satisfies all path and cut inequalities. Let  $u, v \in V$  with  $\text{dist}(u, v) \geq 2$ . We proceed by induction on  $\text{dist}(u, v)$ . If  $\text{dist}(u, v) = 2$ , then the path inequality is directly given by (19), while the two cut inequalities are

given by (20) for the two possible orderings of  $u$  and  $v$ . If  $\text{dist}(u, v) > 2$ , then the path inequality is obtained from (19) and the induction hypothesis for the pair  $\bar{u}(v), v$ , since  $\text{dist}(\bar{u}(v), v) = \text{dist}(u, v) - 1$ . Similarly, for any edge  $e$  on the path from  $u$  to  $v$ , we obtain the cut inequality w.r.t.  $e$  by using the induction hypothesis and (20) such that (w.l.o.g.)  $e$  is on the path from  $\bar{u}(v)$  to  $v$ . Hence,  $x \in \Theta_T^0$ .

**Proof of Lemma 5.** First, suppose  $\text{dist}(u, v) = 2$ . Then  $P_{uv}$  is a path of length 2 and thus chordless in the complete graph on  $V$ . Hence, facet-definingness follows directly from [Horňáková et al., 2017, Thm 4]. Now, suppose  $\text{dist}(u, v) > 2$  and let  $x \in \Xi_T$  be such that (19) is satisfied with equality. We show that this implies

$$x_{uv} + x_{\bar{u}(v),\bar{v}(u)} = x_{u,\bar{v}(u)} + x_{\bar{u}(v),v}. \quad (31)$$

Then the face of  $\Xi_T$  induced by (19) has dimension at most  $m - 2$  and hence cannot be a facet. In order to check that (31) holds, we distinguish the following three cases. If  $x_{uv} = x_{u,\bar{u}(v)} = x_{\bar{u}(v),v}$ , then all terms in (31) vanish. If  $x_{uv} = x_{u,\bar{u}(v)} = 1$  and  $x_{\bar{u}(v),v} = 0$ , then  $x_{\bar{u}(v),\bar{v}(u)} = 0$  and  $x_{u,\bar{v}(u)} = 1$ , so (31) holds. Finally, if  $x_{uv} = x_{\bar{u}(v),v} = 1$  and  $x_{u,\bar{u}(v)} = 0$ , then (31) holds because  $x_{\bar{u}(v),\bar{v}(u)} = x_{u,\bar{v}(u)}$  by contraction of the edge  $u, \bar{u}(v)$ .

**Proof of Lemma 6.** First, suppose  $v$  is not a leaf of  $T$  and let  $x \in \Xi_T$  be such that (20) is satisfied with equality. Since  $v$  is not a leaf, there exists a neighbor  $w \in V$  of  $v$  such that  $P_{\bar{u}(v),v}$  is a subpath of  $P_{\bar{u}(v),w}$ . We show that  $x$  additionally satisfies the equality

$$x_{uw} = x_{\bar{u}(v),w} \quad (32)$$

and thus the face of  $\Xi_T$  induced by (20) cannot be a facet. There are two possible cases: Either  $x_{uv} = x_{\bar{u}(v),v} = 1$ , then  $x_{uw} = x_{\bar{u}(v),w} = 1$  as well, or  $x_{uv} = x_{\bar{u}(v),v} = 0$ , then  $x_{uw} = x_{vw} = x_{\bar{u}(v),w}$  by contraction of the path  $P_{uv}$ , so (32) holds.

Now, suppose  $v$  is a leaf of  $T$  and let  $\Sigma$  be the face of  $\Xi_T$  induced by (20). We need to prove that  $\Sigma$  has dimension  $m - 1$ . This can be done explicitly by showing that we can construct  $m - 1$  distinct indicator vectors  $\chi_{w,w'}$  for  $w, w' \in V$  as linear combinations of elements from the set  $S = \{x \in \Xi_T \mid x_{uv} = x_{\bar{u}(v),v}\}$ . In fact this construction is analogous to the one used in the proof of Theorem 7 in [Horňáková et al., 2017] where the authors derive the dimension of the lifted multicut polytope  $\dim(\Xi_{GG'}) = |E'|$ . The difference here is that the vector  $\mathbb{1} - \chi_{uv} \notin S$ , so we have to distinguish between  $x \in S$  with  $x_{uv} = x_{\bar{u}(v),v} = 0$  and  $x \in S$  with  $x_{uv} = x_{\bar{u}(v),v} = 1$  in order to show  $\chi_{u,\bar{u}(v)} \in \text{lin}(S)$  and then  $\chi_e \in \text{lin}(S)$  for all other  $e \neq \{u, v\}, \{\bar{u}(v), v\}$ .

**Proof of Lemma 7.** We apply the more general characterization given in [Horňáková et al., 2017] to our special case. The nodes  $u, v \in V$  are a pair of  $w$ - $w'$ -cut-vertices for some vertices  $w, w' \in V$  (with at least one being different from  $u$  and  $v$ ) if and only if  $u$  or  $v$  is not a leaf of  $V$ . Thus, the claim follows from [Horňáková et al., 2017, Thm 8]. The second assertion follows from [Horňáková et al., 2017, Thm 9] and the fact that we lift to the complete graph on  $V$ .

**Proof of Lemma 8.** Let  $x \in \Xi_T$  and suppose that either  $x_{u,\bar{v}(u)} = 0$  or  $x_{\bar{u}(v),v} = 0$  for some  $u, v \in V$  with  $\text{dist}(u, v) \geq 3$ . Then, since  $x$  satisfies all cut inequalities w.r.t.  $u, \bar{v}(u)$ , respectively  $\bar{u}(v), v$ , and the path inequality w.r.t.  $\bar{u}(v), \bar{v}(u)$ , it must hold that  $x_{\bar{u}(v),\bar{v}(u)} = 0$ . Moreover, if even  $x_{u,\bar{v}(u)} = 0 = x_{\bar{u}(v),v}$ , then, by the same reasoning, we have  $x_{uv} = 0$  as well. Hence,  $x$  satisfies (21).

**Proof of Lemma 9.** Let  $\Sigma$  be the face of  $\Xi_T$  induced by (21). We need to prove that  $\Sigma$  has dimension  $m - 1$ , which can be done explicitly by showing that we can construct  $m - 1$  distinct indicator vectors  $\chi_{w,w'}$  for  $w, w' \in V$  as linear combinations of elements from the set  $S = \{x \in \Xi_T \mid x_{uv} + x_{\bar{u}(v),\bar{v}(u)} = x_{u,\bar{v}(u)} + x_{\bar{u}(v),v}\}$ . Again, this construction is very technical and analogous to the proof of Theorem 7 in [Hornáková et al., 2017] about the dimension of the lifted multicut polytope.

## B Proofs for Section 5.3

**Proof of Lemma 10.** First, we show that  $\Xi_P \subseteq \Theta_P^{\text{Path}}$ . Let  $x \in \Xi_P$ , then  $x$  satisfies (24) and (27) by definition. Suppose  $x$  violates (25), then  $x_{in} = 1$  and  $x_{i-1,n} = 0$ . This contradicts the fact that  $x$  satisfies all cut inequalities w.r.t.  $i - 1, n$  and the path inequality w.r.t.  $i, n$ . So,  $x$  must satisfy (25) and, by symmetry, also (26). It follows from Lemma 8 that  $x$  satisfies (28) as well and thus  $x \in \Theta_P^{\text{Path}}$ .

Next, we prove that  $\Theta_P^{\text{Path}} \subseteq \Theta_P^1$ . To this end, let  $x \in \Theta_P^{\text{Path}}$ . We show that  $x$  satisfies all inequalities (20). Let  $u, v \in V$  with  $u < v - 1$ . We need to prove that both  $x_{u+1,v} \leq x_{uv}$  and  $x_{u,v-1} \leq x_{uv}$  hold. For reasons of symmetry, it suffices to show only  $x_{u+1,v} \leq x_{uv}$ . We proceed by induction on the distance of  $u$  from  $n$ . If  $v = n$ , then  $x_{u+1,n} \leq x_{un}$  is given by (25). Otherwise, we use (28) for  $j = u$  and  $k = v + 1$  and the induction hypothesis on  $v + 1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} x_{uv} + x_{u+v,v+1} &\geq x_{u+1,v} + x_{u,v+1} \\ &\geq x_{u+1,v} + x_{u+1,v+1} \\ \implies x_{uv} &\geq x_{u+1,v}. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to show that  $x$  satisfies all inequalities (19). Let  $u, v \in V$  with  $u < v - 1$ . We proceed by induction on  $\text{dist}(u, v) = u - v$ . If  $\text{dist}(u, v) = 2$ , then (19) is given by (27). If  $\text{dist}(u, v) > 2$ , then we use (28) for  $j = u$  and  $k = v$  as well as the induction hypothesis on  $u, v - 1$ , which have distance  $\text{dist}(u, v) - 1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} x_{uv} + x_{u+1,v-1} &\leq x_{u+1,v} + x_{u,v-1} \\ &\leq x_{u+1,v} + x_{u,u+1} + x_{u+1,v-1} \\ \implies x_{uv} &\leq x_{u,u+1} + x_{u+1,v}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $x \in \Theta_P^1$ , which concludes the proof.

**Proof of Theorem 2** We prove Theorem 2 via the characterization given by Fact 1. Let  $x \in \{0, 1\}^m$  be some vertex of  $\Xi_P$  and let  $a_1, \dots, a_\ell$  be the rows of the constraint matrix corresponding to the active inequalities of (24) - (28) at  $x$ . We show that the set

$$H = \{\chi_{uv} \mid x_{uv} = 1\} \cup \{-\chi_{uv} \mid x_{uv} = 0\}, \quad (33)$$

where  $\chi_{uv}$  denotes the indicator vector of edge  $\{u, v\}$ , is contained in the non-negative integer span of  $a_1, \dots, a_\ell$ . Then the claim immediately follows, since  $H$  is obviously a Hilbert basis for its non-negative span.

We proceed by induction on  $n$ , i.e. the length of the path. For  $n = 2$ , the system (24) - (28) is given by

$$x_{02} \leq 1, \quad (34)$$

$$x_{12} \leq x_{02}, \quad (35)$$

$$x_{01} \leq x_{02}, \quad (36)$$

$$x_{02} \leq x_{01} + x_{12}. \quad (37)$$

With lexicographical indexing, the lifted multicut polytope  $\Xi_P$  corresponding to  $n = 2$  has the four vertices

$$x^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad x^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad x^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad x^4 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (38)$$

We check that, for any  $x^j$ , the active inequalities of (34) - (37) at  $x^j$  span the Hilbert basis  $H$  in (33) corresponding to  $x^j$ :

For  $x^1$ , combine (35) and (37) to obtain  $-\chi_{01}$ . Similarly, combining (36) and (37) gives  $-\chi_{12}$ . Adding  $-\chi_{01}$  to (36) yields  $-\chi_{02}$ . For  $x^2$ , (34) immediately gives  $\chi_{02}$ . Combining (34) and (36) yields  $\chi_{01}$ . By adding (36) to (37) we obtain  $-\chi_{12}$ . For  $x^3$ , the reasoning is symmetric to  $x^2$ . Finally, for  $x^4$ , (34) gives  $\chi_{02}$  and adding (34) individually to (35) and (36) yields  $\chi_{01}$ , respectively  $\chi_{12}$ .

Now, suppose  $n > 2$ . Let  $x \in \{0, 1\}^m$  be a vertex of  $\Xi_P$ . We make a case distinction at  $x_{n-1,n}$ .

If  $x_{n-1,n} = 1$ , then  $x_{i,n} = 1$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$  and all inequalities (24) and (25) are active. The rows of these inequalities generate  $\chi_{in}$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$ . For the remaining edges we can use the induction hypothesis if we show that the system (24) - (28) includes the same system where  $n$  is replaced by  $n - 1$ . This is indeed the case, since for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, n - 2\}$ , the inequality  $x_{i,n-1} \leq x_{i-1,n-1}$  follows from (28) for the choice  $j = i - 1$  and  $k = n$ :

$$\begin{aligned} x_{i-1,n} + x_{i,n-1} &\leq x_{i,n} + x_{i-1,n-1} \\ \implies 1 + x_{i,n-1} &\leq 1 + x_{i-1,n-1} \\ \implies x_{i,n-1} &\leq x_{i-1,n-1} \end{aligned}$$

and  $x_{0,n-1} \leq 1$  follows from (25) for  $i = n - 1$ . The remaining inequalities are included anyway.

If  $x_{n-1,n} = 0$ , then, by contraction of the edge  $\{n - 1, n\}$ , it holds that

$$x_{i,n} = x_{i,n-1} \quad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n - 2\}. \quad (39)$$

Thus, inequality (27) for  $i = n - 1$  immediately gives  $-\chi_{n-1,n}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} x_{n-2,n} &\leq x_{n-2,n-1} + x_{n-1,n} \\ \implies 0 &\leq x_{n-1,n}. \end{aligned}$$

We can use the induction hypothesis for all edges  $\{u, v\}$  with  $u, v \neq n$  provided we show, once again, that (24) - (28) includes the same system for  $n$  replaced by  $n - 1$ .



Indeed, the inequalities  $x_{i,n-1} \leq x_{i-1,n-1}$  for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}$  are now implied by (25) and (39), while  $x_{0,n-1} \leq 1$  follows from (24) and (39). Therefore, it remains to show that we can generate those basis vectors of  $H$  which correspond to the edges  $\{i, n\}$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq n-2$ . Since (25) hold, there exists some  $j \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$  such that  $x_{i,n} = 0$  for all  $i \geq j$  and  $x_{i,n} = 1$  for all  $i < j$ . We combine the inequalities of (25) with  $-\chi_{n-1,n}$  to obtain  $-\chi_{i,n}$  for all  $i \geq j$  and, similarly, combine (25) with (24) to obtain  $\chi_{i,n}$  for all  $i < j$ . This concludes the proof.