CHARACTERIZING GRAPHIC MATROIDS BY A SYSTEM OF LINEAR EQUATIONS

JIM GEELEN AND BERT GERARDS

ABSTRACT. Given a rank-r binary matroid we construct a system of $O(r^3)$ linear equations in $O(r^2)$ variables that has a solution over GF(2) if and only if the matroid is graphic.

1. INTRODUCTION

We prove the following result.

Theorem 1.1. *Let B be a basis in a binary matroid M. Then M is graphic if and only if the following system of linear equations admits a solution over $GF(2)$.*

(G1) $\beta(a, b) + \beta(a, c) = 0$, *for each* $(a, b, c) \in B^{(3)}$ *with* $C_b^* \cap C_c^* - C_a^* \neq \emptyset$.

(G2) $\beta(a, b) + \beta(a, c) + \beta(b, a) + \beta(b, c) + \beta(c, a) + \beta(c, b) = 1$, *for each* $(a, b, c) \in B^{(3)}$ *with* $C_a^* \cap C_b^* \cap C_c^* \neq \emptyset$.

Here $B^{(k)}$ denotes the set of all ordered k-tuples of distinct elements in B and C_e^* denotes the fundamental cocircuit of e with respect to B; that is, C_e^* is the complement of the hyperplane of M spanned by $B - \{e\}$. The variables and equations have a natural interpretation which is revealed in Section 2.

If M is a rank-r binary matroid with n elements, then the system (G1)-(G2) has $O(r^3)$ equations and $O(r^2)$ variables. The system can be easily determined in $O(nr^3)$-time and solved in $O(r^7)$-time. There are faster algorithms for testing graphicness. By analysing a method proposed by Tutte [7], Bixby and Cunningham [1] gave an $O(r^2n)$-time algorithm. Later, Bixby and Wagner [2] and Fujishige [4], independently, obtained almost linear-time algorithms by using data structures that

keep track of 2-separations; these algorithms assume that the binary matroid is given by a matrix in "standard form".

Mighton [5, 9] has a closely related characterization of graphic matroids. In fact, it is easy to deduce our main result from Mighton's Theorem which, in turn, can be deduced from Tutte's excluded-minor characterization [8]; we will, however, give a direct proof. We do not know how to deduce either Mighton's or Tutte's characterization from ours; this would be interesting since our characterization has a relatively simple proof.

2. Trees and paths

Let B be a basis of a binary matroid M. For each $f \in E(M) - B$, we define $P_f \subseteq B$ such that $P_f \cup \{f\}$ is the unique circuit contained in $B \cup \{f\}$; that is, $P_f \cup \{f\}$ is the fundamental circuit for f. Note that $e \in P_f$ if and only if $f \in C_e^*$ for each $e \in B$ and $f \in E(M) - B$. To avoid ambiguity, we will refer to the fundamental circuits and cocircuits of (M, B), as they rely on both M and B. Our linear system is motivated by the following well-known result; we include the proof for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 2.1. *If B is a basis of a binary matroid M, then M is graphic if and only if there is a tree T with $E(T) = B$ such that each of the sets $(P_f : f \in E(M) - B)$ is a path in T.*

Proof. Suppose that $M = M(G)$ for some graph G; we may assume that G is connected. Then B is a tree and each of the sets $(P_f : f \in E(G) - E(T))$ are paths in G.

Conversely, suppose that there is a tree T with $E(T) = B$ such that, for each $f \in E(G) - E(T)$, the set P_f is a path in T. Then there is a graph G such that the fundamental circuits of (M, B) coincide with the fundamental circuits of $(M(G), B)$. Since M and $M(G)$ are both binary, $M = M(G)$. $\square$

Let $\vec{T}$ be an orientation of a tree T. For each $(a, b) \in E(T)^{(2)}$, we define $\beta_{\vec{T}}(a, b) \in \mathrm{GF}(2)$ to be 1 if the head of a is in the same component of $T - a$ as the edge b, and 0 otherwise. Note that, for $(a, b, c) \in E(T)^{(3)}$, the edge b lies between a and c in T if and only if $\beta_{\vec{T}}(b, a) + \beta_{\vec{T}}(b, c) = 1$. The following lemma characterizes paths in T by linear equations.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\vec{T}$ be an orientation of a tree T and let $P \subseteq E(T)$. Then P is a path in T if and only if*

(H1) $\beta_{\vec{T}}(a, b) + \beta_{\vec{T}}(a, c) = 0$, *for each $(b, c) \in P^{(2)}$ and $a \in E(T) - P$.*

(H2) $\beta_{\vec{T}}(a,b) + \beta_{\vec{T}}(a,c) + \beta_{\vec{T}}(b,a) + \beta_{\vec{T}}(b,c) + \beta_{\vec{T}}(c,a) + \beta_{\vec{T}}(c,b) = 1$,
for each $(a,b,c) \in P^{(3)}$.

Proof. Note that P is a path if and only if

(I1) P induces a connected subgraph of T, and
(I2) there is a path of T containing P.

Now (I1) and (H1) are clearly equivalent and (I2) is equivalent to each triple in $P^{(3)}$ being contained in a path of T. Consider $(a,b,c) \in P^{(3)}$. If there is a path of T containing a, b and c, then exactly one of those edges lies between the other two. On the other hand, if a, b and c do not lie on a path, then none of the edges lies between the other two. Thus (I2) is equivalent to (H2). $\square$

The next lemma determines when $\beta : B^{(2)} \to GF(2)$ encodes a tree.

Lemma 2.3. *Let B be a finite set and let $\beta : B^{(2)} \to GF(2)$. Then there exists an oriented tree $\vec{T}$ such that $E(\vec{T}) = B$ and $\beta = \beta_{\vec{T}}$ if and only if the following condition is satisfied:*

(T) *for each $(a,b,c) \in B^{(3)}$, either $\beta(b,a) + \beta(b,c) = 0$ or $\beta(a,b) + \beta(a,c) = 0$.*

Proof. If an edge b lies between edges a and c in an oriented tree $\vec{T}$, then a does not lie between b and c. Thus $\beta_{\vec{T}}$ satisfies (T).

Conversely, suppose that $\beta : B^{(2)} \to GF(2)$ satisfies (T). We may assume that there exists $(a,b,c) \in B^3$ such that $\beta(a,b) + \beta(a,c) = 1$ since otherwise we can readily construct an oriented star $\vec{T}$ satisfying the result. Let β' denote the restriction of β to $(B-\{a\})^{(2)}$. Inductively we may assume that there is an oriented tree $\vec{T}_a$ such that $E(\vec{T}_a) = B - \{a\}$ and $\beta' = \beta_{\vec{T}_a}$. Let $B_0 = \{e \in B - \{a\} : \beta(a,e) = 0\}$ and let $B_1 = \{e \in B - \{a\} : \beta(a,e) = 1\}$. Since $\beta(a,b) + \beta(a,c) = 1$, the sets B_0 and B_1 are both nonempty. If B_0 and B_1 each form connected subgraphs of $\vec{T}_a$, then it is straightforward to get the desired tree $\vec{T}$. Adding one to each of the values $(\beta(a,e) : e \in B - \{a\})$ gives another function satisfying (T) and this change swaps the roles of B_0 and B_1; this change corresponds to the operation of reversing the orientation on an edge in a tree. So we may assume that B_0 does not form a connected subgraph of T and, hence, there exist $(e,f) \in B_0^{(2)}$ and $d \in B_1$ such that d lies between e and f in $\vec{T}_a$. Note that $\beta(d,e) \neq \beta(d,f)$, so, by possibly switching e and f, we may assume that $\beta(d,a) = \beta(d,e)$. Now $\beta(d,a) + \beta(d,f) = 1$ and $\beta(a,d) + \beta(a,f) = 1$, contradicting (T). $\square$

Lemmas 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 immediately imply the following results.

Lemma 2.4. *If B is a basis of a graphic matroid M, then the linear system (G1)-(G2) admits a solution.*

Lemma 2.5. *If B is a basis of a binary matroid M and there is a solution to the system (G1)-(G2) that satisfies (T), then M is graphic.*

To complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 we need to prove that, when (G1)-(G2) has a solution, there is a solution satisfying (T). We will prove a stronger result that, when $M(G)$ is 3-connected, every solution of (G1)-(G2) also satisfies (T).

3. Connectivity

The following two results are self-evident.

Lemma 3.1. *Let B be a basis of a matroid M and let (X, Y) be a partition of $E(M)$ into nonempty sets. Then (X, Y) is a separation of M if and only if $P_x \subseteq X$ for each $x \in X - B$ and $P_y \subseteq Y$ for each $y \in Y - B$.*

Lemma 3.2. *Let B be a basis of a binary matroid M, and let (X, Y) be a partition of $E(M)$ with $|X|, |Y| \geq 2$. If $C_x^* \subseteq X$, for each $x \in X \cap B$, and there is a set $Z \subseteq X$ such that, for each $y \in Y \cap B$, either $C_y^* \cap X = \emptyset$ or $C_y^* \cap X = Z$, then (X, Y) is a 2-separation of M.*

The next lemma describes solutions to (G1).

Lemma 3.3. *Let B be a basis of a matroid M and let β be a solution to (G1). Then $\beta(b, a) = \beta(b, c)$ for each $(a, b, c) \in B^{(3)}$ where a and c are in the same component of $M \setminus C_b^*$.*

Proof. Suppose that the result fails and let N be the component of $M \setminus C_b^*$ containing a and c. Let $X = \{e \in E(N) : \beta(b, e) = \beta(b, a)\}$. By Lemma 3.1, there exists $f \in E(N) - B$ such that $P_f \cap X$ and $P_f - X$ are both nonempty. Let $a' \in P_f \cap X$ and $c' \in P_f - X$. Note that $b \notin P_f$, so, by (G1), $\beta(b, a') = \beta(b, c')$ — contradicting the definition of X. $\square$

Let B be a basis of a matroid M. For $X \subseteq E(M)$, we let $M[B; X]$ denote $M/(B - X) \setminus (E(M) - (X \cup B))$. Note that $B \cap X$ is a basis of $M[B; X]$ and the fundamental cocircuits of $(M[B; X], B \cap X)$ are $(C_x^* \cap X : x \in B \cap X)$. Therefore, if β satisfies (G1)-(G2) for M, then the restriction of β to $X^{(2)}$ satisfies (G1)-(G2) for $M[B; X]$.

We now reduce Theorem 1.1 to the 3-connected case.

Lemma 3.4. *Let B be a basis of a matroid M. If M is not graphic, then there exists $Z \subseteq E(M)$ such that $M[B; Z]$ is 3-connected and is not graphic.*

Proof. We may assume that M is not graphic and that, for each proper subset Z of $E(M)$, $M[B; Z]$ is graphic. Then M is connected. We may also assume that M is not 3-connected; let (X, Y) be a 2-separation in M. Note that $r(X) + r(Y) = r(M) + 1$, so, up to symmetry, we may assume that $X \cap B$ is a basis of $M|X$. Thus $P_f \subseteq X$ for each $f \in X - B$. Then, by Lemma 3.1, there exists $y \in Y - B$ and $x \in X \cap B$ such that $x \in P_y$. By minimality, $M[B; X \cup \{y\}]$ and $M[B; Y \cup \{x\}]$ are both graphic. However, M is the 2-sum of $M[B; X \cup \{y\}]$ and $M[B; Y \cup \{x\}]$ and, hence, M is graphic. This contradiction completes the proof. $\square$

4. The final step

Combining the following result with Lemmas 2.4, 3.4, and 2.5 completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 4.1. *Let B be a basis of a binary matroid M. If M is 3-connected, then every solution of (G1)-(G2) also satisfies (T).*

Proof. Let β be a solution to (G1)-(G2).

4.1.1. *Let $(a', b', c') \in B^{(3)}$ be such that $\beta(b', a') + \beta(b', c') = 1$ and $\beta(a', b') + \beta(a', c') = 1$, and let $Z = C_{a'}^* \cap C_{b'}^*$. Then neither a' nor b' is in the same component of $M \setminus Z$ as c'.*

Proof of Claim. Let $Z' = (C_{a'}^* - \{a'\}) \cup (C_{b'}^* - \{b'\})$ and let N be the component of $M \setminus Z'$ containing c'. Since a' and b' are coloops of $M \setminus Z'$, neither a' nor b' is contained in N. If the claim fails, then N is not a component of $M \setminus Z$ so, by Lemma 3.1, there exists $f \in Z' - Z$ such that $P_f \cap E(N) \neq \emptyset$. Up to symmetry, we may assume that $f \in C_{a'}^* - C_{b'}^*$. Now $P_f \cup \{f\}$ is a circuit in $M \setminus C_{b'}^*$, so there is a component of $M \setminus C_{b'}^*$ containing $E(N) \cup \{a', f\}$. This component contains both a' and c', and $\beta(b', a') \neq \beta(b', c')$, contrary to Lemma 3.3. $\square$

4.1.2. *Let $(a', b', c') \in B^{(3)}$ be such that $\beta(b', a') + \beta(b', c') = 1$ and $\beta(a', b') + \beta(a', c') = 1$, and let $Z = C_{a'}^* \cap C_{b'}^*$. If $d \in B$ is in the same component of $M \setminus Z$ as c' and $C_d^* \cap Z \neq \emptyset$, then $\beta(b', a') + \beta(b', d) = 1$, $\beta(a', b') + \beta(a', d) = 1$, $\beta(d, a') + \beta(d, b') = 1$, and $Z \subseteq C_d^*$.*

Proof of Claim. By 4.1.1, a' is not in the same component of $M \setminus Z$ as c' and d. Now $C_{a'}^* - Z$ is a cocircuit of $M \setminus Z$, and therefore disjoint from the component containing c' and d. So c' and d are in the same component of $M \setminus C_{a'}^*$, and, hence, by Lemma 3.3, $\beta(a', d) = \beta(a', c')$. By symmetry, $\beta(b', d) = \beta(b', c')$. So $\beta(b', a') + \beta(b', d) = 1$ and $\beta(a', b') + \beta(a', d) = 1$. Note that $C_{a'}^* \cap C_{b'}^* \cap C_d^* \neq \emptyset$, so, by (G2), $\beta(d, a') + \beta(d, b') = 1$. Finally, if there were an element $f \in Z - C_d^*$, then, since a' and b' are contained in the circuit $P_f \cup \{f\}$, a' and b'

would be in the same component of $M \setminus C_d^*$, contrary to Lemma 3.3. So $Z \subseteq C_d^*$. $\qquad\square$

Suppose that β does not satisfy (T) and let $(a, b, c) \in B^{(3)}$ be such that $\beta(b, a) + \beta(b, c) = 1$ and $\beta(a, b) + \beta(a, c) = 1$. Let $Z = C_a^* \cap C_b^*$. By 4.1.1, neither a nor b is in the same component of $M \setminus Z$ as c. By Lemma 3.1, there exists an element $d \in B$ that is in the same component of $M \setminus Z$ as c and that satisfies $C_d^* \cap Z \neq \emptyset$. By possibly changing our choice of c, we may assume that $C_c^* \cap Z \neq \emptyset$. Now, by 4.1.2, there is symmetry among a, b, and c, and, hence, by 4.1.1, no two of a, b, and c are in the same component of $M \setminus Z$.

Let X_a and X_b be the ground sets of the components of $M \setminus Z$ that contain a and b respectively. Since M is connected, $Z \neq \emptyset$, and, hence, $|X_a \cup X_b|, |E(M) - (X_a \cup X_b)| \geq 2$. By 4.1.2, for each $d' \in (X_a \cup X_b) \cap B$, either $C_{d'}^* - (X_a \cup X_b) = \emptyset$ or $C_{d'}^* - (X_a \cup X_b) = Z$. Then, by Lemma 3.2, $(X_a \cup X_b, E(M) - (X_a \cup X_b))$ is a 2-separation of M, contradicting that M is 3-connected. $\qquad\square$

5. Planar graphs

Our theorem was motivated by a result of Naji [6] who characterized the class of circle graphs by a system of linear equations over GF(2). Circle graphs are related to graphic matroids through the following two results: De Fraysseix [3] showed that the fundamental graph of a binary matroid M is a circle graph if and only if M is the cycle matroid of a planar graph. Whitney [10] proved that M is the cycle matroid of planar graph if and only if M is both graphic and cographic. By Whitney's theorem, any characterization for the class of graphic matroids immediately gives a characterization for the class of planar graphs; so we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 5.1. *Let T be a spanning tree in a connected graph G. Then G is planar if and only if the following system of equations has a solution over GF(2).*

- **(P1)** $\beta(a, b) + \beta(a, c) = 0$, *for each $(a, b, c) \in (E(G) - E(T))^{(3)}$ with $P_b \cap P_c - P_a \neq \emptyset$.*
- **(P2)** $\beta(a, b) + \beta(a, c) + \beta(b, a) + \beta(b, c) + \beta(c, a) + \beta(c, b) = 1$, *for each $(a, b, c) \in (E(G) - E(T))^{(3)}$ with $P_a \cap P_b \cap P_c \neq \emptyset$.*

References

[1] R. E. Bixby, W.H. Cunningham, Converting linear programs to network problems, Math. Oper. Res. 5, 1980, 321-357.

[2] R.E. Bixby, D.K. Wagner, An almost linear-time algorithm for graph realization, Math. Oper. Res. 13, 1988, 99-123.

[3] H. de Fraysseix, A characterization of circle graphs, European J. Combin. 5, 1984, 223-238.

[4] S. Fujishige, An efficient PQ-graph algorithm for solving the graph-realization problem, J. Comput. System Sci. 21, 1980, 63-86.

[5] J. Mighton, A new characterization of graphic matroids, J. Combin. Theory, Series B, 98, 2008, 1253-1258,

[6] W. Naji, Reconnaissance des graphes de cordes, Discrete Math. 54, 1985, 329-337.

[7] W. T. Tutte, An algorithm for determining whether a given binary matroid is graphic, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 11, 1960, 905-917.

[8] W. T. Tutte, Lectures on matroids, J. Res. Nat. Bur. Standards Sect. B 69, 1965, 1-47.

[9] D. K. Wagner, On Mighton's characterization of graphic matroids, J. Combin. Theory, Series B, 100, 2010, 493-496.

[10] H. Whitney, Non-separable and planar graphs, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 34, 1932, 339-362.

DEPARTMENT OF COMBINATORICS AND OPTIMIZATION, UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO, WATERLOO, CANADA

CENTRUM WISKUNDE & INFORMTICA, AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS, AND THE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS, MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY, MAASTRICHT, THE NETHERLANDS