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1. Let $(N, E)$ be an undirected network, and consider the polytope

$$
P_{d}=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{E}: \sum_{e \in \delta(i)} x_{e} \leq d, i \in N\right\}
$$

for $d \in \mathbb{N}$
a) Suppose the network is bipartite; show that $P_{1}$ is integral by showing that any fractional point cannot be extreme. Hint: Start by assuming the network has a cycle. Then argue the acyclic case.

Answer: Let $x \in P_{1}$ be a fractional solution. Let $E(x)=\left\{e \in E: x_{e} \in(0,1)\right\}$ be the set of edges associated to a fraction coordinate of $x$. Let $\varepsilon=\min _{e \in E(x)}\left(\min \left\{x_{e}, 1-x_{e}\right\}\right)$. Recall that a bipartite graph cannot contain odd cycles. Then, there are two possibilities for the graph $G(x):=(N, E(x))$ :
i. $G(x)$ has an even cycle $C$. Let $i_{1} i_{2} \cdots i_{2 k} i_{1}$ be the of nodes $C$. We can define two other solutions $x^{1}, x^{2} \in P_{1}$ such that $x=\frac{x^{1}+x^{2}}{2}$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
& x_{e}^{1}= \begin{cases}x_{e}+\epsilon, & \text { if } e=\left(i_{r}, i_{r+1}\right) \text { and } r \text { is even, } \\
x_{e}-\epsilon, & \text { if } e=\left(i_{r}, i_{r+1}\right) \text { and } r \text { is odd or } e=\left(i_{2 k}, i_{1}\right), \\
x_{e}, & \text { if } e \text { does not belong to } C,\end{cases} \\
& x_{e}^{2}= \begin{cases}x_{e}-\epsilon, & \text { if } e=\left(i_{r}, i_{r+1}\right) \text { and } r \text { is even }, \\
x_{e}+\epsilon, & \text { if } e=\left(i_{r}, i_{r+1}\right) \text { and } r \text { is odd or } e=\left(i_{2 k}, i_{1}\right), \\
x_{e}, & \text { if } e \text { does not belong to } C .\end{cases} \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$

Hence, $x$ cannot be an extreme point.
ii. $G(x)$ is acyclical. Let $P=i_{1} \cdots i_{n}$ be a maximal path in $G(x)$. Note that $x_{e}$ must be 0 for any edge in $\delta\left(i_{1}\right) \cup \delta\left(i_{n}\right) \backslash E(x)$. Indeed, if $x_{e}$ is 1 for some edge $e \in \delta\left(i_{1}\right) \backslash E(x)$ then the constraint $\sum_{e \in \delta\left(i_{1}\right)} x_{e} \leq 1$ implies that the solution $x_{e^{\prime}}$ for the edge $e^{\prime}=\left(i_{1}, i_{2}\right)$ cannot be fraction. Similarly, for $e \in \delta\left(i_{n}\right) \backslash E(x)$. Thus, $x_{e}$ must be 0 for any edge in $\delta\left(i_{1}\right) \cup \delta\left(i_{n}\right) \backslash E(x)$. We define two other solutions $x^{1}, x^{2} \in P_{1}$ such that $x=\frac{x^{1}+x^{2}}{2}$ analogously to (1):

$$
\begin{align*}
& x_{e}^{1}= \begin{cases}x_{e}+\epsilon, & \text { if } e=\left(i_{r}, i_{r+1}\right) \text { and } r \text { is even }, \\
x_{e}-\epsilon, & \text { if } e=\left(i_{r}, i_{r+1}\right) \text { and } r \text { is odd, } \\
x_{e}, & \text { if } e \text { does not belong to } P,\end{cases} \\
& x_{e}^{2}= \begin{cases}x_{e}-\epsilon, & \text { if } e=\left(i_{r}, i_{r+1}\right) \text { and } r \text { is even }, \\
x_{e}+\epsilon, & \text { if } e=\left(i_{r}, i_{r+1}\right) \text { and } r \text { is odd, } \\
x_{e}, & \text { if } e \text { does not belong to } P .\end{cases} \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

Hence, $x$ cannot be an extreme point.
b) Now suppose the network is not necessarily bipartite; prove that $P_{2}$ is integral, by again arguing that a fractional point cannot be extreme. Hint: Start with your argument from (a) and then think of how many variables can have positive value.

Answer: Given a graph $G=(N, E)$, we create a bipartite graph $\bar{G}=\left(N^{\prime} \cup N^{\prime \prime}, \bar{E}\right)$ with partitions $N^{\prime}$ and $N^{\prime \prime}$ by duplicating each node $i \in N$ into $i^{\prime}$ and $i^{\prime \prime}$ in $N^{\prime}$ and $N^{\prime \prime}$, respectively. For each edge $\{i, j\} \in E$ we create the edges $\left\{i^{\prime}, j^{\prime \prime}\right\}$ and $\left\{i^{\prime \prime}, j^{\prime}\right\}$ in the sets $E_{1}$ and $E_{2}$, respectively. We define the set of edges $\bar{E}$ as $E_{1} \cup E_{2}$. Consider the following polytope $Q$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q=\left\{y \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{\bar{E}}: \sum_{\bar{e} \in \delta_{\bar{G}}(k)} y_{\bar{e}} \leq 1, \forall k \in N^{\prime} \cup N^{\prime \prime}\right\} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

From question (a), we know that $Q$ is an integral polytope. Let $A: \mathbb{R}^{\bar{E}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{E}$ be the following linear transformation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
[A(y)]_{e}:=y_{e_{1}}+y_{e_{2}}, \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $e=\{i, j\} \in E, e_{1}=\left\{i^{\prime}, j^{\prime \prime}\right\} \in E_{1}$, and $e_{2}=\left\{i^{\prime \prime}, j^{\prime}\right\} \in E_{2}$. It is enough to prove that $P_{2}=A(Q)$ since the extreme points of the image of a polyhedron is the image of the extreme points, and the sum of two integral vectors is an integral vector.
Indeed, let $x \in P_{2}$. Then, define $y \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{\bar{E}}$ as follows:

$$
y_{\bar{e}}= \begin{cases}x_{e} / 2, & \text { if } \bar{e}=\left\{i^{\prime}, j^{\prime \prime}\right\} \in E_{1}, \text { where } e=\{i, j\}, \\ x_{e} / 2, & \text { if } \bar{e}=\left\{i^{\prime \prime}, j^{\prime}\right\} \in E_{2}, \text { where } e=\{i, j\} .\end{cases}
$$

It follows from the definition of the bipartite graph $\bar{G}$ that $\sum_{\bar{e} \in \delta_{\bar{G}}(k)} y_{\bar{e}} \leq 1$. So, $P_{2} \subseteq A(Q)$. Conversely, for any $y \in Q$, we have that $x$ defined as $A(y)$ is such that

$$
\sum_{e \in \delta_{G}(i)} x_{e}=\sum_{e \in \delta_{G}(i)}\left(y_{e_{1}}+y_{e_{2}}\right)=\sum_{\bar{e} \in \delta_{\bar{G}}\left(i^{\prime}\right)} y_{\bar{e}}+\sum_{\bar{e} \in \delta_{\bar{G}}\left(i^{\prime \prime}\right)} y_{\bar{e}} \leq 2 .
$$

Thus, $P_{2} \supseteq A(Q)$. Hence, we conclude that $P_{2}=A(Q)$.
2. Consider polytopes $P_{k}=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}: A^{k} x \leq b^{k}\right\}$ for $k=1, \ldots, K$, and recall the copies method: We model $\bigcup_{k} P_{k}$ with

$$
Q_{I}=\left\{x, x^{1}, \ldots, x^{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{n} ; z \in\{0,1\}^{K}: x=\sum_{k=1}^{K} x^{k} ; \sum_{k=1}^{K} z_{k}=1 ; A^{k} x^{k} \leq b^{k} z_{k}, \forall k\right\}
$$

Let $Q$ be the linear relaxation of $Q_{I}$, where $z \in[0,1]^{K}$. Prove that $Q=\operatorname{conv}\left(Q_{I}\right)$, and thus $\operatorname{proj}_{x}(Q)=$ $\operatorname{conv}\left(\bigcup_{k} P_{k}\right)$ Hint: If you can prove it for $K=2$ you can prove it for any $K$.

Answer: We observe that $\operatorname{conv}\left(Q_{I}\right) \subseteq Q$, since $Q$ is the linear relaxation of $Q_{I}$. To prove the reverse inclusion, we need to show that any vector of $Q$ is the convex combination of vectors in $Q_{I}$. Let $\left(x, x^{1}, \ldots, x^{k}, z\right) \in Q$ and let $I(z)=\left\{i \in\{1, \ldots, k\}: z_{i}>0\right\}$. Note that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& I(z) \text { is nonempty, } \\
& \widetilde{x}^{i}:=\frac{1}{z_{i}} x^{i} \in P_{i}, \quad \forall i \in I(z), \quad \text { and } \\
& x^{i}=0, \quad \forall i \in\{1, \ldots, k\} \backslash I(z) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Recall that $\left(\widetilde{x}, \widetilde{x}^{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{x}^{k}, \widetilde{z}\right)$ belongs to $Q_{I}$ if, and only if,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widetilde{x}=\widetilde{x}^{i}, \quad \widetilde{x}^{i} \in P_{i}, \quad \widetilde{x}^{j}=0 \quad \text { for all } j \neq i, \quad \text { and } \quad \widetilde{z}=e^{i} \quad \text { for some } i \in\{1, \ldots, k\}, \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

This concludes that $\left(x, x^{1}, \ldots, x^{k}, z\right)$ is the convex combination of vectors in $Q_{I}$, as indicated by (5), with weights $\left\{z_{i}\right\}_{i \in I(z)}$.
For the last part, note that $\operatorname{proj}_{x} Q_{I}=\bigcup_{k} P_{k}$ and the equality

$$
\operatorname{proj}_{x}(\operatorname{conv} A)=\operatorname{conv}\left(\operatorname{proj}_{x} A\right)
$$

holds for any subset $A$. Hence, $\operatorname{proj}_{x}(Q)=\operatorname{proj}_{x}\left(\operatorname{conv} Q_{I}\right)=\operatorname{conv}\left(\bigcup_{k} P_{k}\right)$.
3. For an undirected network ( $N, E$ ) without isolated nodes, consider the polytope $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{+}$defined by nonnegativity and the constraints $x_{i}+x_{j} \leq 2$, for $\{i, j\} \in E$.
a) Suppose the network has a cycle. Show that the constraints defined by the edges of the cycle are linearly independent if and only if the cycle is odd.

Answer: Let $C$ be the cycle defined by the nodes $i_{1} i_{2} \cdots i_{n}$. The coefficient matrix $A_{n}$ that represents the constraints $x_{i}+x_{j} \leq 2$ for edges $\{i, j\} \in E(C)$ can be represented as:

$$
A_{n}=\left(\begin{array}{cccccccc}
i_{1} & i_{2} & i_{3} & i_{4} & \cdots & i_{n-1} & i_{n} &  \tag{6}\\
1 & 1 & & & & & \\
& 1 & 1 & & & & \\
& & 1 & 1 & & & \\
& & & & \ddots & & \\
& & & & & 1 & 1 \\
1 & & & & & & 1
\end{array}\right) \begin{gathered}
\left\{i_{1}, i_{2}\right\} \\
\left\{i_{2}, i_{3}\right\} \\
\left\{i_{3}, i_{4}\right\} \\
\vdots \\
\left\{i_{n-1}, i_{n}\right\} \\
\left\{i_{n}, i_{1}\right\}
\end{gathered}
$$

We show by induction that $\operatorname{det} A_{n}=2$ if $n$ is odd, and $\operatorname{det} A_{n}=0$ if $n$ is even. Indeed, the base cases $\operatorname{det} A_{3}$ and $\operatorname{det} A_{4}$ can be easily computed:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{det} A_{3}=\left|\begin{array}{lll}
1 & 1 & \\
1 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & & 1
\end{array}\right| \stackrel{\left(L_{2}-L_{3}\right)}{=}\left|\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 1 & \\
-1 & 1 & 0 \\
1 & & 1
\end{array}\right| \stackrel{\left(L_{1}-L_{2}\right)}{=}\left|\begin{array}{ccc}
2 & 0 & \\
-1 & 1 & 0 \\
1 & & 1
\end{array}\right|=2, \\
& \operatorname{det} A_{4}=\left|\begin{array}{lll}
1 & 1 & \\
& 1 & 1 \\
& & 1
\end{array}\right|
\end{aligned}
$$

We complete our proof by showing that $\operatorname{det} A_{n}=\operatorname{det} A_{n-2}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{det} A_{n} & =\left|\begin{array}{lllllll}
1 & 1 & & & & & \\
& 1 & 1 & & & & \\
& & 1 & 1 & & & \\
& & & & \ddots & & \\
& & & & & 1 & 1 \\
1 & & & & & & 1
\end{array}\right| \stackrel{\left(C_{2}-C_{1}\right)}{=}\left|\begin{array}{lllllll}
1 & 0 & & & & \\
& 1 & 1 & & & \\
& & 1 & 1 & & \\
& & & & \ddots & \\
1 & & -1 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{array}\right| \\
& \left|\begin{array}{lllllll}
1 & 0 & & & & & \\
& 1 & 0 & & & & \\
& & 1 & 1 & & & \\
& & & & \ddots & & \\
& & & & & 1 & 1 \\
1 & -1 & 1 & & & & 1
\end{array}\right|=\left|\begin{array}{lllll}
1 & 1 & & & \\
& & \ddots & & \\
1 & & 1 & 1 \\
1 & & & 1
\end{array}\right|=\operatorname{det} A_{n-2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

b) Use your answer in (a) to show that the polytope is integral, by arguing directly that every extreme point must be integral.

Answer: Let $A$ be the incidence matrix of the constraints $x_{i}+x_{j} \leq 2$, for $\{i, j\} \in E$, where the rows and columns represent the edges and nodes of the graph $G=(N, E)$, respectively, as illustrated in Eq. (6). An extreme point $x$ to the polytope $P=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{E}: A x \leq 2 \cdot \mathbb{1}, x \geq 0\right\}$ is the unique solution to

$$
\begin{aligned}
H x_{H} & =2 \cdot \mathbb{1}_{H}, \\
x_{H}{ }^{\mathrm{\complement}} & =0,
\end{aligned}
$$

where $H \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ is a square non-singular submatrix of $A, \mathbb{1}_{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{k}$ is a vector of 1 's, $x_{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{k}$ and $x_{H^{\mathrm{0}}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ are subvectors of $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$, and $n:=|N|$. From the Cramer's rule, we have that

$$
\left(x_{H}\right)_{i}=\frac{\operatorname{det} H_{i}}{\operatorname{det} H}
$$

where $H_{i}$ is the matrix formed by replacing the $i$-th column of $H$ by the column vector $2 \cdot \mathbb{1}_{H}$. Let $\widetilde{H}_{i}$ be the matrix formed by replacing the $i$-th column of $H$ by the column vector $\mathbb{1}_{H}$ (instead of $2 \cdot \mathbb{1}_{H}$ ). Note that

$$
\operatorname{det} H_{i}=2^{k} \cdot \operatorname{det} \widetilde{H}_{i}, \quad \text { and } \quad \operatorname{det} \widetilde{H}_{i} \in \mathbb{Z}
$$

If we prove that $\operatorname{det} H$ is equal to $2^{l}$ for some $l \leq k$ then we conclude that $x_{H}$ is integral.
Below we have some comments regarding $\operatorname{det} H$ :
i. By performing row expansions on the determinant of $H$, we eliminate the rows of $H$ with only one 1 . The result is the determinant of an incidence matrix of a subgraph of $G$.
ii. By performing column expansions on the determinant of $H$, we eliminate the column of $H$ with only one 1. This result in the determinant of an incidence matrix $\bar{H}$ of a subgraph $G_{\bar{H}}$ for which all the nodes have degree at least 2 .
iii. Each connected component of $G_{\bar{H}}=\left(N_{\bar{H}}, E_{\bar{H}}\right)$ must have the same number of nodes and edges. Indeed, since $\left|N_{\bar{H}}\right|=\left|E_{\bar{H}}\right|$, if some connected component have more edges than nodes then there is another connected component with more nodes than edges, which implies that there exist at least one node of degree 1. However, this cannot happen because of the previous step. Thus, the incidence matrix $\bar{H}$ is a block diagonal matrix of square matrices $\bar{H}_{r} \in \mathbb{R}^{k_{r} \times k_{r}}$,

$$
\operatorname{det} \bar{H}=\left[\begin{array}{llll}
\bar{H}_{1} & \bar{H}_{2} & &  \tag{7}\\
& & \ddots & \\
& & & \bar{H}_{l}
\end{array}\right], \quad \text { and } \quad \operatorname{det} H=\operatorname{det} \bar{H}=\prod_{r=1}^{l} \operatorname{det} \bar{H}_{r}
$$

where $l \leq k$ is the number of connected components of $G_{\bar{H}}$ and $\bar{H}_{r}$ is the incidence matrix of a connected component, for all $1 \leq r \leq l$.
iv. Because the graph $G_{\bar{H}_{r}}=\left(N_{\bar{H}_{r}}, E_{\bar{H}_{r}}\right)$ is connected, $\left|N_{\bar{H}_{r}}\right|=\left|E_{\bar{H}_{r}}\right|$, and the degree of each node is at least 2 then $G_{\bar{H}_{r}}$ must be a cycle. In particular, the graph $G_{\bar{H}_{r}}$ must be an odd cycle, for every $r=1, \ldots, l$, otherwise the matrix $H$ would be singular.
This concludes our proof that $\operatorname{det} H=2^{l}$, for some $l \leq k$.
4. Let $A$ be a TU matrix with full row rank, and let $B$ be a basis of $A$. Prove that $B^{-1} A$ is TU.

Answer: Recall that a matrix $H \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is TU if, and only if, $\left[H, I_{m}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times(m+n)}$ is unimodular. Thus, we show that $C:=\left[B^{-1} A, I_{m}\right]$ is unimodular. Let $M \subseteq\{1, \ldots,(n+m)\}$ be a subset of columns of $C$ with
cardinality $m$, that is, $|M|=m$. Let $M_{1}:=M \cap\{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $M_{2}:=M \cap\{n+1, \ldots, m+n\}$. Denote by $C_{M}$ the matrix formed by the columns in $M$. Then, we can represent $C_{M}$ as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
C_{M} & =\left[\left(B^{-1} A_{j}\right)_{j \in M_{1}},\left(e_{j}\right)_{j \in M_{2}}\right] \\
& =B^{-1}\left[\left(A_{j}\right)_{j \in M_{1}},\left(B_{j}\right)_{j \in M_{2}}\right] \\
& =B^{-1}\left[A_{M_{1}}, B_{M_{2}}\right] \\
& =B^{-1}\left[A_{M_{1}}, A_{M_{2}}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

where $A_{j}$ and $B_{j}$ are the $j$-th column of $A$ and $B$, respectively, and $e_{j}$ is the $j$-th element of the canonical basis. Since $B$ and $\left[A_{M_{1}}, A_{M_{2}}\right]$ are square submatrices of $A$ their determinant are in $\{0, \pm 1\}$. Therefore,

$$
\operatorname{det} C_{M}=\operatorname{det} B^{-1} \cdot \operatorname{det}\left[A_{M_{1}}, A_{M_{2}}\right] \in\{0, \pm 1\}
$$

Hence, $C$ is unimodular.
5. Let $A \in\{0,1\}^{n \times(n+1)}$ be a matrix consisting of an identity matrix appended with a column of all 1 's. Prove that $A$ is TU directly from the definition, i.e. by showing that all square sub-matrices have determinants in $\{0, \pm 1\}$.

Answer: Let $H \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ be a square submatrix of $A$. If $H$ does not contain the last column of $A$ then $H$ is just a submatrix of the identity $I_{n}$, so $\operatorname{det}(H) \in\{0, \pm 1\}$. If $H$ contains the last column, one could represent it as $[B, \mathbb{1}]$, where $\mathbb{1} \in \mathbb{R}^{k}$ is a column vector of 1 's, and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times(k-1)}$ is a submatrix of $I_{n}$. Recall that if we subtract a row from another row it does not change the determinant of a matrix. Thus, we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{det}([B, \mathbb{1}]) & =\operatorname{det}\left(\left[\widetilde{B}, e_{1}\right]\right) \\
& =\operatorname{det} \hat{B} \in\{0, \pm 1\}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\widetilde{B}$ is a submatrix of $B$ obtained by subtracting the consecutive rows of $B$ from the first row of $B$, and $\hat{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{(k-1) \times(k-1)}$ is the submatrix obtained by removing the first row of $\widetilde{B}$.

