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Abstract

We show that deciding if a mixed graph has a well-balanced orientation is \textit{NP}-complete.

1 Introduction

Consider the following problem: given an undirected graph $G$, orient the edges of $G$ in such a way that in the resulting directed graph $\vec{G}$, we have at least $\lfloor \lambda_G(x,y)/2 \rfloor$ directed edge-disjoint paths from $x$ to $y$, for all $x,y \in V(G)$. Here, $\lambda_G(x,y)$ denotes the maximum number of edge-disjoint paths between $x$ and $y$ in $G$. Such an orientation of $G$ is said to be a \textit{well-balanced} orientation. An important theorem of Nash-Williams [5] asserts that every graph has a well-balanced orientation (see Frank [2] for a simpler proof). Also, as explained in [3], a well-balanced orientation of $G$ can be found in polynomial time.

The above mentioned theorem of Nash-Williams on the existence of well-balanced orientations has intrigued many mathematicians since it was born (which was quite long ago, in 1960). The reason for this is that the theorem, the generalization of it which was in fact proved and the proof method itself is so different from other results and methods in graph theory that no connection with other areas has been found since then. We can say that not much more is known about the problem since 1960. In [4] many approaches were presented to obtain generalizations of this theorem, but with little success: most of the questions raised there were answered negatively with counter-examples, though some remained open. Here we decide one of these open problems.

Recently, several generalizations of the above problem were shown to be \textit{NP}-complete by Bernáth [1]. For instance, if for every edge $\{x,y\} \in E(G)$ we are given non negative costs $c_{xy}$, $c_{yx}$ for orienting the edge from $x$ to $y$, and from $y$ to $x$ respectively, then deciding if $G$ has a well-balanced orientation of cost at most a given bound $K$ is \textit{NP}-complete.

In this note, we are concerned with the following special case of the problem: we are given a graph $G$ where some edges are already oriented (a \textit{mixed} graph), and we want to decide if the remaining undirected edges can be oriented in such
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a way as to obtain a well-balanced orientation of the underlying undirected graph. The complexity of this problem was posed as an open question in [4]. We will show that it is also \(NP\)-complete:

**Theorem 1.** Deciding whether a mixed graph has an orientation that is a well-balanced orientation of the underlying undirected graph is \(NP\)-complete.

### 2 The Reduction

For the reduction we need a special form of the **Vertex Cover** problem:

**Lemma 1.** Given a graph with \(2n\) vertices and no isolated vertex, it is \(NP\)-complete to decide whether there exists a vertex cover of size at most \(n\).

**Proof.** It is well known that the **Vertex Cover** problem is \(NP\)-complete, we will reduce it to the above problem. Assume we are given an instance of the **Vertex Cover** problem consisting of a graph \(G = (V, E)\) and a positive integer \(k\) where the question is whether \(G\) has a vertex cover of size at most \(k\). We may clearly assume that \(G\) has no isolated vertex. Distinguish the following cases:

1. If \(k = |V|/2\) then we are done.
2. If \(k > |V|/2\) then let \(G'\) be the disjoint union of \(G\) and \(K_{t,1}\) for \(t = 2k + 1 - |V|\). Then \(G\) has a vertex cover of size at most \(k\) iff \(G'\) has a vertex cover of size at most \(k + 1\). Since \(G'\) has \(2k + 2\) vertices, \(G'\) is an instance of the problem in the lemma.
3. If \(k < |V|/2\) then let \(G'\) be the disjoint union of \(G\) and \(K_t\) for \(t = |V| + 2 - 2k\). Then \(G\) has a vertex cover of size at most \(k\) iff \(G'\) has a vertex cover of size at most \(k + t - 1\). As \(G'\) has \(2(k + t - 1)\) vertices, \(G'\) is again an instance of the problem in the lemma.

The reduction takes clearly polynomial time, hence the lemma follows. We note that \(G'\) has no isolated vertices. \(\square\)

Let us introduce some notations. A mixed graph will be denoted by a triple \((V, E, A)\) where \(V\) is the set of nodes, \(E\) is the set of undirected edges and \(A\) is the set of directed edges. For a given directed graph \(D\) and \(x, y \in V(D)\), we denote by \(\lambda_D(x, y)\) the maximum number of directed edge-disjoint paths from \(x\) to \(y\) in \(D\). Also, for \(S \subseteq V(D)\), we use \(\varrho_D(S)\) for the number of arcs in \(D\) going from \(V(D) - S\) to \(S\) (when \(S = \{v\}\), we simply write \(\varrho_D(v)\)). We note that, by Menger’s theorem, we have

\[
\lambda_D(x, y) = \min_{S \subseteq V(D), \ x \notin S, y \in S} \varrho_D(S).
\]

We may now turn to the reduction.

**Proof of Theorem 1.** The problem is easily seen to be in \(NP\), so let us prove its completeness. To this end we will reduce the problem in Lemma 1 to our problem using a construction similar to those in [1]. So suppose we are given an instance \(G' = (V', E')\) of the problem in Lemma 1. We remark that we wanted to
avoid isolated vertices in \(G'\) only to make the following argumentation simpler. Consider the following mixed graph \(M = (V, E, A)\): the vertex set \(V\) will contain two designated vertices \(s\) and \(t\), \(d_{G'}(v) + 3\) vertices \(y^v, z^v, x^v_0, x^v_1, x^v_2, \ldots, x^v_{d_{G'}(v)}\) for every \(v \in V'\), and one vertex \(x_e\) for every \(e \in E'\). Let us fix an ordering of \(V'\), say \(V' = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}\). The arc set \(A\) of \(M\) contains a directed circuit on \(s, z^v_1, z^v_2, \ldots, z^v_n\) in this order, a pair of oppositely directed arcs between \(s\) and \(y^v\) for every \(v \in V'\), arcs \((z^v_i, x^v_0)\) and \((x^v_i, x^v_{i+1})\) for \(i = 0, \ldots, d_{G'}(v) - 1\) and every \(v \in V'\), two parallel arcs from \(x_e\) to \(s\) for every \(e \in E'\) and finally for each \(v \in V'\) take an arbitrary order of the \(d_{G'}(v) = d\) edges of \(G'\) incident to \(v\), say \(e^1, e^2, \ldots, e^d\), and include the arc \((x^v_i, x_{e^i})\) for every \(i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}\).

The edge set \(E\) of \(M\) contains one edge between \(t\) and \(y^v\) and one edge between \(y^v\) and \(x^v_0\) for every \(v \in V'\).

The construction is illustrated in Figure 1. The arcs with a label “2” indicate a multiplicity of 2; the undirected edges are drawn in bold.

Let \(G\) be the underlying undirected graph of \(M\) and \(D = (V, A)\) be the directed part of \(M\). Notice that \(\lambda_C(x, y) = \min\{d_C(x), d_C(y)\}\) for every \(x, y \in V\) (for example one can check that this is true if \(y = s\) from which it follows for arbitrary \(x, y\)). Observe that \(D - t\) is strongly connected and that \(\lambda_D(x_e, s) = 2\) for each \(e \in E'\).

Observe furthermore that the well-balanced orientations of \(M\) are necessarily of the following form: the two edges of \(E\) incident to a vertex \(y^v\) with \(v \in V'\) form a directed path of length two, and for exactly half (i.e. \(|V'|/2\)) of these, this path starts at \(t\), and for the other half this path ends at \(t\). In other words, \(g^{-}_M(y^v) = 2\) for all \(v \in V'\) and \(g^+_M(t) = |V'|/2\) in any well-balanced orientation \(\tilde{M}\) of \(M\). This is implied by the edge-connectivities in \(G\).

If \(G'\) has a vertex cover of size at most \(|V'|/2\) then it has one, say \(S\), of size exactly \(|V'|/2\). By orienting for every \(v \in V'\) the path \(t, y^v, x^v_0\) from left to right if \(v \in S\), and from right to left otherwise, it is easily seen that we get a well-balanced orientation of \(M\).
Suppose now that $\mathcal{M}$ admits a well-balanced orientation $\vec{\mathcal{M}}$ and consider the set $S \subseteq V'$ of vertices of $G'$ for which the corresponding directed paths in $\vec{\mathcal{M}}$ start at $t$, that is

$$S := \{ v \in V' : (t, y^v) \text{ and } (y^v, x^v_0) \text{ are arcs of } \vec{\mathcal{M}} \}.$$ 

We claim that $S$ forms a vertex cover of $G'$: if edge $e = \{v_j, v_k\} \in E'$ were not covered by $S$ (where $j < k$ are the indices of the vertices in the fixed ordering), then $\rho_{\vec{\mathcal{M}}}(X) = 1$ would contradict the well-balancedness of $\vec{\mathcal{M}}$, where

$$X := \{x_e\} \bigcup \{z^{v_j} : j \leq i \leq k\} \bigcup \{x^{v_j}_i : 0 \leq i \leq d_{G'}(v_j)\} \bigcup \{x^{v_k}_i : 0 \leq i \leq d_{G'}(v_k)\}$$

(the vertices in grey in Figure 1 illustrate this cut).

\[\square\]
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