

Reprinted from

MATHEMATICAL PROGRAMMING

Mathematical Programming 70 (1995) 201–209

A note on packing paths in planar graphs¹

András Frank^{*}, Zoltán Szigeti

Department of Computer Science, Eötvös University, Múzeum krt. 6–8, Budapest, H-1088 Hungary

Received 1 February 1994; revised manuscript received 15 November 1994



Founder: M.L. BALINSKI

Former Editors-in-Chief:

M.L. BALINSKI (1970–1980), R.W. COTTLE (1980–1986), M.J. TODD (Series A, 1986–1989), R.E. BIXBY (Series A, 1989–1994)

Editor-in-Chief for Series A: D. GOLDFRAB, Department of Industrial Engineering and Operations Research, 331 Mudd Bldg, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027-6599, USA

Editor-in-Chief for Series B: W.R. PULLEYBLANK, Thomas J. Watson Research Center, IBM, P.O. Box 218, Yorktown Heights, NY 10598, USA

Incoming Editor-in-Chief for Series B: J.R. BIRGE, Department of Industrial and Operations Engineering, 1205 Beal, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA

Co-Editors for Series A:

R.M. FREUNO, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 50 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, MA 02142-1347, USA

R.B. SCHWABEL, Computer Science Department, University of Colorado, Campus Box 430, Boulder, CO 80309, USA

L.A. WOLSEY, Center for Operations Research and Econometrics, Catholic University of Louvain, 34 voie du Roman Pays, 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

Associate Editors for Series A:

E.L. ALLGOWER, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA

J.R. BIRGE, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

A.R. CONN, Thomas J. Watson Research Center, IBM, Yorktown Heights, NY, USA

W. COOK, Bellcore, Morristown, NJ, USA

R. CORREA, Universidad de Chile, Santiago, Chile

W.H. CUNNINGHAM, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ont., Canada

B.C. EAVES, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

N.J.M. GOULD, Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, Oxon., UK

M. GROTSCHTEL, Konrad-Zuse-Zentrum für Informationstechnik, Berlin, Germany

M. IRI, Ohio University, Tokyo, Japan

D.S. JOHNSON, AT&T Bell Laboratories, Murray Hill, NJ, USA

M. JÜNGER, Universität zu Köln, Köln, Germany

K.C. KWIMER, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland

L. LOVÁK, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary

I. LUSTIG, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA

N. MEGIDDO, IBM Almaden Research Center, San José, CA, USA, and Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel

R.R. MEYER, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI, USA

J. NOCEDAL, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, USA

J.-S. PANO, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA

B.T. POLYAK, Institute of Control Sciences, Moscow, Russia

M.J.D. POWELL, Cambridge University, Cambridge, UK

W.R. PULLEYBLANK, Thomas J. Watson Research Center, IBM, Yorktown Heights, NY, USA

M.J. TODD, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA

Ph. TOUIT, Facultés Universitaires Notre Dame de la Paix, Namur, Belgium

M.H. WRIGHT, AT&T Bell Laboratories, Murray Hill, NJ, USA

(Editorial Board listing continued on the outside of the back cover)

A note on packing paths in planar graphs¹

András Frank*, Zoltán Szigeti

Department of Computer Science, Eötvös University, Műzeum krt. 6–8, Budapest, H-1088 Hungary

Received 1 February 1994; revised manuscript received 15 November 1994

Abstract

Seymour (1981) proved that the cut criterion is necessary and sufficient for the solvability of the edge-disjoint paths problem when the union of the supply graph and the demand graph is planar and Eulerian. When only planarity is required, Middendorf and Pfeiffer (1993) proved the problem to be NP-complete. For this case, Korach and Penn (1992) proved that the cut criterion is sufficient for the existence of a near-complete packing of paths. Here we generalize this result by showing how a natural strengthening of the cut criterion yields better packings of paths.

Analogously to Seymour's approach, we actually prove a theorem on packing cuts in an arbitrary graph and then the planar edge-disjoint paths case is obtained by planar dualization. The main result is derived from a theorem of Sebő (1990) on the structure of ± 1 weightings of a bipartite graph with no negative circuits.

Keywords: Disjoint paths; Joins; Packing cuts

1. Introduction

The edge-disjoint paths problem consists of finding edge-disjoint paths in an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ that connect specified pairs of terminal nodes. We will say that uv is a *demand edge* if (u, v) is a specified pair of nodes to be connected. Let $H = (V, F)$ denote the graph of demand edges and call H a *demand graph*. If (u, v) is specified k times, that is, k paths are required to connect u and v , then in the demand graph k parallel demand edges occur connecting u and v . The edge-disjoint paths problem is equivalent to finding a family of $|F|$ edge-disjoint circuits in $G + H$ so that each of these circuits contains precisely one demand edge (and then, clearly, each demand edge belongs to a circuit). Such a circuit will be called *F-good* and the family a *complete*

* Corresponding author. e-mail: frank@konig.elte.hu.

¹ Research partially supported by the Hungarian National Foundation for Scientific Research Grants OTKA 2118 and 4271.

Publication information. *Mathematical Programming* (ISSN 0025-5610). For 1995 Volumes 68–71 are scheduled for publication. Subscription prices are available upon request from the publisher. Subscriptions are accepted on a prepaid basis only and are entered on a calendar year basis. Issues are sent by surface mail except to the following countries where air delivery via S.A.L. mail is ensured: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Hong Kong, India, Israel, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Pakistan, PR China, Singapore, South Africa, South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, USA. For all other countries airmail rates are available upon request. Claims for missing issues must be made within six months of our publication (mailing) date. Please address all your requests regarding orders and subscription queries to Elsevier Science B.V., Journal Department, P.O. Box 211, 1000 AE Amsterdam, Netherlands. Tel.: 31-20-4853642; fax: 31-20-4853598. Individual subscriptions are available through membership in the Mathematical Programming Society, Inc., c/o International Statistical Institute, 428 Prinses Beatrixlan, 2270 AZ Voorburg, Netherlands. Individual subscriptions may not be used for the benefit of any library or other institution. Manuscripts submitted for publication and related correspondence should be addressed to the Editor-in-Chief for Series A or to one of the Co-Editors listed above.

US mailing notice. *Mathematical Programming* (ISSN 0025-5610) is published monthly by Elsevier Science B.V. (Molenwerf 1, P.O. Box 211, 1000 AE Amsterdam). Annual subscription price in the USA is US\$ 703.25 (US\$ price valid in North, Central and South America only), including air speed delivery. Application to mail at second class postage is pending at Jamaica, NY 11431, USA POST-MASTERS. Send address changes to *Mathematical Programming*, Publication Expediting, Inc., 200 Meacham Avenue, Elmont, NY 11003. Airfreight and mailing in the USA by Publication Expediting.

packing of F -good circuits. That is, a complete packing is one covering all demand edges. We say that in a concrete instance $G + H$ there is a solution to the edge-disjoint paths problem if such a complete packing exists.

In this paper we will mainly be concerned with the edge-disjoint paths problem in the planar case, that is, when $G + H$ is planar. Middendorf and Pfeiffer [4] showed that even in this case the problem is NP-complete.

The following is clearly a necessary condition for the solvability of the edge-disjoint paths problem.

Cut criterion. $d_G(X) \geq d_H(X)$ for every $X \subseteq V$, where $d_G(X)$ denotes the number of edges of G with precisely one end-node in X .

Let $s(X) := s(B) := d_G(X) - d_H(X)$ and we call this quantity the *surplus* of X or of the cut $B := [X, V - X]$ determined by X . Then the cut criterion is equivalent to requiring that the surplus of every cut is nonnegative.

The cut criterion is not sufficient in general (not even in the planar case) but there are important special cases when it is. (For a survey, see [1].) For example, Seymour [7] proved the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *When $G + H$ is planar and Eulerian, the edge-disjoint paths problem has a solution if and only if the cut criterion holds.*

What can one say on the non-Eulerian planar edge-disjoint paths problem? Korach and Penn [3] proved a theorem stating, roughly, that the cut criterion, though not sufficient, ensures the near-solvability of the edge-disjoint paths problem in the sense that each demand can be met except possibly one from each bounded face.

Theorem 1.2 (Korach and Penn [3]). *Suppose that $G + H$ is planar and the cut condition holds. There is at most one demand edge on each bounded face of G so that leaving out these edges from H , the problem has a solution.*

Note that in this theorem the infinite face of G plays a special role: no demand edge from it is left out. What if we want to require the same for some or all other faces of G ? We should somehow find conditions stronger than the cut criterion.

On the negative side, we show that even in the planar case there is no constant $K \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that requiring $d_G(X) \geq d_H(X) + K$ for every subset X of nodes is sufficient for the solvability of the edge-disjoint paths problem however big K is. Even worse, we will see that for any positive ε the requirement $d_G(X) \geq (2 - \varepsilon)d_H(X)$ for every $X \subseteq V$ is still not sufficient, in general. On the other hand, we will observe that requiring $d_G(X) \geq 2d_H(X)$ for every $X \subseteq V$ is already sufficient. We are going to prove a refinement of this statement asserting the sufficiency of a weaker condition. Our main result is a generalization of the theorem of Korach and Penn (but not of Seymour's).

A subset F of edges is called a *join* if $|C \cap F| \leq |C - F|$ holds for every circuit C . We call a ± 1 weighting w of the edge-set *conservative* if the total weight $w(C)$ of every circuit C is nonnegative. Guan [2] pointed out that these notions are intimately related: for a conservative w the set N_w of negative edges is a join and conversely, for a join F the weighting w_F is conservative where $w_F(e) := -1$ for $e \in F$ and $:= +1$ for $e \notin F$.

A cut containing precisely one element of F (one negative element) will be called *F-good*. A family of disjoint F -good cuts is called a *complete packing* if every negative edge belongs to one of them.

2. Results

For planar graphs the problem of packing F -good circuits (that is, the edge-disjoint paths problem) and the problem of packing F -good cuts are clearly equivalent via planar dualization. But very often results concerning packing F -good cuts extend to nonplanar graphs. For example, Seymour's above-mentioned result was originally proved in a more general form, as follows.

Theorem 2.1 (Seymour [7]). *Given a bipartite graph and a subset F of its edges, there is a complete packing of F -good cuts if and only if F is a join.*

(To see the equivalence of Theorems 1.1 and 2.1 in the planar case, notice that a planar graph is Eulerian if and only if its planar dual is bipartite and that the cut condition holds if and only if the edge-set in the dual corresponding to the demand edges is a join.)

For those who are familiar with T -joins and T -cuts, we note that Seymour actually proved his result in an equivalent form.

Theorem 2.1(A). *For a bipartite graph the minimum cardinality of a T -join is equal to the maximum number of disjoint T -cuts.*

Korach and Penn also proved their result in the form of packing F -good cuts in an arbitrary graph $\hat{G} = (V\hat{E})$, as follows.

Theorem 2.2 (Korach and Penn [3]). *Let F be a join in \hat{G} and let the components of the subgraph $(V(F), F)$ be $K_0, F_1, F_2, \dots, F_l$. Then it is possible to contract at most one edge from each F_i so that the resulting graph has a complete packing of F -good cuts.*

When \hat{G} is planar, its planar dual corresponds to $G + H$ in Theorem 1.2. Moreover, the elements of F correspond to the demand edges (that is, the edges of H). It is an easy exercise to see that a tree F_i corresponds to a subset of demand edges in H which lie in one face of G .

In order to generalize Theorem 2.2, assume that the components of the subgraph $(V(F), F)$ are divided into two groups: $\{K_0, K_1, \dots, K_k\}$ and $\{F_1, \dots, F_l\}$, $k \geq 0$, $l \geq 0$. For a circuit C , let $k_+(C)$ denote the number of those components K_i , $i \geq 1$, from which C contains at least one edge.

Main Theorem 2.3. *If*

$$w_F(C) \geq k_+(C) \tag{1}$$

for every circuit C of G , then it is possible to contract at most one edge from each F_i so that the resulting graph has a complete packing of F -good cuts. In particular, if $l = 0$, there is a complete packing of F -good cuts.

In other words, the theorem says that there is a packing of F -good cuts which is nearly complete in the sense that each edge of K_i , $i = 0, \dots, k$, is covered and each but at most one edge of F_j , $j = 1, \dots, l$, is covered.

In the same way as Theorem 1.2 arises from Theorem 2.2, one can specialize Theorem 2.3 to the planar case. Here we do this only when $l = 0$.

Corollary 2.4. *Let $G + H$ be planar. Suppose that the surplus $s(B)$ of every cut B is at least the number of those bounded faces of G which contain a demand edge from B . Then the edge-disjoint paths problem has a solution.*

This immediately implies the following corollary.

Corollary 2.5. *In the planar case the edge-disjoint paths problem has a solution if $d_G(X) \geq 2d_H(X)$ for every $X \subseteq V$.*

On the other hand, we construct an example showing that the coefficient 2 in the corollary cannot be replaced by $2 - \varepsilon$ for any positive ε . Let K_1, K_2, \dots, K_t be t disjoint copies of the complete graph on four nodes and choose two disjoint edges e_i, f_i in each K_i . Glue together the copies by identifying each e_i into one edge e_0 . In the resulting graph, let e_0 and each f_i be demand edges. (For $t = 3$, see Fig. 1). Clearly, the edge-disjoint paths problem has no solution in this instance. Moreover, $d_G(X) \geq d_H(X)2t/(t + 1)$.

3. Proof

Seymour's Theorem 2.1 tells us that in a bipartite graph for any join F there is a complete packing of F -good cuts. Sebő [5] found an extremely elegant approach to describe a complete packing, "canonical" in a sense. His theorem (Theorem 3.1 below), which might be called the *Distance Theorem*, not only generalizes Seymour's but directly implies Theorem 2.2 of Korach and Penn, as well. To show this, Sebő first constructed a bipartite graph by subdividing each edge by a new node, he applied then his Distance




Fig. 1.

Theorem, and finally, from the obtained cut packing, extracted the family of disjoint cuts required in the theorem of Korach and Penn.

Our proof will follow the similar line: the difference is that the Distance Theorem will be applied to an auxiliary bipartite graph which is constructed in a more sophisticated way.

In order to formulate the Distance Theorem, let B be a connected bipartite graph and F' a join of B , that is, $w := w^{F'}$ is conservative. Choose an arbitrary node s of B and let $\lambda(v)$ denote the minimum w -weight of a path between s and v . Clearly, $\lambda(s) = 0$ and it is also evident that $|\lambda(x) - \lambda(y)| = 1$ for every edge xy of B . Let i be any integer between the smallest and the largest distance from s . Define a level set $L_i := \{x \in V(B) : \lambda(s, x) = i\}$ and a down set $D_i := \{x \in V(B) : \lambda(x) \leq i\}$.

Let \mathcal{D}_i denote the family of connected components of the subgraph induced by D_i . Note that each edge leaving a member of \mathcal{D}_i connects a node of L_i and a node of L_{i+1} . Now the family $\mathcal{D} := \bigcup \mathcal{D}_i$ is a laminar family (i.e., any two members are either disjoint or one includes the other) and the cuts defined by the members of \mathcal{D} form a partition of the edge-set of B .

We call a member of \mathcal{D} containing s a *root-component* while the members not containing s are called the *nonroot-components*. (There are no root-components in \mathcal{D}_i if $i < 0$, and there is precisely one if $i \geq 0$.)

Distance Theorem 3.1 (Sebő [5,6]). *Given a bipartite graph B and a join F' of B , every negative edge (that is, every element of F') enters a nonroot-member of \mathcal{D} and each nonroot-member of \mathcal{D} is entered by exactly one negative edge. Equivalently, the cuts determined by the distance components form a complete packing of F' -good cuts.*

Let us call a node $v \neq s$ *singular* if there are precisely two edges u_1v, u_2v incident to v , both of them negative, and $\lambda(v) - 1 = \lambda(u_1) = \lambda(u_2)$.

Lemma 3.2 (Sebő [5]). *Each component T of F' contains at most one singular node. Moreover, if s belongs to T , then T contains no singular node.*

Proof. We claim that

$$\text{there are no two adjacent negative edges } x_1y, x_2y \text{ for which } \lambda(y) + 1 = \lambda(x_1) = \lambda(x_2). \tag{2}$$

This can be seen directly by some easy manipulations with the minimum weight paths or we can argue that if (2) were not true, then there would be two negative edges entering the component of $\mathcal{D}_{\lambda(y)}$ containing y and this would contradict the Distance Theorem.

Now suppose, indirectly, that there are two singular nodes a, b in T . Let P be the unique path in T connecting a and b and let y be a node of P for which $\lambda(y)$ is minimum. Now the two incident edges x_1y and x_2y of P violate (2). \square



We will need another simple lemma. For a sub-tree T of a graph $\hat{G} = (V, \hat{E})$ we call a circuit C continuous in T if $x, y \in V(C) \cap V(T)$ implies that the unique path in T connecting x and y belongs to C .

Lemma 3.3. *If F is a sub-forest of a graph so that w_F is not conservative, then there is a negative circuit which is continuous in each component of F .*

Proof. We claim that a negative circuit C containing a minimum number of positive edges will do. If not, then there are two nodes x, y of C belonging to some component T of F so that the unique path P in T connecting x and y is internally disjoint from the two subpaths C_1 and C_2 of C connecting x and y . Now both circuits $P \cup C_1$ and $P \cup C_2$ contain a positive edge since F is a forest, hence both have less positive edges than C has. But one of them is a negative circuit contradicting the choice of C . \square

Proof of Main Theorem 2.3. We define an auxiliary graph B in two steps. For reference purposes let us assume that the nodes of \hat{G} are linearly ordered. First, subdivide each edge $e = uv$ of \hat{G} by a new node called a *subdividing node* and denoted by s_e , that is, replace e by two new edges $e' := us_e$ and $e'' := s_e v$. If say, $u < v$, then e' will be called the *first half* of e while e'' the *second half*. Then for each node $u \in \bigcup(V(K_i) : i = 1, \dots, k)$ split u into two in the following sense: add a new copy u' of u , called a *split node*, to the graph, along with a new edge $u'u$, called a *split edge*, and for each original edge $e = uv \notin F$ replace the edge $s_e u$ by $s_e u'$. (Intuitively, this operation means that we split apart at u the negative and the positive edges.) (See Fig. 2 where solid lines denote the edges belonging to the join.)

It is immediately seen that the resulting graph B is bipartite. (Note that B has three types of nodes: original, subdividing and split nodes.) In B let F' consist of the split edges plus the halves of the elements of F . Let s be an original node from $V(K_0)$. From the hypothesis of Theorem 2.3 and from the construction of B , Lemma 3.3 implies that F' is a join and thus we can apply Theorem 3.1.



split edge \square
subdividing node \circ
split node \square




Fig. 2.

Let us consider the level sets $L_i := \{x \in V(B) : \lambda(s, x) = i\}$. The original nodes of K_0 and F_1, \dots, F_l and all the split nodes lie in even levels while the original nodes of K_1, \dots, K_k lie in odd levels. Furthermore,

a subdividing node s_e is in an even level precisely if edge e belongs to $K_1 \cup \dots \cup K_k$. (*)

Recall the definition of singular nodes. We call an (original) edge in F singular if its

subdividing node s_e is singular. It follows from Lemma 3.2 that K_0 contains no singular edge and each other component of F contains at most one.

By the Distance Theorem every nonroot-component C' is entered by exactly one element of F' and the cuts of B determined by these components are edge-disjoint. In order to get edge-disjoint F -good cuts of G , let us define a subset \mathcal{D}' of \mathcal{D} , as follows.

Let $\mathcal{D}_{\text{odd}} := \bigcup \{ \mathcal{D}_i : i \text{ odd} \}$. Discard from \mathcal{D}_{odd} the root-components along with those members which are entered by either a split edge or the second half of a singular edge. Let \mathcal{D}' denote the resulting family.

For any $X \in \mathcal{D}'$ let $\Delta(X)$ denote the cut of \hat{G} determined by the set of original nodes in X . Such a cut is clearly F -good. Let $\hat{\mathcal{B}} := \{ \Delta(X) : X \in \mathcal{D}' \}$.

We claim that $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ consists of disjoint cuts. To see that, let $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}'$. If $X \in \mathcal{D}_i, Y \in \mathcal{D}_j, i \neq j$, then $|i - j| \geq 2$ and hence $\Delta(X) \cap \Delta(Y) = \emptyset$ follows. If $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}_i$, and, indirectly, there is an edge $e \in \Delta(X) \cap \Delta(Y)$, then the subdividing node s_e is in L_{i-1} or in L_{i+1} . By $(*)$, e belongs to $K_1 \cup \dots \cup K_i$. Expression (2) implies that s_e must belong to L_{i-1} and hence one of X and Y is entered by the second half of e . This contradicts the definition of \mathcal{D}' .

Moreover, we claim that, apart from the singular edges occurring (possibly) in F' , each other edge e in F belongs to a cut in $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$. Indeed, if e is a nonsingular edge in F , then (exactly) one of its two halves in B connects some level sets L_j and L_{j+1} where j is odd. Then this half enters a member of \mathcal{D}' and therefore e belongs to a cut in $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$. If e is a singular edge of some K_i , then $i > 0$ and, by $(*)$, each half of e connects some level sets L_j and L_{j+1} where j is odd. We conclude that such an e also belongs to a cut in $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$.

We obtained that, after contracting the singular edges belonging to some F_i , the family $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ is a complete packing of F -good cuts. Since each F_i contains at most one singular edge, the theorem follows. \square

4. Remarks

Recall that in the case $k = 0$ the Main Theorem specializes to Theorem 2.2. We note that also the proof above specializes to that of Theorem 2.2 given in [5].

One can ask how sharp the main theorem is. Let us consider only the following.

Corollary 4.1. Suppose that for a join F ,

$$w_F(C) \geq k(C) \quad (3)$$

for every circuit C where $k(C)$ denotes the number of components of F sharing an edge with C . Then there is a complete packing of F -good cuts.

In (3), $k(C)$ cannot be replaced by $k(C) - 2$ as is shown by K_4 , the complete graph on four nodes, when F consists of two disjoint edges. In this case $w_F(C) \geq k(C) - 2$ clearly holds for every circuit C but there is no complete packing of F -good cuts since

there are no two disjoint cuts at all. (K_4 is not a single bad example: it is not difficult to construct graphs with a join F of arbitrarily many components so that $w_F(C) \geq k(C) - 2$ holds for every circuit and there is no complete packing of F -good cuts.)

We are left with the following problem.

Open problem. Can $k(C)$ in (3) be replaced by $k(C) - 1$?

Finally, we briefly remark that given an arbitrary conservative weighting, the distance of two specified nodes can be computed with the help of matchings. Therefore the level sets in the Distance Theorem can be computed in polynomial time for arbitrary conservative weightings. (For further details, see [6].) Because the reduction we used in the proof of the main theorem is algorithmic, we conclude that there is a polynomial time algorithm for finding the desired packing of F -good cuts. The resulting algorithm is polynomial even in the capacitated version of the main theorem.

References

- [1] A. Frank, "Packing paths, circuits, and cuts — a survey," in: B. Korte, L. Lovász, H.-J. Prömel and A. Schrijver, eds., *Paths, Flows and VLSI-Layouts* (Springer, Berlin, 1990) pp. 47–100.
- [2] M. Guan, "Graphic programming using odd and even points," *Chinese Journal of Mathematics* 1 (1962) 273–277.
- [3] E. Korach and M. Penn, "Tight integral duality gap in the Chinese postman problem," *Mathematical Programming* 55 (1992) 183–191.
- [4] M. Middendorf and F. Pfeiffer, "On the complexity of the edge-disjoint paths problem," *Combinatorica* 13 (1) (1993) 97–108.
- [5] A. Sebő, "Undirected distances and the postman-structure of graphs," *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 49 (1) (1990) 10–39.
- [6] A. Sebő, "Potentials in undirected graphs and planar multiflows," *SIAM Journal on Computing*, to appear.
- [7] P.D. Seymour, "On odd cuts and planar multiconnmodity flows," *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* (3) 42 (1981) 178–192.

The Mathematical Programming Society

The Mathematical Programming Society is an international organization dedicated to the support and development of the applications, computational methods, and theory of mathematical programming in its widest sense. The society holds the triennial International Symposium on Mathematical Programming and sponsors many meetings, throughout the world. It has also instituted a program of prizes for outstanding advances in the field.

A detailed description of the society and its activities appeared in the August 1985 issue of *Optima*, the society's newsletter, edited by Professor Donald W. Hearn of the University of Florida.

ELECTED OFFICERS

Chairmen:

G.B. Dantzig (1973-1974)
E.M.L. Beale (1974-1976)
A.W. Tucker (1976-1978)
P. Wolfe (1978-1980)
J. Abadie (1980-1983)
A. Orden (1983-1986)
M.L. Balinski (1986-1989)
G.L. Nemhauser (1989-1992)
J.K. Lenstra (1992-1995)

Treasurers:

J.S. Fulkers (1973-1975)
F.A. Lootsma (1975-1980)
M.W. Padberg (1980-1982)
A.C. Williams (1982-1989)
L.E. Trotter Jr. (1989-1995)

Council Members-at-Large:

1973-1975: B. Martos, A. Orden, M.J.D. Powell, P. Wolfe
1975-1977: J. Abadie, R. Fletcher, D.R. Fulkerson (to 1976), G.P. McCormick (from 1976), R.T. Rockafellar
1977-1979: R.W. Cottle, L. Lasdon, G.L. Nemhauser, L.A. Wolsey
1979-1982: M. Avriel, M. Held, A. Land, A. Orden
1982-1985: E.M.L. Beale, J.-L. Goffin, D. Goldfarb, J.K. Lenstra
1985-1988: M. Grötschel, K.L. Hoffman, M. In, R.B. Schnabel
1988-1991: E. Balas, W.H. Cunningham, C. Lemaréchal, A. Schrijver
1991-1994: C.C. Gonzaga, M. Kojima, B. Korte, S.M. Robinson

APPOINTED OFFICERS

Chairmen of the Executive Committee:

R.W. Cottle (1973-1976)
A.C. Williams (1976-1983)
M. Held (1983-1985)
M.D. Grigoriadis (1985-1986)
J.K. Lenstra (1986-1992)
R.H. Möhring (1992-)

Editors-in-Chief:

M.L. Balinski (1970-1980)
R.W. Cottle (1980-1986)
M.J. Todd (Series A, 1986-1989)
W.R. Pulleyblank (Series B, 1988-)
R.E. Bixby (Series A, 1989-1994)
D. Goldfarb (Series A, 1994-)

STANDING COMMITTEES, DATES OF FORMATION, PRESENT CHAIRMEN

Committee on Algorithms, 1974, F.A. Al-Khayyal
Publications Committee, 1976, S.M. Robinson
Symposium Advisory Committees, 1977, C.L. Monma (1994), B. Korte (1997)
Fulkerson Prize Committee, 1978, A. Schrijver
Dantzig Prize Committee, 1979, M.J. Todd
Membership Committee, 1979, P. Toth
Committee on Stochastic Programming, 1982, S.W. Wallace
Beale-Orchard-Hoys Prize Committee, 1984, L.A. Wolsey
Tucker Prize Committee, 1987, T.M. Liebling

© 1995, The Mathematical Programming Society, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

No responsibility is assumed by the Publisher for any injury and/or damage to persons or property as a matter of products liability, negligence or otherwise, or from any use or operation of any methods, products, instructions or ideas contained in the material herein. Although all advertising material is expected to conform to ethical standards, inclusion in this publication does not constitute a guarantee or endorsement of the quality or value of such product or of the claims made of it by its manufacturer.