Degrees of Perfectness

JAN VAN DEN HEUVEL

Prague, 28 July 2009

Department of Mathematics
London School of Economics and Political Science

Some good terminology

- **set system** $(S, \mathcal{F})$: a finite set S with a collection $\mathcal{F}$ of subsets of S

- a set system is "**good**" if :
  - $\mathcal{F}$ is closed under taking subsets, and
  - $\mathcal{F}$ covers all of S

    (for all $s \in S$ there is an $F \in \mathcal{F}$ with $x \in F$)

Two important examples

- $G = (V_G, E_G)$ be a graph
  - take $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{S}_G}$ the collection of all stable sets

    (sets containing no adjacent pairs of vertices)
  - then $(V_G, \mathcal{S}_G)$ is a good set system
- V be a vector space, and U a subset of $V \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$
  - take $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}_U}$ the collection of all

    linearly independent subsets of U
  - then $(U, \mathcal{I}_U)$ is a good set system

Coverings

- a **covering** of $(S, \mathcal{F})$:

  a collection of sets from $\mathcal{F}$ whose union is S

- **covering number Cov$(S, \mathcal{F})$** :

  the minimum number of elements in a covering

- for a graph G : Cov$(V_G, \mathcal{S}_G)$ is the minimum number of stable sets needed to cover all vertices

  - so Cov$(V_G, \mathcal{S}_G)$ is just the **chromatic number**

Let's make it look more complicated

- the covering number is also the solution of the IP problem :

$$\text{minimise} \quad \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} x_F$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \sum_{F \ni s} x_F \geq 1, \qquad \text{for all } s \in S$$

$$x_F \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}, \qquad \text{for all } F \in \mathcal{F}$$

The fractional version

- removing the integrality condition :

$$\text{minimise} \quad \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} x_F$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \sum_{F \ni s} x_F \geq 1, \qquad \text{for all } s \in S$$

$$x_F \geq 0, \qquad \text{for all } F \in \mathcal{F}$$

- gives the **fractional covering number** $\mathbf{Cov}_f(S, \mathcal{F})$
  - and we obviously have : $\mathrm{Cov}_f(S, \mathcal{F}) \leq \mathrm{Cov}(S, \mathcal{F})$

Rule 1 of Linear Programming: dualise

- the dual LP problem of the fractional covering number is:

$$\text{maximise} \quad \sum_{s \in S} y_s$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \sum_{s \in F} y_s \leq 1, \qquad \text{for all } F \in \mathcal{F}$$

$$y_s \geq 0, \qquad \text{for all } s \in S$$

- this gives the **fractional packing number** $\mathbf{Pack}_f(\boldsymbol{S}, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}})$
  - and by LP-duality: $\mathrm{Pack}_f(S, \mathcal{F}) = \mathrm{Cov}_f(S, \mathcal{F})$

The packing number

- the integral version is the **packing number** $\mathbf{Pack}(\boldsymbol{S}, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}})$:
  - the maximum size $|T|$ of a subset $T \subseteq S$ so that $|T \cap F| \leq 1$, for all $F \in \mathcal{F}$
  - i.e.: the maximum size $|T|$ of a subset $T \subseteq S$ so that no two elements of T appear together in a set from $\mathcal{F}$

- for a graph G : $\mathrm{Pack}(V_G, \mathcal{S}_G)$ is the maximum size of a set of vertices with no two elements in a stable set
  - so $\mathrm{Pack}(V_G, \mathcal{S}_G)$ is just the **clique number**

The status so far

- for any good set system $(S, \mathcal{F})$ we have

  $$\text{Pack}(S,\mathcal{F}) \;\le\; \text{Pack}_{\boldsymbol{f}}(S,\mathcal{F}) \;=\; \text{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{f}}(S,\mathcal{F}) \;\le\; \text{Cov}(S,\mathcal{F})$$

- we will add one more parameter :

  the **circular covering number** $\textbf{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{S}, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}})$

The circular covering number

- map the elements of S to a circle so that :
  - for every unit interval $[x, x+1)$ along the circle

    elements mapped into that interval form a set from $\mathcal{F}$



- **circular covering number** $\mathbf{Cov}_c(S, \mathcal{F})$:

  minimum circumference of a circle for which this is possible

The right place for the circular covering number - I

- for a good set system : $\mathrm{Cov}_c(S,\mathcal{F}) \ \leq \ \mathrm{Cov}(S,\mathcal{F})$
  - take a disjoint cover $F_1,\ldots,F_k$ of $(S,\mathcal{F})$
  - put the elements of each F_i together at unit distance around a circle with circumference k :



  - gives a circular cover with circumference k

The right place for the circular covering number - II

- for a good set system : $\mathrm{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{f}}(S, \mathcal{F}) \le \mathrm{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(S, \mathcal{F})$
  - take a circular cover along a circle



  - "move" the unit interval with "unit speed" round the circle
  - for a set F that appears in the interval at some point :

    denote by x_F the "length of time" it appears

The right place for the circular covering number - II

- for a good set system: $\mathrm{Cov}_f(S, \mathcal{F}) \leq \mathrm{Cov}_c(S, \mathcal{F})$
  - take a circular cover along some circle
  - for a set F that appears in the interval at some point:

    denote by x_F the "length of time" it appears
  - then for all $s \in S$: $\sum_{F \ni s} x_F = 1$
  - and $\sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} x_F = \text{circumference}$
  - this gives a fractional cover with value the circumference

Inequalities, inequalities, and more inequalities

- so now we know :

$$\text{Pack} \le \text{Pack}_{\boldsymbol{f}} = \text{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{f}} \le \text{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{c}} \le \text{Cov}$$

- can we say for which good set systems we have equality for one of the inequalities ?
  - probably too hard ("too local")
- what about those that satisfy an equality

  "through and through" ?

Through and through $=$ *induced*

- $(S, \mathcal{F})$ a good set system and $T \subseteq S$, then define:

$$\mathcal{F}_T \;=\; \{\, F \cap T \mid F \in \mathcal{F} \,\} \;=\; \{\, F \in \mathcal{F} \mid F \subseteq T \,\}$$

- then $(T, \mathcal{F}_T)$ is again a good set system
  - called an **induced** set system

- for a graph G with $U \subseteq V_G$:

  $(\mathcal{S}_G)_U$ are the stable sets of the subgraph induced by U

$$\text{Pack} \;\le\; \frac{\text{Cov}_f}{\text{Pack}_f} \;\le\; \text{Cov}_c \;\le\; \text{Cov}$$

Degrees of perfectness

- a good set system is $(\boldsymbol{A}=\boldsymbol{B})$ **-perfect** :
  - the system and all its induced systems satisfy $A=B$
- note that we have **six** degrees of perfectness
- by definition, perfect graphs are exactly those graphs G for which $(V_G, \mathcal{S}_G)$ is $(\text{Pack}=\text{Cov})$-perfect
  - that makes them perfect for all inequalities !

$$\text{Pack} \leq \frac{\text{Cov}_f}{\text{Pack}_f} \leq \text{Cov}_c \leq \text{Cov}$$

What about the other set systems ?

- we know non-perfect graphs very well :

<u>**Strong Perfect Graph Theorem**</u> (Chudnovsky et al., 2006)

- G **not** a perfect graph $\iff$

  G contains an induced copy :

  - of an odd cycle C_{2k+1} , $k \geq 2$, or
  - of the complement $\overline{C_{2k+1}}$ of an odd cycle, $k \geq 2$

$$\text{Pack} \leq \frac{\text{Cov}_f}{\text{Pack}_f} \leq \text{Cov}_c \leq \text{Cov}$$

What about other "graphical" set systems ?

- for an odd cycle C_{2k+1}, $k \geq 2$, it is easy to check :
  - $\text{Pack}(V_{C_{2k+1}}, \mathcal{S}_{C_{2k+1}}) = 2$
  - $\text{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{f}}(V_{C_{2k+1}}, \mathcal{S}_{C_{2k+1}}) = \text{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(V_{C_{2k+1}}, \mathcal{S}_{C_{2k+1}}) = 2 + \dfrac{1}{k}$
  - $\text{Cov}(V_{C_{2k+1}}, \mathcal{S}_{C_{2k+1}}) = 3$

- similar things happen for

  the complement $\overline{C_{2k+1}}$ of an odd cycle, $k \geq 2$

$$\text{Pack} \leq \frac{\text{Cov}_f}{\text{Pack}_f} \leq \text{Cov}_c \leq \text{Cov}$$

Perfect graphs are very perfect

so :

- a good set system of the form $(V_G, \mathcal{S}_G)$ is
  - $(\text{Pack} = \text{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{f}})$-perfect, or
  - $(\text{Pack} = \text{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{c}})$-perfect, or
  - $(\text{Pack} = \text{Cov})$-perfect, or
  - $(\text{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{f}} = \text{Cov})$-perfect, or
  - $(\text{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{c}} = \text{Cov})$-perfect

$\iff$ G is perfect

$$\text{Pack} \leq \begin{matrix}\text{Cov}_f \\ \text{Pack}_f\end{matrix} \leq \text{Cov}_c \leq \text{Cov}$$

And what about non-graphical set systems ?

- suppose $(S, \mathcal{F})$ is a good set system such that
  - all minimal sets not in $\mathcal{F}$ have size 2

    (smaller than 2 is not possible, as $\mathcal{F}$ covers S)

- then form the graph G with $V_G = S$ by setting

$$s_1 s_2 \in E_G \iff \{s_1, s_2\} \notin \mathcal{F}$$

- easy to check : $(S, \mathcal{F}) = (V_G, \mathcal{S}_G)$

$$\text{Pack} \le \frac{\text{Cov}_f}{\text{Pack}_f} \le \text{Cov}_c \le \text{Cov}$$

And what about non-graphical set systems ?

- $(S, \mathcal{F})$ is a non-graphical good set system $\iff$

  there is a subset $T \subseteq S$ with $|T| = k \geq 3$ so that :

  - $T \notin \mathcal{F}$
  - but every **proper** subset of T is in $\mathcal{F}$

- for such a T , the induced set system $(T, \mathcal{F}_T)$ satisfies :

  - $\text{Pack}(T, \mathcal{F}_T) = 1$
  - $\text{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{f}}(T, \mathcal{F}_T) = \text{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(T, \mathcal{F}_T) = 1 + \dfrac{1}{k-1}$
  - $\text{Cov}(T, \mathcal{F}_T) = 2$

$$\text{Pack} \leq \frac{\text{Cov}_f}{\text{Pack}_f} \leq \text{Cov}_c \leq \text{Cov}$$

Perfect graphs are really, really perfect!

so:

- a good good set system $(S, \mathcal{F})$ is
  - $(\text{Pack} = \text{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{f}})$-perfect, or
  - $(\text{Pack} = \text{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{c}})$-perfect, or
  - $(\text{Pack} = \text{Cov})$-perfect, or
  - $(\text{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{f}} = \text{Cov})$-perfect, or
  - $(\text{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{c}} = \text{Cov})$-perfect

$\iff$ $(S, \mathcal{F}) = (V_G, \mathcal{S}_G)$ for some perfect graph G

$$\text{Pack} \leq \begin{matrix} \text{Cov}_f \\ \text{Pack}_f \end{matrix} \leq \text{Cov}_c \leq \text{Cov}$$

All that is left to do . . .

- what good set systems $(S, \mathcal{F})$ are $(\text{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{f}} = \text{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{c}})$-perfect ?

- well . . .

  - stable sets of perfect graphs

  - stable sets of odd cycles or complements of odd cycles

  - loopless matroids (vdH & Thomassé)

  - and a lot more

$\text{Cov}_f \leq \text{Cov}_c$

What the $****$ is a loopless matroid ?

- a set system $(S, \mathcal{F})$ is a **loopless matroid** if
  - $(S, \mathcal{F})$ is good
  - for each $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ with $|F_1| > |F_2|$:

    there is an $s \in F_1 \setminus F_2$ so that $F_2 \cup \{s\} \in \mathcal{F}$

example

- V a vector space, U a subset of $V \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$
  - then $(U, \mathcal{I}_U)$ is a loopless matroid
  - so : $\mathrm{Cov}_f(U, \mathcal{I}_U) = \mathrm{Cov}_c(U, \mathcal{I}_U)$

$\mathrm{Cov}_f \leq \mathrm{Cov}_c$

The "remaining" case

- good set systems that are $(\mathrm{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{f}} = \mathrm{Cov}_{\boldsymbol{c}})$-perfect :
  - stable sets of perfect graphs
  - stable sets of odd cycles or complements of odd cycles
  - loopless matroids
  - disjoint unions of the above
  - and probably a lot more . . .

by the way :

- a stable set system $(V_G, \mathcal{S}_G)$ is a loopless matroid

  $\iff$ G is the disjoint union of cliques

$\mathrm{Cov}_f \leq \mathrm{Cov}_c$

The "remaining" case

<u>**questions**</u>:

- can we characterise $(\text{Cov}_f = \text{Cov}_c)$-perfect set systems?
- or at least the graphs G for which $(V_G, \mathcal{S}_G)$ is $(\text{Cov}_f = \text{Cov}_c)$-perfect?
- what "natural" class of set systems contains both matroids and stable sets of perfect graphs?

$\text{Cov}_f \leq \text{Cov}_c$