

SHORT PROOFS OF THE GALE & RYSER AND FORD & FULKERSON CHARACTERIZATIONS OF THE ROW AND COLUMN SUM VECTORS OF (0,1)-MATRICES

RICHARD A. BRUALDI

(communicated by J. Pečarić)

Abstract. We simultaneously give short, direct proofs of the Gale & Ryser and Ford & Fulkerson characterizations of the row and column sum vectors of (0,1)-matrices.

Let $R := r_1 \geq r_2 \geq \dots \geq r_m$ and $S := s_1 \geq s_2 \geq \dots \geq s_n$ be two nonincreasing sequences of nonnegative integers with

$$\tau := r_1 + r_2 + \dots + r_m = s_1 + s_2 + \dots + s_n.$$

Let $\bar{R} : \bar{r}_1 \geq \bar{r}_2 \geq \dots \geq \bar{r}_n$ be the *conjugate* of R :

$$\bar{r}_j = |\{i : r_i \geq j\}|,$$

and let $T = [t_{kl}]$ be the $m + 1$ by $n + 1$ *structure matrix* defined by

$$t_{kl} = kl + \sum_{i=k+1}^m r_i - \sum_{j=1}^l s_j, \quad (0 \leq k \leq m, 0 \leq l \leq n).$$

One easily verifies that

$$t_{00} = \tau, t_{0n} = 0, t_{m0} = 0, t_{1n} = n - r_1, t_{m1} = m - s_1, \text{ and } t_{mn} = mn - \tau.$$

For vectors $X : x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \dots \geq x_n$ and $Y : y_1 \geq y_2 \geq \dots \geq y_n$, define X is *majorized* by Y , denoted $X \preceq Y$, to mean

$$\sum_{i=1}^k x_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^k y_i \quad (1 \leq k \leq n)$$

with equality for $k = n$.

By use of direct combinatorial reasoning (Ryser [5] for (1) below) and the theory of network flows (Gale [3] also for (1), and Ford and Fulkerson [2] for (2)), the following theorem has been proved (see also [1]).

Mathematics subject classification (2000): 05A20, 05B20, 15A39.

Key words and phrases: Row and column sum vector, (0, 1)-matrices, majorization, structure matrix.

THEOREM 1. Each of the following conditions is equivalent to the existence of an m by n $(0, 1)$ -matrix A with row sums given by R and column sums given by S :

$$r_1 \leq n \text{ and } S \preceq \bar{R} \tag{1}$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^l s_j - \sum_{i=k+1}^m r_k \leq kl, \quad (0 \leq k \leq m, 0 \leq l \leq n) \tag{2}$$

(T is a nonnegative matrix).

Proof. (This part of the proof is standard.) Assume there is a matrix A with row sums R and column sums S . Then $r_1 \leq n$ and if one partitions A into

$$\left[B_1 \mid B_2 \right] \quad (B_1 \text{ is } m \text{ by } l),$$

then the number of 1's in B_1 does not exceed the number of 1's in the first l columns of the matrix obtained from A by sliding the 1's in each row as far to the left as possible; that is, $\sum_{i=1}^l s_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^l \bar{r}_i$. Likewise, if one partitions A into

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|c} A_1 & X \\ \hline Y & A_2 \end{array} \right] \quad (A_1 \text{ is } k \text{ by } l),$$

then t_{kl} equals the number of 0's in A_1 plus the number of 1's in A_2 (either or both of A_1 and A_2 may be vacuous); hence T is a nonnegative matrix.

We prove the converses together by contradiction; a direct proof of the equivalence of (1) and (2) can also be given. Choose a counterexample with $m + n$ minimal, and for that $m + n$, with τ minimal. Clearly $t_{00} = \tau > 0$ (otherwise take A to be the zero matrix O) and $t_{mm} > 0$ (otherwise take A to be the matrix J of all 1's).

Case 1: $\sum_{i=1}^l s_i = \sum_{i=1}^l \bar{r}_i$ for some l with $0 < l < n$, and $t_{kl} = 0$ for some k and l with $(k, l) \neq (0, n)$ or $(m, 0)$, respectively. It is an immediate consequence that each of

$$R_1 := r'_1 = \min\{l, r_1\}, \dots, r'_m = \min\{l, r_m\} \text{ and } S_1 := s_1, \dots, s_l$$

and

$$R_2 := r_1 - r'_1, \dots, r_m - r'_m, \text{ and } S_2 := s_{l+1}, \dots, s_n$$

both satisfy the majorization criteria (1) of Gale and Ryser, and that the structure matrices for $R_3 := r_1 - l, \dots, r_m - l$, $S_3 := s_{l+1}, \dots, s_n$ and for $R_4 := r_{k+1}, \dots, r_m$, $S_4 := s_1 - k, \dots, s_l - k$ satisfy the nonnegativity criteria (2) of Ford and Fulkerson. By minimality there exists a $(0, 1)$ -matrices A_1 and A_2 with row sums R_1 and column sums S_1 , and row sums R_2 and column sums S_2 , respectively. Hence the matrix

$$\left[A_1 \mid A_2 \right]$$

has row sums R and column sums S , a contradiction. By minimality there also exists a $(0, 1)$ -matrix A_3 with row sums R_3 and column sums S_3 , and a $(0, 1)$ -matrix A_4 with row sums R_4 and column sums S_4 . Hence the matrix

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|c} J & A_3 \\ \hline A_4 & O \end{array} \right] \quad (J \text{ is the } k \text{ by } l \text{ matrix of all } 1 \text{'s})$$

has row sums R and column sums S , also a contradiction.

Case 2: $\sum_{i=1}^l s_i > \sum_{i=1}^l \bar{r}_i$ for all l with $0 < l < n$, and $t_{kl} > 0$ for all k and l with $(k, l) \neq (0, n)$ or $(m, 0)$, respectively. By minimality, $r_m \geq 1$ and $s_n \geq 1$. Let $R' := r_1, \dots, r_{m-1}, r_m - 1$ and $S' := s_1, \dots, s_{n-1}, s_n - 1$. Then $R' \preceq S'$ and the structure matrix for R' and S' is nonnegative. By minimality again there is a matrix $A' = [a'_{ij}]$ with row sums R' and column sums S' . If $a'_{mn} = 0$, then changing this 0 to a 1 we obtain a matrix with row sums R and column sums S , a contradiction. Suppose that $a'_{mn} = 1$. Since $r_m - 1 \leq n - 1$, there is a q such that $a'_{mq} = 0$. Since $s_q \geq s_n$, there is a p such that $a'_{pq} = 1$ and $a'_{pn} = 0$. Interchanging 0 with 1 in this 2 by 2 matrix gives a matrix A'' with row sums R' and column sums S' , and we get a contradiction as before. \square

Simple, ‘minimal counterexample’ proofs of e.g. Landau’s existence theorem for tournaments with a given score vector and König’s matching theorem can be found in [4, 6].

REFERENCES

- [1] R. A. BRUALDI, *Matrices of zeros and ones with fixed row and column sum vectors*, Linear Alg. Applics, **33**(1980) 159–231.
- [2] L. R. FORD, JR. AND D. R. FULKERSON, *Flows in Networks*, Princeton, 1962.
- [3] D. GALE, *A theorem on flows in networks*, Pacific. J. Math., **7**(1957) 1073–1082.
- [4] R. RIZZI, *A short proof of König’s matching theorem*, J. Graph Theory, **33**(2000) 138–139.
- [5] H. J. RYSER, *Combinatorial Mathematics*, Carus. Math. Monograph #14, Math. Assoc. of America, 1963.
- [6] C. THOMASSEN, *Landau’s characterization of tournament score sequences*, *The Theory and Applications of Graphs*, Proceedings — Fourth International Graph Theory Conference (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1980), 589–591, Wiley, New York, 1981.

(Received February 13, 2000)

Richard A. Brualdi
Department of Mathematics
University of Wisconsin
Madison, WI 53706
e-mail: brualdi@math.wisc.edu