## Matchings in bipartite graphs

Let G be a bipartite graph with bipartition (A, B). A matching M is a **complete matching from** A **to** B if it saturates every vertex of A.

If |A| = |B|, then a complete matching from *A* to *B* is the same as a perfect matching.

## **Obstruction:**



 $N(S) \coloneqq \{v \notin S : v \text{ is adjacent to a vertex in } S\}$ If |N(S)| < |S| for some  $S \subseteq A$ , then  $\nexists$  complete matching A to B

**Theorem.** (Hall) A bipartite graph with bipartition (A, B) has a complete matching from A to B if and only if  $|N(S)| \ge |S|$  for every  $S \subseteq A$ .

**Theorem.** (Hall) A bipartite graph with bipartition (A, B) has a complete matching from *A* to *B* if and only if  $|N(S)| \ge |S|$  for every  $S \subseteq A$ .

**Proof #1.** Using Menger's theorem

 $\Rightarrow$  already done

 $\Leftarrow$  If there exist |A| disjoint paths from *A* to *B*, then their edge-sets form a complete matching from *A* to *B*. Thus WMA  $\nexists |A|$  disjoint *A*-*B* paths. By Menger's theorem  $\exists X \subseteq V(G)$  such that  $G \setminus X$  has no *A*-*B* path and |X| < |A|.



Let S := A - X. Then  $N(S) \subseteq X \cap B$  and hence  $|N(S)| \le |X \cap B| = |X| - |X \cap A| < |A| - |X \cap A| = |S|$ , a contradiction. **Proof #2.** From first principles ( $\Leftarrow$  only) **Case 1.** |N(S)| > |S| for every  $\emptyset \neq S \subsetneqq A$ . Pick  $v \in A$  and a neighbor u of v. Apply induction to  $G \setminus \{u, v\}$ .



В

u

 $G_1$  clearly satisfies the induction hypothesis.

To see that  $G_2$  satisfies the induction hypothesis for  $L \subseteq A - S$ , look at  $N_G(L \cup S)$ .

 $|N_G(S)| + |N_{G_2}(L)| = |N_G(S \cup L)| \ge |S \cup L| = |S| + |L|$ and so $|N_{G_2}(L)| \ge |L|$ , as desired. **Perfect matchings in (not necessarily bipartite) graphs** An obstruction:



Let o(H): = # of odd components of *H*.

If  $o(G \setminus X) > |X|$  for some X, then G has no perfect matching.

**Tutte's 1-factor theorem** (1947). A graph *G* has a perfect matching if and only if  $o(G \setminus X) \leq |X|$  for every  $X \subseteq V(G)$ .

**Definition.** Let *M* be a matching in *G*. A cycle *C* in *G* of length 2k + 1 containing *k* edges of *M* is called an *M*-blossom. Let *G*/*C* denote the graph obtained from *G* by contracting all edges of *C* and deleting all loops and parallel edges.



**Lemma.** Let *M* be a matching in *G*, and let *C* be an *M*-blossom in *G*. Let  $G' \coloneqq G/C$  and  $M' \coloneqq M - E(C)$ . If *M* is a maximum matching in *G*, then *M'* is a maximum matching in *G'*.

**Proof.** Suppose not. Then  $\exists M'$ -augmenting path P' in G'. We will exhibit an M-augmenting path in G. Let w be the new vertex of G'. WMA  $w \in V(P')$ , for otherwise P' is as desired.



The vertex *w* divides P' into  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . Let *u*, *v* be the ends of P'. WMA by symmetry that the edge of  $P_2$  incident with *w* is in *M*.



Then in *G* the path  $P_2$  becomes a path from *v* to the tip of the blossom, and  $P_1$  becomes a path from *u* to the blossom. Follow  $P_1$  from *u* to  $u' \in V(C)$ , then follow *C* along the even path from u' to the tip, and then follow  $P_2$ . That gives an *M*-augmenting path in *G*.

**Definition.** Let *M* be a matching in *G*, and let  $r \in V(G)$  be *M*-unsaturated. An *M*-alternating tree rooted at *r* is a tree *T* such that

- (i) T is a subgraph of G
- (ii)  $r \in V(T)$
- (iii) every path in T with end r is M-alternating
- (iv) if  $e \in M$  is incident with a vertex of *T*, then  $e \in E(T)$



Given an *M*-alternating tree *T* let

 $A(T) := \{ v \in V(T) : v \text{ is at odd distance from } r \text{ in } T \}$  $B(T) := \{ v \in V(T) : v \text{ is at even distance from } r \text{ in } T \}$ 

**Theorem.** Let *G* be a graph, let *M* be a maximum matching in *G*, let  $r \in V(G)$  be *M*-unsaturated, and let *T* be an *M*-alternating tree rooted at *r*. Then there exists a set  $X \subseteq V(G)$  such that  $X \cap V(T) \subseteq A(T)$  and  $o(G \setminus X) > |X|$ .

Note that this implies Tutte's theorem.