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### 8.3 Testing idealness is co-NP-complete.

We saw two rich classes of ideal clutters, namely the clutter of dicuts of a digraph and the clutter of $T$-joins of a graph. This suggests that studying general ideal clutters is more complicated than perfect clutters. Indeed, this is confirmed by a negative complexity result on detecting idealness that we will mention here. Let $A$ be a $0-1$ matrix. Consider the following problem:

Is $A$ an ideal matrix?
This is a co-NP problem: to certify that $A$ is non-ideal, all we need is a fractional point $x^{\star} \in Q(A)=\{x \geq \mathbf{0}$ : $A x \geq \mathbf{1}\}$ along with a full-rank row subsystem $A^{\prime} x \geq b^{\prime}$ of $\binom{A}{I} x \geq\binom{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{0}}$ such that $A^{\prime} x^{\star}=b^{\prime}$. In fact, as the following result claims, this problem is one of the most difficut problems in the co-NP class:

Theorem 8.15 (Ding, Feng, Zang 2008). Let A be a $0-1$ matrix, where every column has exactly two 1 s. Then the problem

Is A an ideal matrix?
is co-NP-complete.
In other words, given a general $0-1$ matrix that is a priori ideal, we cannot convince an adversary in polynomial time that $A$ is indeed an ideal matrix, unless P and co-NP are equal. This means that unlike perfect clutters, ideal clutters do not admit a polynomial characterization in this model. (The authors above proved that "Is $A$ a Mengerian matrix?" is a also co-NP-complete problem.) Let us study ideal clutters from a different angle.

## 9 Minimally non-ideal clutters

By Remark 7.11, we know that if a clutter is ideal, then so is any minor of it. In other words, the class of ideal clutters is minor-closed. As a result, we may indirectly study the class by characterizing the excluded minors defining the class. We say that a clutter is minimally non-ideal (mni) if it is non-ideal, and every proper minor of it is ideal. It follows from Remark 7.11 and Theorem 7.8 that,

Remark 9.1. The following statements hold:

- a non-ideal clutter is minimally non-ideal if every single deletion and contraction minor is ideal,
- a clutter is ideal if, and only if, it has no minimally non-ideal minor,
- if a clutter is minimally non-ideal, then so is its blocker.

As we will see, mni clutters split into two classes that behave quite differently from one another. We will study each class independently.

### 9.1 The deltas

Given a clutter $\mathcal{C}$, we may obtain another clutter $\mathcal{C}^{\prime}$ by relabeling the elements of $\mathcal{C}$. We will say that $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}^{\prime}$ are isomorphic and write $\mathcal{C} \cong \mathcal{C}^{\prime}$. Take an integer $n \geq 3$. Consider the clutter over ground set $[n]:=\{1,2,3, \ldots, n\}$ whose members are

$$
\Delta_{n}:=\{\{1,2\},\{1,3\}, \ldots,\{1, n\},\{2,3, \ldots, n\}\}
$$

and whose incidence matrix is

$$
M\left(\Delta_{n}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ccccc}
1 & 1 & & & \\
1 & & 1 & & \\
\vdots & & & \ddots & \\
1 & & & & 1 \\
& 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1
\end{array}\right)
$$

We refer to $\Delta_{n}$, and any clutter isomorphic to it, as a delta of dimension $n$. Notice that the elements and members of $\Delta_{n}$ correspond to the points and lines of a degenerate projective plane. ${ }^{1}$

Theorem 9.2. Take an integer $n \geq 3$. Then,
(1) $b\left(\Delta_{n}\right)=\Delta_{n}$,
(2) $\min \left\{\mathbf{1}^{\top} x: M\left(\Delta_{n}\right) x \geq \mathbf{1}\right\}$ has no integral optimal solution, and
(3) $\Delta_{n}$ is minimally non-ideal.

Proof. (1) As $\Delta_{n}$ does not have disjoint members, every member is also a cover, so every member of $\Delta_{n}$ contains a member of $b\left(\Delta_{n}\right)$. Conversely, let $B$ be a minimal cover of $\Delta_{n}$. If $1 \notin B$, then as $B$ intersects each one of $\{1,2\},\{1,3\}, \ldots,\{1, n\}$, it follows that $\{2,3, \ldots, n\} \subseteq B$. If $1 \in B$, then as $B$ intersects $\{2,3, \ldots, n\}$, it follows that $\{1, i\} \subseteq B$ for some $i \in\{2,3, \ldots, n\}$. In both cases, we see that $B$ contains a member, so every member of $b\left(\Delta_{n}\right)$ contains a member of $\Delta_{n}$. It therefore follows from Remark 6.6 that $b\left(\Delta_{n}\right)=\Delta_{n}$. (2) In particular, $\tau(\mathcal{C})=2$. Consider now the fractional feasible solution $x^{\star}:=\left(\frac{n-2}{n-1} \frac{1}{n-1} \cdots \frac{1}{n-1}\right)$. The objective

[^0]value of this solution is $1+\frac{n-2}{n-1}<2=\tau(\mathcal{C})$, so (2) holds. (3) It follows from (2) that $\Delta_{n}$ is non-ideal. To prove that $\Delta_{n}$ is mni, we need to show for each $e \in[n]$ that $\Delta_{n} \backslash e$ and $\Delta_{n} / e$ are ideal clutters. In fact, since
$$
\Delta_{n} \backslash e=b\left(b\left(\Delta_{n} \backslash e\right)\right)=b\left(b\left(\Delta_{n}\right) / e\right)=b\left(\Delta_{n} / e\right)
$$
by (1), it suffices by Theorem 7.8 to show that one of $\Delta_{n} \backslash e, \Delta_{n} / e$ is ideal. By the symmetry between the elements $2,3, \ldots, n$, we may assume that $e \in\{1, n\}$. Observe that
$$
\Delta_{n} \backslash 1=\{\{2,3, \ldots, n\}\}
$$
and
$$
\Delta_{n} / n=\{\{1\},\{2, \ldots, n-1\}\} .
$$

We leave it as an exercise for the reader to see that these clutters are indeed ideal. Thus, $\Delta_{n}$ is mni.
The deltas form an important class of mni clutters that is tractable in the sense that it is easy to see whether a clutter has a delta minor or not. To see why, we need the following result:

Theorem 9.3 (Abdi, Cornuéjols, Pashkovich 2017). Take a clutter $\mathcal{C}$ over ground set $E$ and an element $e \in E$. If there are distinct members $C_{1}, C_{2}, C$ such that $e \in C_{1} \cap C_{2}, e \notin C$ and $\left(C_{1} \cup C_{2}\right)-\{e\} \subseteq C$, then $\mathcal{C}$ has a delta minor that can be found in time $O(|E||\mathcal{C}|)$.

Proof. Let us call $\left(C_{1}, C_{2}, C\right)$ a bad triple through $e$. We may assume that in every proper minor of $\mathcal{C}$ where $e$ is present, no bad triple through $e$ exists. We will prove that $\mathcal{C}$ itself is a delta. The minimality assumption implies that
(1) $C_{1} \cap C_{2}=\{e\}$,
because for $I:=\left(C_{1} \cap C_{2}\right)-\{e\}$, the minor $\mathcal{C} / I$ has the bad triple $\left(C_{1}-I, C_{2}-I, C-I\right)$ through $e$.
The minimality assumption also implies that
(2) $\{e\} \cup C=E$,
because for $J:=E-(\{e\} \cup C), \mathcal{C} \backslash J$ has the same bad triple $\left(C_{1}, C_{2}, C\right)$ through $e$.
Next we claim that
(3) $\left|C_{1}\right|=\left|C_{2}\right|=2$.

To see this, suppose for a contradiction that one of $C_{1}, C_{2}$, say $C_{1}$, has cardinality at least 3 . Pick an element $h \in C_{1}-\{e\}$, and note that by $(1), h \notin C_{2}$. Consider the minor $\mathcal{C}^{\prime}:=\mathcal{C} / h$, for which $C_{1}^{\prime}:=C_{1}-\{h\}$ and $C^{\prime}:=C-\{h\}$ are still members. Notice that $C_{2}$ contains a member $C_{2}^{\prime}$ of $\mathcal{C}^{\prime}$, for which it is easy to see that $e \in C_{2}^{\prime}$ and $C_{2}^{\prime} \neq\{e\}$. But now $\mathcal{C}^{\prime}$ has a bad triple $\left(C_{1}^{\prime}, C_{2}^{\prime}, C^{\prime}\right)$ through $e$, a contradiction to our minimality assumption. This proves (3).

Now let $X:=\{f \in E:\{e, f\}$ is a member $\}$. So $|X| \geq 2$ by (3), and $X \subseteq C$ by (2). Our last claim is that
(4) $X=C$.

For if not, pick an element $h \in C-X$, and note that $\mathcal{C} / h$ has a bad triple $\left(C_{1}, C_{2}, C-\{h\}\right)$ through $e$, contradicting the minimality assumption. Thus, $X=C$. Hence,

$$
\mathcal{C} \supseteq\{\{e, f\}: f \in C\} \cup\{C\} .
$$

Since $\{e\} \cup C=E$ by (2), and $\mathcal{C}$ is a clutter, equality must hold above, implying in turn that $\mathcal{C}$ indeed is a delta, as required.

We will use this in the next lecture to give a polynomial time algorithm for certifying whether or not a clutter has a delta minor.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ In the literature, a delta of dimension $n$ is called a degenerate projective plane of order $n-1$. However, as there are other degenerate projective planes, we refrain from using this terminology.

