

NALITY MATCHING PROBLEM, described in Section 10.5, and its weighted version which we postpone to Sections 11.2 and 11.3.

10.1 Bipartite Matching

Since the CARDINALITY MATCHING PROBLEM is easier if G is bipartite, we shall deal with this case first. In this section, a bipartite graph G is always assumed to have the bipartition $V(G) = A \dot{\cup} B$. Since we may assume that G is connected, we can regard this bipartition as unique (Exercise 19 of Chapter 2).

For a graph G , let $\nu(G)$ denote the maximum cardinality of a matching in G , while $\tau(G)$ is the minimum cardinality of a vertex cover in G .

Theorem 10.2. (König [1931]) *If G is bipartite, then $\nu(G) = \tau(G)$.*

Proof: Consider the graph $G' = (V(G) \cup \{s, t\}, E(G) \cup \{\{s, a\} : a \in A\} \cup \{\{b, t\} : b \in B\})$. Then $\nu(G)$ is the maximum number of vertex-disjoint s - t -paths, while $\tau(G)$ is the minimum number of vertices whose deletion makes t unreachable from s . The theorem now immediately follows from Menger's Theorem 8.10. \square

$\nu(G) \leq \tau(G)$ evidently holds for any graph (bipartite or not), but we do not have equality in general (as the triangle K_3 shows).

Several statements are equivalent to König's Theorem. Hall's Theorem is probably the best-known version.

Theorem 10.3. (Hall [1935]) *Let G be a bipartite graph with bipartition $V(G) = A \dot{\cup} B$. Then G has a matching covering A if and only if*

$$|\Gamma(X)| \geq |X| \quad \text{for all } X \subseteq A. \quad (10.1)$$

Proof: The necessity of the condition is obvious. To prove the sufficiency, assume that G has no matching covering A , i.e. $\nu(G) < |A|$. By Theorem 10.2 this implies $\tau(G) < |A|$.

Let $A' \subseteq A$, $B' \subseteq B$ such that $A' \cup B'$ covers all the edges and $|A' \cup B'| < |A|$. Obviously $\Gamma(A \setminus A') \subseteq B'$. Therefore $|\Gamma(A \setminus A')| \leq |B'| < |A| - |A'| = |A \setminus A'|$, and the Hall condition (10.1) is violated. \square

It is worthwhile to mention that it is not too difficult to prove Hall's Theorem directly. The following proof is due to Halmos and Vaughan [1950]:

Second Proof of Theorem 10.3: We show that any G satisfying the Hall condition (10.1) has a matching covering A . We use induction on $|A|$, the cases $|A| = 0$ and $|A| = 1$ being trivial.

If $|A| \geq 2$, we consider two cases: If $|\Gamma(X)| > |X|$ for every nonempty proper subset X of A , then we take any edge $\{a, b\}$ ($a \in A$, $b \in B$), delete its two vertices and apply induction. The smaller graph satisfies the Hall condition because $|\Gamma(X)| - |X|$ can have decreased by at most one for any $X \subseteq A \setminus \{a\}$.