

ALGEBRAIC CHARACTERIZATION OF STRONGLY CONNECTED GRAPHS

Zhivko Nedev

International University VNU-HCM
Thu Duc District
HCM City, VIETNAM

Abstract: We introduce the notion of *uniform rank*. A matrix \mathbf{C} has an uniform rank r if its (normal) $\text{rank}(\mathbf{C})$ equals r and each of its minors of size r is non-zero.

1. Introduction

All digraphs in this paper are loop-free and simple, i.e. multiple edges are not allowed. Let $\mathbf{G} = (V, E)$ be a digraph with a vertex set $V = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and an edge set E . For $1 \leq i \leq n$, we denote with $\text{out}(i)$ the outgoing degree of the vertex i ; that is, $\text{out}(i)$ is the number of edges in E that begin at i . Then the laplacian matrix for \mathbf{G} , \mathbf{C} , is constructed as usual:

$$\mathbf{C}_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \text{out}(i) & \text{if } i = j, \\ -1 & \text{if } (v_i, v_j) \in E, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

A well known result by W. T. Tutte from [5], is that the number of oriented spanning subtrees of \mathbf{G} with root a vertex v equals the determinant taken from the Laplacian with its row and column v deleted. Since a digraph is strongly connected iff for any one (root) vertex v , there exists both an out-oriented spanning tree and an in-oriented one, we can test (using linear algebra) a digraph for strong connectivity with two applications of Tutte's formula. In

this paper, we show that testing if a digraph is strong connected can be done 2 times faster: with a single run of Gaussian Elimination on the laplacian \mathbf{C} .

The author discovered these ideas while researching a family of discrete number-theoretic games called Magnus-Derek Game and Vector Game that were described for the first time in [1, 2]. And some of the techniques in this paper appeared initially in two previous papers by Nedev and Quas [4, 3]. More specifically, in [4], the proof of Lemma 9 is based on strongly connected digraphs with constant out-degree 2. Furthermore, Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 from this paper use techniques similar to the techniques used in Lemma 1 and Lemma 4 from [3].

Definition. We say that a matrix has an uniform rank r if its (normal) rank equals r and if each of its minors of size $r \times r$ is non-zero. (Note that some matrices do not have uniform rank.)

Lemma 1. *Let \mathbf{C} be a matrix with $\text{rank}(\mathbf{C}) = r$. Then the rank of \mathbf{C} is uniform if and only if these two conditions are both true: every r row vectors and every r column vectors in \mathbf{C} are linearly independent.*

Proof. By definition, if \mathbf{C} has an uniform rank r , each of its $r \times r$ minors is non-zero. Thus by choosing an appropriate minor, we can show that every r row vectors and every r column vectors in \mathbf{C} are linearly independent.

Now let every r row vectors and every r column vectors in \mathbf{C} be linearly independent. Suppose the rank of \mathbf{C} is not uniform. Then there exists a $r \times r$ submatrix \mathbf{C}' with $\det(\mathbf{C}') = 0$. Without loss of generality, let \mathbf{C}' be the submatrix in the top left corner (where the first r rows and first r columns of \mathbf{C} intersect). That is

$$\mathbf{C}' = (\mathbf{C}_{i,j})_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq r \\ 1 \leq j \leq r}}$$

We now consider the submatrix \mathbf{C}^* consisting of the first r columns of \mathbf{C}

$$\mathbf{C}^* = (\mathbf{C}_{i,j})_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq n \\ 1 \leq j \leq r}}$$

By assumption the column rank of \mathbf{C}^* is r .

We now view \mathbf{C}^* as n row vectors each of size r , and note the following:

1. Since $\text{rank}(\mathbf{C}) = r$ and the first r rows of \mathbf{C} are linearly independent, each of the (last) $n - r$ rows in \mathbf{C} is a linear combination of the first r rows. Thus the same is true of the last $n - r$ rows of \mathbf{C}^* .
2. Since $\det(\mathbf{C}') = 0$, the first r rows of \mathbf{C}^* are linearly dependent.

Therefore, the row rank of \mathbf{C}^* is at most $r - 1$. Since the row rank equals the column rank, this is a contradiction. Therefore, every minor of \mathbf{C} of size $r \times r$ is non-zero. \square

The lemma gives an equivalent definition for matrix with an uniform rank.

Definition. We say that a matrix has an uniform rank r if its (normal) rank equals r and if every r row vectors and every r column vectors in \mathbf{C} are linearly independent.

In the next two sections, we will prove that a digraph with n vertices is strongly connected if and only if its laplacian has an uniform rank $n - 1$ (the number of its vertices minus one). Although the proof can be done using the Tutte's formula from [5], for greater insight into the problem, we develop a new proof based only on the notions of linear independence and graph strong connectivity.

2. Necessary Condition

Suppose \mathbf{G} is strongly connected, i.e. it contains a directed path from u to v for every pair of vertices u, v . Then its laplacian \mathbf{C} has the following two properties:

Property 1) In the i -th row of \mathbf{C} , the entry on the main diagonal is an integer, say k_i with $1 \leq k_i \leq n - 1$, exactly k_i other row entries are -1 , and the remaining entries are zero. Thus in each row, the entries sum to zero.

Property 2) For each non-trivial proper subset T of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, there exist $i \in T$ and $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \setminus T$ such that $\mathbf{C}_{i,j} = -1$.

The first property is by construction; the second is an equivalent definition for \mathbf{G} to be strongly connected. We denote by $\mathcal{A}(n)$ the family of $n \times n$ matrices satisfying the above two properties.

Lemma 2. *Let the matrix $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{A}(n)$ and let $\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, \dots, \vec{r}_n$ be the row vectors of \mathbf{C} . Then any proper subset of these row vectors is linearly independent.*

Proof. Suppose otherwise. Let t , with $t < n$, be an integer such that there exist t linearly dependent row vectors of \mathbf{C} . Clearly $t \geq 2$. Without loss of

generality, let $\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, \dots, \vec{r}_t$ be linearly dependent. Then, there exist scalars $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_t$, not all zero, such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \alpha_i \vec{r}_i = \vec{0} \quad (1)$$

If all α_i are nonpositive, we multiply equation (1) by -1 ; so assume that at least one $\alpha_i > 0$. Without loss of generality, let $\alpha_i > 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, s$, with $1 \leq s \leq t$ and $\alpha_i \leq 0$ for $i = s+1, \dots, t$. Thus, the first s scalars are positive and the rest, if any, are negative.

We consider the first s scalar equations from the vector equation (1). For $\forall j, 1 \leq j \leq s$

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \alpha_i \mathbf{C}_{i,j} = 0 \quad (2)$$

Since, in addition, $\mathbf{C}_{i,j} \leq 0$ for $i > s, 1 \leq j \leq s$, we have $\alpha_i \mathbf{C}_{i,j} \geq 0$ for $s+1 \leq i \leq t$ and $1 \leq j \leq s$. Thus, we obtain the following s inequalities

$$\sum_{i=s+1}^t \alpha_i \mathbf{C}_{i,j} \geq 0, \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq s \quad (3)$$

From (2) and (3), it follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i \mathbf{C}_{i,j} \leq 0, \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq s$$

Summing the above s inequalities, we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^s \left(\sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i \mathbf{C}_{i,j} \right) \leq 0 \iff \sum_{i=1}^s \left(\sum_{j=1}^s \alpha_i \mathbf{C}_{i,j} \right) \leq 0 \quad (4)$$

Recall that each $\alpha_i > 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$. By property 1 of \mathbf{C} , for each $i, 1 \leq i \leq s$, the sum $\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_i \mathbf{C}_{i,j} = 0$. And in this sum, only the term $\alpha_i \mathbf{C}_{i,i}$ is positive. Therefore for each $i, 1 \leq i \leq s$, the sum $\sum_{j=1}^s \alpha_i \mathbf{C}_{i,j} \geq 0$ because it still contains the only positive term. Furthermore, by property 2 of \mathbf{C} , there must exist $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and $l \in \{s+1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\mathbf{C}_{k,l} = -1$. Thus, the sum $\sum_{j=1}^s \alpha_k \mathbf{C}_{k,j} > 0$ because $\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_k \mathbf{C}_{k,j} = 0$. It follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^s \left(\sum_{j=1}^s \alpha_i \mathbf{C}_{i,j} \right) > 0$$

which contradicts inequality (4). Therefore, any proper subset of row vectors from \mathbf{C} is linearly independent. \square

Lemma 3. *Let $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{A}(n)$. Then its rank is $n - 1$.*

Proof. By property 1, the column vectors of \mathbf{C} sums to $\vec{0}$, so its rank is less than n . But by lemma 2, every $n - 1$ row vectors of \mathbf{C} are linearly independent. Therefore the rank of \mathbf{C} is $n - 1$. \square

Lemma 4. *Let \mathbf{C} be a $n \times n$ matrix with column vectors $\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n$ and rank $n - 1$, and let there exist scalars $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n$, all non-zero, such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \vec{c}_i = \vec{0} \quad (5)$$

Then any $n - 1$ column vectors from \mathbf{C} are linearly independent.

Proof. Suppose otherwise. Since $\text{rank}(\mathbf{C}) = n - 1$, there are $n - 1$ linearly independent column vectors. Without loss of generality, let $\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_{n-1}$ be linearly independent.

By assumption, there exists a set of $n - 1$ linearly dependent column vectors. Then \vec{c}_n must be a member of this set. Without loss of generality, let one set of linearly dependent vectors be $\vec{c}_2, \vec{c}_3, \dots, \vec{c}_n$. Then there exist $\beta_2, \beta_3, \dots, \beta_n$, not all zero, such that

$$\sum_{i=2}^n \beta_i \vec{c}_i = \vec{0} \quad (6)$$

where $\beta_n \neq 0$.

From (5) and (6) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{c}_n &= -\alpha'_1 \vec{c}_1 - \alpha'_2 \vec{c}_2 - \dots - \alpha'_{n-1} \vec{c}_{n-1} & \text{where } \alpha'_i &= \frac{\alpha_i}{\alpha_n} \\ \vec{c}_n &= -\beta'_2 \vec{c}_2 - \dots - \beta'_{n-1} \vec{c}_{n-1} & \text{where } \beta'_i &= \frac{\beta_i}{\beta_n} \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\alpha'_1 \vec{c}_1 + (\alpha'_2 - \beta'_2) \vec{c}_2 + \dots + (\alpha'_{n-1} - \beta'_{n-1}) \vec{c}_{n-1} = \vec{0}$$

with $\alpha'_1 \neq 0$. But $\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_{n-1}$ are linearly independent, so this is a contradiction. Therefore, every set of $n - 1$ column vectors of \mathbf{C} is linearly independent.

Note that the same lemma is valid if we replace the column vectors with the row vectors of \mathbf{C} . \square

Since for every digraph, the columns of its laplacian sum to zero, we have

Corollary 5. *If a matrix $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{A}(n)$, then any $n - 1$ of its column vectors are linearly independent.*

From all the lemmas to this point, we have

Corollary 6. *Let the matrix $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{A}(n)$. Then its rank is $n - 1$ and each of its minors of size $(n - 1) \times (n - 1)$ is non-zero. So any matrix $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{A}(n)$ has an uniform rank $n - 1$.*

3. Sufficient Condition

Lemma 7. *Let $\mathbf{G} = (V, E)$ be a digraph with $V = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and let its laplacian matrix \mathbf{C} have an uniform rank $n - 1$. Then \mathbf{G} is strongly connected.*

Proof. Suppose \mathbf{G} is not strongly connected. Then \mathbf{G} has a strongly connected component, say \mathbf{S} , from which there is no edge going out to any other component. Let \mathbf{S} have k vertices; $k < n$ since \mathbf{G} is not strongly connected.

Without loss of generality, we rename the vertices of \mathbf{G} so that the vertices of \mathbf{S} become $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. But then for every $i: 1 \leq i \leq k$, and every $j: (k+1) \leq j \leq n$, the matrix entry $C_{i,j} = 0$. Since the component \mathbf{S} is strongly connected, the first $k - 1$ rows of \mathbf{C} are linearly independent, but more importantly its k -th row is a linear combination of the first $k - 1$.

It follows that any $(n - 1) \times (n - 1)$ minor of \mathbf{C} , that contains the first k rows of \mathbf{C} is zero. This is a contradiction with \mathbf{C} having an uniform rank $n - 1$. Therefore \mathbf{G} is strongly connected. \square

Combining the results from both sections, we reach

Theorem 8. *A digraph with n vertices is strongly connected if and only if its laplacian has an uniform rank $n - 1$.*

4. Testing if a Digraph is Strongly Connected

Lemma 9. *Let \mathbf{G} be a digraph with n vertices and laplacian \mathbf{C} , and let $\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, \dots, \vec{r}_n$ be the row vectors of \mathbf{C} . Then \mathbf{C} has an uniform rank $n - 1$ or equivalently \mathbf{G} is strongly connected if and only if these two conditions are both true:*

1. the normal rank of \mathbf{C} is $n - 1$

2. there exist scalars $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n$, all non-zero, such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \vec{r}_i = \vec{0}$.

Proof. Let the laplacian \mathbf{C} have an uniform rank $n - 1$. Then its normal rank is $n - 1$, and so there exist scalars $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n$, not all zero, such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \vec{r}_i = \vec{0}$. If any of the scalars is zero, then there is proper subset of $\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, \dots, \vec{r}_n$ that are linearly dependent and the normal rank of \mathbf{C} is not uniform. Contradiction!

Let now $\text{rank}(\mathbf{C}) = n - 1$ and all non-zero α s exist, such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \vec{r}_i = \vec{0}$. We want to prove that \mathbf{C} has an uniform rank $n - 1$. Since \mathbf{C} is the laplacian, the sum of all its columns is zero. Then by lemma 4, every $n - 1$ column vectors of \mathbf{C} are linearly independent. Applying lemma 4 again, we get that also every $n - 1$ row vectors of \mathbf{C} are linearly independent. By lemma 1, the rank of \mathbf{C} is uniform and equals $n - 1$. \square

Now to test if the graph's laplacian $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{A}(n)$, we can apply Gaussian Elimination(GE) on the transpose of \mathbf{C} . In this way, we solve the homogenous equation $\mathbf{C}^T \vec{x} = \vec{0}$ for $\vec{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$. By the above lemma, if we get $\text{rank}(\mathbf{C}) = n - 1$ and a solution \vec{x} with all x_i non-zero, it follows that the digraph is strongly connected. Otherwise, the digraph has more than one strongly connected component.

Acknowledgments

Most of this paper was created several years ago when the author was living in Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.

References

- [1] Zhivko Nedev, Universal sets and the vector game, *INTEGERS: The Electronic Journal of Combinatorial Number Theory*, #A45, No. 8 (2008).
- [2] Zhivko, Nedev, S. Muthukrishnan, The Magnus-Derek game, *Theoretical Computer Science*, **393**, No. 1-3 (2008), doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016>.
- [3] Zhivko, Nedev, Lower bound for balanced sets, *Theoretical Computer Science*, **12** (2012), doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2012.06.016>.

- [4] Zhivko, Nedev, Anthony Quas, Balanced sets and the vector game, *International Journal of Number Theory*, **4** (2008), 339-347, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S179304210800133X>.
- [5] W.T. Tutte, The dissection of equilateral triangles into equilateral triangles, *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* (1948), 463-482, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S030500410002449X>.