

# On some Graphs with a Unique Perfect Matching

S. Chaplick<sup>1</sup>    M. Fürst<sup>2</sup>    F. Maffray<sup>3</sup>    D. Rautenbach<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lehrstuhl für Informatik I, Universität Würzburg, Germany,  
`steven.chaplick@uni-wuerzburg.de`

<sup>2</sup> Institut für Optimierung und Operations Research, Universität Ulm,  
 Germany, `{maximilian.fuerst,dieter.rautenbach}@uni-ulm.de`

<sup>3</sup> CNRS, Laboratoire G-SCOP, Université de Grenoble-Alpes, France,  
`frederic.maffray@grenoble-inp.fr`

## Abstract

We show that deciding whether a given graph  $G$  of size  $m$  has a unique perfect matching as well as finding that matching, if it exists, can be done in time  $O(m)$  if  $G$  is either a cograph, or a split graph, or an interval graph, or claw-free. Furthermore, we provide a constructive characterization of the claw-free graphs with a unique perfect matching.

**Keywords:** unique perfect matching; claw-free

## 1 Introduction

Bartha [1] conjectured that a unique perfect matching of a given graph  $G$  of size  $m$ , if it exists, can always be found in  $O(m)$  time. Gabow, Kaplan, and Tarjan [6] describe a  $O(m \log^4 m)$  algorithm for this problem. Furthermore, they show that, if apart from  $G$ , some perfect matching  $M$  is also part of the input, then one can decide the uniqueness of  $M$  in  $O(m)$  time. Since maximum matchings can be found in linear time for chordal bipartite graphs [2], cocomparability graphs [11], convex bipartite [13], and cographs [3, 16], also deciding whether these graphs have a unique perfect matching, as well as finding the unique perfect matching, if it exists, is possible in linear time. Also for strongly chordal graphs given a strong elimination order [4], a maximum matching can be found in linear time, and the same conclusion applies. Levit and Mandrescu [9] showed

that unique perfect matchings can be found in linear time for König-Egerváry graphs and unicyclic graphs.

We contribute some structural and algorithmic results concerning graphs with a unique perfect matching. First, we extend a result from [5] to cographs and split graphs, which leads to a very simple linear time algorithm deciding the existence of a unique perfect matching, and finding one, if it exists. For interval graphs, we describe a linear time algorithm that determines a perfect matching, if the input graph has a unique perfect matching. Similarly, for connected claw-free graphs of even order, we describe a linear time algorithm that determines a perfect matching. Together with the result from [6] this implies that for such graphs the existence of a unique perfect matching can be decided in linear time. Finally, we give a constructive characterization of claw-free graphs with a unique perfect matching.

## 2 Results

For a graph  $G$ , we say that a set  $U = \{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$  forces a unique perfect matching in  $G$  if  $n(G) = 2k$ , and  $d_{G_i}(u_i) = 1$  for every  $i \in [k]$ , where  $G_i = G - \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} N_G[u_j]$ , and  $N_G[u]$  denotes the closed neighborhood of  $u$  in  $G$ . Clearly, if  $U$  forces a unique perfect matching in  $G$ , then  $G$  has a unique perfect matching  $u_1v_1, \dots, u_kv_k$ , where  $v_i$  is the only neighbor of  $u_i$  in  $G_i$  for  $i \in [k]$ . As shown by Golumbic, Hirst, and Lewenstein (Theorem 3.1 in [5]), a bipartite graph  $G$  has a unique perfect matching if and only if some set forces a unique perfect matching in  $G$ ; their result actually implies that both partite sets of  $G$  force a unique perfect matching. This equivalence easily extends to cographs and split graphs.

**Theorem 2.1.** *If  $G$  is a cograph or a split graph, then  $G$  has a unique perfect matching if and only if some set forces a unique perfect matching in  $G$ .*

*Proof.* Since the sufficiency is obvious, we proceed to the proof of the necessity. Therefore, let  $G$  be a cograph or a split graph with a unique perfect matching  $M$ . In view of an inductive argument, and since the classes of cographs and of split graphs are both hereditary, it suffices to consider the case that  $G$  is a connected graph of order at least 4, and to show that  $G$  has a vertex of degree 1.

First, suppose that  $G$  is a cograph. Since  $G$  is connected, it is the join

of two graphs  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ . If  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  both have order at least 2, then  $M$  contains either two edges between  $V(G_1)$  and  $V(G_2)$ , or one edge of  $G_1$  as well as one edge of  $G_2$ . In both cases, these two edges are part of an  $M$ -alternating cycle of length 4, which is a contradiction. Hence, we may assume that  $V(G_2)$  contains exactly one vertex  $v$ , which is a universal vertex in  $G$ . Let  $u$  be such that  $uv \in M$ . If  $u'$  is a neighbor of  $u$  in  $G_1$ , and  $u'v' \in M$ , then  $uu'v'vu$  is an  $M$ -alternating cycle of length 4, which is a contradiction. Hence, the vertex  $u$  has degree 1 in  $G$ .

Next, suppose that  $G$  is a split graph. Let  $V(G) = S \cup C$ , where  $S$  is an independent set, and  $C$  is a clique that is disjoint from  $S$ . Since  $G$  has a unique perfect matching, it follows easily that  $|C| - |S|$  is either 0 or 2. Since  $G$  has order at least 4, the set  $S$  is not empty. If no vertex in  $S$  has degree 1, then it follows, similarly as for bipartite graphs, that  $G$  contains an  $M$ -alternating cycle, which completes the proof.  $\square$

If  $G$  is given by neighborhood lists, then it is straightforward to decide the existence of a set that forces a unique perfect matching in  $G$  in linear time, by iteratively identifying a vertex of degree 1, and removing this vertex together with its neighbor from  $G$ . Altogether, for a given cograph or split graph, one can decide in linear time whether it has a unique perfect matching, and also find that matching, if it exists.

Our next results concern interval graphs.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $G$  be an interval graph with a unique perfect matching  $M$ , and let  $\left([\ell_u, r_u]\right)_{u \in V(G)}$  be an interval representation of  $G$  such that all  $2n(G)$  endpoints of the intervals  $[\ell_u, r_u]$  for  $u \in V(G)$  are distinct.*

*If  $u^* \in V(G)$  is such that  $r_{u^*} = \min\{r_u : u \in V(G)\}$ , and  $v^* \in N_G(u^*)$  is such that  $r_{v^*} = \min\{r_v : v \in N_G(u^*)\}$ , then  $u^*v^* \in M$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose, for a contradiction, that  $u^*v \in M$  for some neighbor  $v$  of  $u^*$  that is distinct from  $v^*$ . Let  $u$  be such that  $uv^* \in M$ . By the choice of  $u^*$  and  $v^*$ , and since the intervals  $[\ell_u, r_u]$  and  $[\ell_{v^*}, r_{v^*}]$  intersect, also the intervals  $[\ell_u, r_u]$  and  $[\ell_v, r_v]$  intersect, that is,  $uv \in E(G)$ . Now,  $u^*vuv^*u^*$  is an  $M$ -alternating cycle of length 4, which is a contradiction.  $\square$

Since, for a given interval graph, an interval representation as in Lemma 2.2 can be found in linear time [7], Lemma 2.2 yields a simple linear time algorithm to determine a perfect matching in a given interval graph  $G$ , provided that  $G$  has a unique perfect matching.

We proceed to claw-free graphs.

Let  $G$  be a graph. Let  $P : u_1 \dots u_k$  be a path in  $G$ , where we consider  $u_k$  to be the *last* vertex of  $P$ . We consider two operations replacing  $P$  with a longer path  $P'$  in  $G$ .

- $P'$  arises by applying an *end-extension* to  $P$ , if  $P'$  is the path  $u_1 \dots u_k v$ , where  $v$  is some neighbor of  $u_k$  that does not lie on  $P$ .
- $P'$  arises by a *swap-extension* to  $P$ , if  $k \geq 3$ , and  $P'$  is the path

$$u_1 \dots u_{k-2} u_k u_{k-1} v,$$

where  $v$  is some neighbor of  $u_{k-1}$  that does not lie on  $P$ . Note that  $u_{k-2}$  and  $u_k$  need to be adjacent for this operation.

The following lemma is a simple variation of a folklore proof of Sumner's result [14] that connected claw-free graphs of even order have a perfect matching.

**Lemma 2.3.** *If  $G$  is a connected claw-free graph of even order, and  $P : u_1 \dots u_k$  is a path in  $G$  that does not allow an end-extension or a swap-extension, then the edge  $u_{k-1}u_k$  belongs to some perfect matching of  $G$ .*

*Proof.* In view of an inductive argument, it suffices to show that  $G' = G - \{u_{k-1}, u_k\}$  is connected. Suppose, for a contradiction, that  $G'$  is not connected. Clearly,  $k \geq 2$ . If  $k = 2$ , then  $u_1$  has neighbors in two components of  $G'$  while  $u_2$  is only adjacent to  $u_1$ , which yields a claw centered at  $u_1$ . Now, let  $k \geq 3$ . The path  $u_1 \dots u_{k-2}$  lies in one component  $K$  of  $G'$ . Let  $K'$  be a component of  $G'$  that is distinct from  $K$ . Since  $P$  allows no end-extension,  $u_k$  has no neighbor in  $K'$ . Hence,  $u_{k-1}$  has a neighbor  $v$  in  $K'$ . Since  $u_{k-2}$  and  $v$  are not adjacent, and  $G$  is claw-free,  $u_k$  is adjacent to  $u_{k-2}$ , and  $P$  allows a swap-extension, which is a contradiction.  $\square$

Lemma 2.3 is the basis for the simple greedy algorithm **PMinCF** (cf. Algorithm 1) that determines a perfect matching in connected claw-free graphs of

even order.

**Input:** A connected claw-free graph  $G$  of even order.

**Output:** A perfect matching  $M$  of  $G$ .

```

1 begin
2    $M \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;  $k \leftarrow 0$ ;
3    $\text{lm\_nb}(u) \leftarrow -1$  for all vertices  $u$  of  $G$ ;
4   while  $n(G) \geq 2$  do
5     if  $k = 0$  then  $k \leftarrow 2$ ;  $u_1 \leftarrow u$ ;  $u_2 \leftarrow v$ , where  $uv$  is some edge of  $G$ ;
6     repeat
7       extend  $\leftarrow 0$ ;
8       if  $\exists v \in N_G(u_k) \setminus \{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$  then
9          $u_{k+1} \leftarrow v$ ;  $k \leftarrow k + 1$ ; extend  $\leftarrow 1$ ;
10      else
11        if  $\text{lm\_nb}(u_k) = -1$  then
12           $\text{lm\_nb}(u_k) \leftarrow \max\{\ell \in [k-1] : u_{k-i} \in N_G(u_k) \text{ for } i \in$ 
13             $[\ell]\}$ ;
14          end
15          if  $\text{lm\_nb}(u_k) \geq 2$  and  $\exists v \in N_G(u_{k-1}) \setminus \{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$  then
16             $\text{lm\_nb}(u_k) \leftarrow \text{lm\_nb}(u_k) - 1$ ;
17            if  $\text{lm\_nb}(u_{k-1}) \neq -1$  then
18               $\text{lm\_nb}(u_{k-1}) \leftarrow \text{lm\_nb}(u_{k-1}) + 1$ 
19            end
20             $x \leftarrow u_k$ ;  $y \leftarrow u_{k-1}$ ;
21             $u_{k-1} \leftarrow x$ ;  $u_k \leftarrow y$ ;  $u_{k+1} \leftarrow v$ ;
22             $k \leftarrow k + 1$ ; extend  $\leftarrow 1$ ;
23          end
24        until extend = 0;
25         $M \leftarrow M \cup \{u_{k-1}u_k\}$ ;  $G \leftarrow G - \{u_{k-1}, u_k\}$ ;  $k \leftarrow k - 2$ ;
26      end
27    return  $M$ ;
28 end

```

#### Algorithm 1: PMinCF

**Theorem 2.4.** *The algorithm PMinCF works correctly and can be implemented to run in  $O(m(G))$  time for a given connected claw-free graph  $G$  of even order.*

*Proof.* Line 2 initializes the matching  $M$  as empty and the order  $k$  of the path  $P$  :

$u_1 \dots u_k$  as 0. The **while**-loop in lines 4 to 26 extends the matching iteratively as long as possible using the last edge  $u_{k-1}u_k$  of the path  $P : u_1 \dots u_k$ . If  $k = 0$ , which happens in the first execution of the **while**-loop, and possibly also in later executions, then, in line 5, the path  $P$  is reinitialized with  $k = 2$  using any edge  $uv$  of  $G$ . The **repeat**-loop in lines 6 to 24 ensures that  $P$  allows no end-extension and no swap-extension, which, by Lemma 2.3, implies the correctness of **PMinCF**. The proof of Lemma 2.3 actually implies that  $G$  stays connected throughout the execution of **PMinCF**. In line 8 we check for the possibility of an end-extension, which, if possible, is performed in line 9. If no end-extension is possible, we check for the possibility of a swap-extension. The first time that some specific vertex  $u_k$  is the last vertex of  $P$ , and we check for the possibility of a swap-extension, we set  $\mathbf{lm\_nb}(u_k)$  to the largest integer  $\ell$  such that  $u_k$  is adjacent to  $u_{k-1}, \dots, u_{k-\ell}$ . Initializing  $\mathbf{lm\_nb}(u)$  as  $-1$  for every vertex  $u$  of  $G$  in line 3 indicates that its correct value has not yet been determined. This happens for the first time in lines 11 and 12. Once  $\mathbf{lm\_nb}(u_k)$  has been determined, it is only updated in line 15 for  $u_k$ , and, if necessary, in line 16 for  $u_{k-1}$ . Clearly,  $u_k$  is adjacent to  $u_{k-2}$  if and only if  $\mathbf{lm\_nb}(u_k) \geq 2$ . Therefore, line 14 correctly checks for the possibility of a swap-extension, which, if possible, is performed in lines 19, 20, and 21. Altogether, the correctness follows, and it remains to consider the running time.

We assume that  $G$  is given by neighborhood lists, that is, for every vertex  $u$  of  $G$ , the elements of the neighborhood  $N_G(u)$  of  $u$  in  $G$  are given as an (arbitrarily) ordered list. Checking for the existence of a suitable vertex  $v$  within the **if**-statements in lines 8 and 14 can be implemented in such a way that we traverse the neighborhood list of every vertex at most once throughout the entire execution of **PMinCF**. Every time we check for the existence of such a neighbor  $v$  of  $u_k$ , we only need to consider the neighbors of  $u_k$  that have not been considered before, that is, we start with the first not yet considered neighbor of  $u_k$  within its neighborhood list, and continue until we either find a suitable neighbor  $v$  or reach the end of the list. Since vertices that leave  $P$  are also removed from  $G$  in line 25, this is correct, and the overall effort spent on checking for such neighbors is proportional to the sum of all vertex degrees, that is,  $O(m(G))$ . The first computation of  $\mathbf{lm\_nb}(u_k)$  in line 12 can easily be done in  $O(d_G(u_k))$  time. After that, every update of  $\mathbf{lm\_nb}(u_k)$  only requires constant effort. Since  $P$  is extended exactly  $n(G) - 2$  times, the overall effort spent on maintaining  $\mathbf{lm\_nb}(u_k)$  is again proportional to the sum of all vertex degrees. Altogether, it follows that the running time is  $O(m(G))$ , which completes the

proof. □

Again, it follows using [6] that one can decide in linear time whether a given claw-free graph has a unique perfect matching.

Our final goal is a constructive characterization of the claw-free graphs that have a unique perfect matching. Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the class of graphs  $G$  obtained by starting with  $G$  equal to  $K_2$ , and iteratively applying the following two operations:

- **Operation 1**

Add to  $G$  two new vertices  $x$  and  $y$ , and the three new edges  $xy$ ,  $xu$ , and  $yu$ , where  $u$  is a simplicial vertex of  $G$ .

- **Operation 2**

Add to  $G$  two new vertices  $x$  and  $y$ , the new edge  $xy$ , and new edges between  $x$  and all vertices in a set  $C$ , where  $C$  is a non-empty clique in  $G$  such that  $N_G(u) \setminus C$  is a clique for every vertex  $u$  in  $C$ .

**Theorem 2.5.** *A connected claw-free graph  $G$  has a unique perfect matching if and only if  $G \in \mathcal{G}$ .*

*Proof.* It is easy to prove inductively that all graphs in  $\mathcal{G}$  are connected, claw-free, and have a unique perfect matching. Note that requiring  $u$  to be simplicial in Operation 1 ensures that no induced claw is created by this operation. Similarly, the conditions imposed on  $C$  in Operation 2 ensure that no induced claw is created.

Now, let  $G$  be a connected claw-free graph with a unique perfect matching  $M$ . If  $G$  has order 2, then, trivially,  $G$  is  $K_2$ , which lies in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Now, let  $G$  have order at least 4. By Kotzig's theorem [8, 12],  $G$  has a bridge that belongs to  $M$ . In particular,  $G$  is not 2-connected. Let  $B$  be an endblock of  $G$ . If  $n(B) \leq 3$ , then  $B$  is  $K_2$  or  $K_3$ , and the claw-freeness of  $G$  easily implies that  $G$  arises from a proper induced subgraph of  $G$  by applying Operation 1 or 2. Hence, we may assume that  $n(B) \geq 4$ . If  $n(B)$  is even, then, by Kotzig's theorem,  $B$ , and hence also  $G$ , has two distinct perfect matchings, which is a contradiction. Hence,  $n(B)$  is odd, that is  $n(B) \geq 5$ . If  $u$  is the cutvertex of  $G$  in  $B$ , then, since  $G$  is claw-free,  $N_B(u)$  is a clique of order at least 2. This implies that  $B - u$  is 2-connected. Again, by Kotzig's theorem,  $B - u$ , and hence also  $G$ , has two distinct perfect matchings, which is a contradiction, and completes the proof. □

Note that Theorem 3.4 in [15], and also Theorem 3.2 in [15] restricted to claw-free graphs, follow very easily from Theorem 2.5 by an inductive argument.

**Acknowledgment** We thank Vadim Levit for drawing our attention to the problem studied in this paper.

## References

- [1] M. Bartha, Efficient unique perfect matching algorithms, 8th Joint Conference on Mathematics and Computer Science, July 14-17, 2010, Komárno, Slovakia.
- [2] M. Chang, Algorithms for maximum matching and minimum fill-in on chordal bipartite graphs, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 1178 (1996) 146-155.
- [3] D.G. Corneil, Y. Perl, L.K. Stewart, A linear recognition algorithm for cographs, SIAM Journal on Computing 14 (1985) 926-934.
- [4] E. Dahlhaus, M. Karpinski, Matching and multidimensional matching in chordal and strongly chordal graphs, Discrete Applied Mathematics 84 (1998) 79-91.
- [5] M.C. Golumbic, T. Hirst, M. Lewenstein, Uniquely Restricted Matchings, Algorithmica 31 (2001) 139-154.
- [6] H.N. Gabow, H. Kaplan, R.E. Tarjan, Unique Maximum Matching Algorithms, Journal of Algorithms 40 (2001) 159-183.
- [7] M. Habib, R. McConnell, C. Paul, L. Viennot, Lex-bfs and partition refinement, with applications to transitive orientation, interval graph recognition and consecutive ones testing, Theoretical Computer Science 234 (2000) 59-84.
- [8] A. Kotzig. On the theory of finite graphs with a linear factor II, Matematicko-Fyzikálny Časopis, Slovenskej Akadémie Vied 9 (1959) 136-159.
- [9] V.E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, Computing unique maximum matchings in  $O(m)$  time for König-Egerváry graphs and unicyclic graphs, Journal of Combinatorial Optimization 32 (2016) 267-277.

- [10] L. Lovász, M.D. Plummer, Matching theory, Annals of Discrete Mathematics, 29, 1986, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam.
- [11] G.B. Mertzios, A. Nichterlein, R. Niedermeier, Linear-Time Algorithm for Maximum-Cardinality Matching on Cocomparability Graphs, arXiv:1703.05598.
- [12] G. Nenashev, A short proof of Kotzig's theorem, arXiv:1402.0949
- [13] G. Steiner and J.S. Yeomans, A linear time algorithm for maximum matchings in convex, bipartite graphs, Computers & Mathematics with Applications 31 (1996) 91-96.
- [14] D.P. Sumner, Graphs with 1-factors, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 42 (1974) 8-12.
- [15] X. Wang, W. Shang, J. Yuan, On Graphs with a Unique Perfect Matching, Graphs and Combinatorics 31 (2015) 1765-1777.
- [16] M. Yu, C. Yang, An  $O(n)$  time algorithm for maximum matching on cographs, Information Processing Letters 47 (1993) 89-93.