

A combinatorial algorithm for computing the rank of a generic partitioned matrix with 2×2 submatrices*

Hiroshi Hirai[†]Yuni Iwamasa[‡]

June 23, 2021

Abstract

In this paper, we consider the problem of computing the rank of a block-structured symbolic matrix (a generic partitioned matrix) $A = (A_{\alpha\beta}x_{\alpha\beta})$, where $A_{\alpha\beta}$ is a 2×2 matrix over a field \mathbf{F} and $x_{\alpha\beta}$ is an indeterminate for $\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, \mu$ and $\beta = 1, 2, \dots, \nu$. This problem can be viewed as an algebraic generalization of the bipartite matching problem and was considered by Iwata and Murota (1995). Recent interests in this problem lie in the connection with non-commutative Edmonds' problem by Ivanyos, Qiao, and Subrahmanyam (2018) and Garg, Gurvits, Oliveiva, and Wigderson (2019), where a result by Iwata and Murota implicitly states that the rank and non-commutative rank (nc-rank) are the same for this class of symbolic matrices.

The main result of this paper is a simple and combinatorial $O((\mu\nu)^2 \min\{\mu, \nu\})$ -time algorithm for computing the symbolic rank of a (2×2) -type generic partitioned matrix of size $2\mu \times 2\nu$. Our algorithm is inspired by the Wong sequence algorithm by Ivanyos, Qiao, and Subrahmanyam for the nc-rank of a general symbolic matrix, and requires no blow-up operation, no field extension, and no additional care for bounding the bit-size. Moreover it naturally provides a maximum rank completion of A for an arbitrary field \mathbf{F} .

Keywords: generic partitioned matrix, Edmonds' problem, non-commutative Edmonds' problem, maximum rank completion problem.

1 Introduction

The maximum matching problem in a bipartite graph G has a natural algebraic interpretation; it amounts to the symbolic rank computation of the matrix A defined by $(A)_{ij} := x_{ij}$ if $ij \in E(G)$ and zero otherwise, where x_{ij} is a variable for each edge ij and the row and column sets of A are identified with the color classes of G . Such an algebraic interpretation is also known for other matching-type combinatorial optimization problems such as linear matroid intersection, nonbipartite matching, and their generalizations (e.g., linear matroid matching); see [18, 21]. *Edmonds' problem* [2] is a general algebraic formulation, which asks to compute the rank of a symbolic matrix A represented by

$$A = A_1x_1 + A_2x_2 + \cdots + A_kx_k. \quad (1.1)$$

*A preliminary version of this paper has appeared in the proceedings of the 21st Conference on Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization (IPCO 2020). This work was done while Yuni Iwamasa was at National Institute of Informatics.

[†]Department of Mathematical Informatics, Graduate School of Information Science and Technology, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan. Email: hirai@mist.i.u-tokyo.ac.jp

[‡]Department of Communications and Computer Engineering, Graduate School of Informatics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan. Email: iwamasa@i.kyoto-u.ac.jp

Here A_i is a matrix over a field \mathbf{F} and x_i is a variable for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$. Although a randomized polynomial-time algorithm for Edmonds' problem is known (if $|\mathbf{F}|$ is large) [17, 20], a deterministic polynomial-time algorithm is not known, which is one of the prominent open problems in theoretical computer science (see e.g., [15]). Known polynomial-time algorithms for the above-mentioned matching-type problems can be viewed as solutions for special Edmonds' problems.

The present article addresses the rank computation (Edmonds' problem) of a matrix of the following block-matrix structure

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11}x_{11} & A_{12}x_{12} & \cdots & A_{1\nu}x_{1\nu} \\ A_{21}x_{21} & A_{22}x_{22} & \cdots & A_{2\nu}x_{2\nu} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_{\mu 1}x_{\mu 1} & A_{\mu 2}x_{\mu 2} & \cdots & A_{\mu\nu}x_{\mu\nu} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $A_{\alpha\beta}$ is a 2×2 matrix over a field \mathbf{F} and $x_{\alpha\beta}$ is a variable for $\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, \mu$ and $\beta = 1, 2, \dots, \nu$. Recall that bipartite matching is precisely the case where each $A_{\alpha\beta}$ is a 1×1 matrix. Such matrices, which we call (2×2) -type generic partitioned matrices, were considered in detail by Iwata and Murota [14], subsequent to the study on partitioned matrices of general type [10]. They established a min-max formula (i.e., good characterization) for the rank of this class of matrices, which involves the minimization of a submodular function on the lattice of vector subspaces. A combinatorial polynomial-time rank computation is not known and desired. Our main result solves this issue.

Theorem 1.1. *There exists a combinatorial $O((\mu\nu)^2 \min\{\mu, \nu\})$ -time algorithm for Edmonds' problem for a (2×2) -type generic partitioned matrix of the form (1.2).*

This result links the recent development of Edmonds' problem in a noncommutative setting. The *noncommutative Edmonds' problem* [12] asks to compute the rank of a matrix of the form (1.1), where x_i and x_j are supposed to be noncommutative, i.e., $x_i x_j \neq x_j x_i$. In this setting, the rank concept can be defined (via the free skew field or the inner rank of a matrix over a ring) and is called *noncommutative rank* or *nc-rank*. Nc-rank is an upper bound of (usual) rank. Surprisingly, the nc-rank can be computed in deterministic polynomial time. Algorithms to do this were proposed by Garg, Gurvits, Oliveira, and Wigderson [5] for the case of $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{Q}$ and by Ivanyos, Qiao, and Subrahmanyam [13] for an arbitrary field. The former algorithm (*operator scaling*) is an analytical algorithm motivated by quantum information theory. The latter, which we call the *IQS-algorithm*, is an augmenting-path type algorithm. It utilizes a *Wong sequence* [11]—a vector-space analogue of an alternating walk—and the formula of nc-rank earlier proved by Fortin and Reutenauer [3]. In fact, for (2×2) -type generic partitioned matrices, the rank formula proved by Iwata and Murota is essentially the same as the nc-rank formula by Fortin and Reutenauer. This means that the rank and nc-rank are the same for this class of matrices and that the polynomial solvability follows from these results. Thus, the real contribution of this paper is in the term “combinatorial” in the theorem, which is explained as follows.

Our proposed algorithm is viewed as a combinatorial enhancement of the IQS-algorithm for (2×2) -type generic partitioned matrices. As mentioned, the IQS-algorithm is an augmenting-path type algorithm: Given a *substitution* \tilde{A} obtained from A by substituting a value in \mathbf{F} to each x_i , construct the Wong sequence for (A, \tilde{A}) , which is an analogue of augmenting path search in the auxiliary graph. If an augmenting path exists, then one can find another substitution \tilde{A}' with $\text{rank } \tilde{A}' > \text{rank } \tilde{A}$ and repeat it with updating $\tilde{A} \leftarrow \tilde{A}'$. If an augmenting path does not exist, then one obtains a certificate of optimality of the nc-rank formula. Here, for reaching $\text{rank } \tilde{A} = \text{nc-rank } A$, the algorithm conducts the *blow-up* operation, which replaces A with a larger matrix $A^{(d)} := \sum_{i=1}^m A_i \otimes X_i$ for $d \times d$ matrices X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k of variable entries. It

is known that $\text{nc-rank } A$ is equal to $1/d$ times the rank of a substitution $\tilde{A}^{(d)}$ for some d (if $|\mathbf{F}|$ is large). The blow-up steps (and field extensions of \mathbf{F}) make the algorithm considerably complicated and slow. For our special case, the rank and nc-rank are equal, and therefore a *blow-up-free* algorithm is expected and desirable; a naive application of the IQS-algorithm cannot avoid the blow-up.

Our algorithm is the first blow-up-free algorithm that can solve Edmonds' problem for the class of (2×2) -type generic partitioned matrices. The key concept that we introduce in this paper is a *matching* in this setting. It is actually a 2-matching in the graph consisting of edges $\alpha\beta$ with nonzero $A_{\alpha\beta}$, which inherits the 2×2 structure of our matrix A and provides a canonical substitution of A . Incorporating the idea of Wong sequence, we introduce an *augmenting space-walk* for a matching. Then our algorithm continues analogously to the augmenting path algorithm, as expected. It requires no blow-up operation, no field extension, and no additional care for bounding the bit size. Moreover it naturally provides a maximum rank completion (substitution) \tilde{A} of A for an arbitrary field \mathbf{F} . This reveals that the maximum rank completion problem for a (2×2) -type generic partitioned matrix is polynomially solvable for arbitrary \mathbf{F} , while this problem is known to be NP-hard in general [1].

Related work. It is an interesting research direction to construct a polynomial-time blow-up-free algorithm for general matrices A with $\text{rank } A = \text{nc-rank } A$. Such an algorithm can decide whether rank and nc-rank are equal, which leads to a solution of (commutative) Edmonds' problem. Indeed, such an algorithm naturally provides polynomial-time solvability of the full-rank decision version of Edmonds' problem. Note that the family of linear independent column sets of A forms a matroid, and the full-rank decision version of Edmonds' problem can play a role as an independence oracle of the matroid. Thus, by a greedy algorithm for the matroid, we can obtain a basis in polynomial time; the size of the basis is equal to $\text{rank } A$.

A representative example of a matrix A with $\text{rank } A = \text{nc-rank } A$ is a matrix such that each A_i in (1.1) is a rank-1 matrix. In this case, the rank computation is equivalent to the linear matroid intersection problem [18]. Edmonds' matroid intersection algorithm becomes obviously blow-up-free. In fact, it can naturally be interpreted as the Wong sequence [9]. Ivanyos, Karpinski, Qiao, and Santha [11] gave a Wong-sequence-based blow-up-free algorithm for matrices A having an "implicit" rank-1 expression, that is, A becomes rank-1 summands by some (unknown) linear transformation of variables.

Computation of nc-rank is formulated as submodular function minimization on the modular lattice of vector subspaces. Based on this, Hamada and Hirai [6, 7] developed a conceptually different algorithm from [5] and [13]. Via an analogue of the Lovász extension, they solved the problem as a geodesically-convex optimization on a CAT(0)-space. For the case of a (2×2) -type generic partitioned matrix, the submodular function is defined on the direct product of modular lattices of rank-2 with infinite size. Following a pioneering work by Kuivinen [16], Fujishige, Király, Makino, Takazawa, and Tanigawa [4] demonstrated the oracle tractability of submodular function minimization on *diamond*, which is a direct product of modular lattices of rank-2 with "finite" size.

A weighted analogue of Edmonds' problem is computation of the degree of the determinant of a matrix of the form (1.1) such that each $A_i = A_i(t)$ is a polynomial matrix over t . This algebraically abstracts the weighted versions of combinatorial optimization problems, such as the maximum-weight bipartite matching problem. Its noncommutative extension was studied in [8] (see also [19]). It may also be interesting to extend our results to such a weighted version.

Organization. The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the concept of matching for a (2×2) -type generic partitioned matrix, which is an algebraic gen-

eralization of bipartite matching. We also provide a combinatorial and algebraic characterization of a matching and its useful properties. The formal description of our proposed algorithm is given in Sections 3 and 4. We introduce an *augmenting space-walk* for a matching (Section 3.1), and develop an algorithm for finding an augmenting space-walk (Section 3.2) and an augmentation algorithm (Section 4). In Section 5, we present concluding remarks.

2 Matching

In this section, we introduce the concept of *matching*, which plays a central role in devising our algorithm. We give an algebraic and combinatorial characterization of a matching. This provides several nontrivial properties of matchings, which will be used in our algorithm.

2.1 Notations

For a positive integer k , we denote $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ by $[k]$. A $p \times q$ matrix B over a field \mathbf{F} is regarded as the bilinear map defined by $B(u, v) := u^\top Bv$ for $u \in \mathbf{F}^p$ and $v \in \mathbf{F}^q$. We denote by $\ker_L(B)$ and $\ker_R(B)$ the left and right kernels of B , respectively.

Let A be a (2×2) -type generic partitioned matrix A of the form (1.2). The matrix A is regarded as a matrix over the field $\mathbf{F}(x)$ of rational functions with variables $x_{\alpha\beta}$ for $\alpha \in [\mu]$ and $\beta \in [\nu]$. Symbols α , β , and γ are used to represent elements of $[\mu]$, $[\nu]$, and $[\mu] \sqcup [\nu]$, respectively, where \sqcup denotes the direct sum. We often drop “ $\in [\mu]$ ” from the notation of “ $\alpha \in [\mu]$ ” if it is clear from the context. For each α and β , consider 2-dimensional \mathbf{F} -vector spaces $U_\alpha = \mathbf{F}^2$ and $V_\beta = \mathbf{F}^2$. Each submatrix $A_{\alpha\beta}$ is considered as a bilinear form $U_\alpha \times V_\beta \rightarrow \mathbf{F}$. Let $U := \mathbf{F}^{2\mu} = \bigoplus_\alpha U_\alpha$ and $V := \mathbf{F}^{2\nu} = \bigoplus_\beta V_\beta$.

We define the (undirected) bipartite graph $G := ([\mu], [\nu]; E)$ by $E := \{\alpha\beta \mid A_{\alpha\beta} \neq O\}$. For $I \subseteq E$, let A_I denote the matrix obtained from A by replacing each submatrix $A_{\alpha\beta}$ with $\alpha\beta \notin I$ by the 2×2 zero matrix. An edge $\alpha\beta \in E$ is said to be *rank- k* ($k = 1, 2$) if $\text{rank } A_{\alpha\beta} = k$. For notational simplicity, the subgraph $([\mu], [\nu]; I)$ for $I \subseteq E$ is also denoted by I . For a node γ , let $\deg_I(\gamma)$ denote the degree of γ in I , i.e., the number of edges in I incident to γ . A connected component of I is said to be *rank-1* if it contains a rank-1 edge. An edge $\alpha\beta \in I$ is said to be *isolated* if $\deg_I(\alpha) = \deg_I(\beta) = 1$.

2.2 Definition and characterization

An edge subset $I \subseteq E$ is called a *matching* if

$$\text{rank } A_I > \text{rank } A_{I \setminus \{\alpha\beta\}} \quad (2.1)$$

holds for any $\alpha\beta \in I$. A matching I is said to be *maximum* if $\text{rank } A_I \geq \text{rank } A_{I'}$ for any matching I' , or equivalently, if $\text{rank } A = \text{rank } A_I$ holds. This matching concept generalizes bipartite matching; for a matrix A of the form (1.2) with 1×1 blocks $A_{\alpha\beta}$ and the corresponding bipartite graph G to A , an edge subset satisfies (2.1) if and only if it is a bipartite matching of G .

Theorem 2.1 below provides a characterization of a matching I and a simple combinatorial rank formula of A_I . The characterization consists of the following four conditions for an edge subset $I \subseteq E$:

(Deg) $\deg_I(\gamma) \leq 2$ for each node γ of G .

Suppose that I satisfies this condition. Then each connected component of I forms a path or a cycle. Thus I is 2-edge-colorable, namely, there are two edge classes such that any two incident

edges are in different classes. An edge in one color class is called a *+edge*, and an edge in the other color class is called a *--edge*. For a path component C of I , an *end edge* is an edge $\alpha\beta \in C$ with $\deg_I(\alpha) = 1$ or $\deg_I(\beta) = 1$.

(Path) For each non-isolated path component of I , both the end edges are rank-1.

(Cycle) Each cycle component of I has both a rank-1 *+edge* and rank-1 *--edge*.

A *valid labeling* for I is a node-labeling that assigns two distinct 1-dimensional subspaces to each node, $U_\alpha^+, U_\alpha^- \subseteq U_\alpha$ for α and $V_\beta^+, V_\beta^- \subseteq V_\beta$ for β , such that for each edge $\alpha\beta \in I$, it holds that

$$A_{\alpha\beta}(U_\alpha^+, V_\beta^-) = A_{\alpha\beta}(U_\alpha^-, V_\beta^+) = \{0\}, \quad (2.2)$$

$$(\ker_L(A_{\alpha\beta}), \ker_R(A_{\alpha\beta})) = \begin{cases} (U_\alpha^+, V_\beta^+) & \text{if } \alpha\beta \text{ is a rank-1 +edge,} \\ (U_\alpha^-, V_\beta^-) & \text{if } \alpha\beta \text{ is a rank-1 --edge.} \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

(VL) I has a valid labeling.

By (2.2) and (2.3), one of the labels U_α^+ and U_α^- (V_β^+ and V_β^-) is uniquely determined from the label of a rank-1 end edge along the path to it. Therefore, if I satisfies (Deg), (Path), and (Cycle), then two labels on any vertex with degree 2 are uniquely determined. (VL) requires that they are different.

For the rank formula, we define

$$r(I) := |I| + \text{the number of isolated rank-2 edges in } I.$$

We are now ready to describe the characterization and rank formula; the proof is given in Section 2.3.1.

Theorem 2.1. *An edge subset I is a matching if and only if I satisfies (Deg), (Path), (Cycle), and (VL). In addition, for a matching I , it holds that $\text{rank } A_I = r(I)$.*

Now Edmonds' problem for A is equivalent to the problem of obtaining a maximum matching for A , since, for a matching I , it holds that $\text{rank } A_I = \text{rank } A = r(I)$ by Theorem 2.1. Our proposed algorithm (described in Sections 3 and 4) finds a maximum matching of A in $O((\mu\nu)^2 \min\{\mu, \nu\})$ time.

Theorem 2.1 has several consequences. It can be immediately seen from Theorem 2.1 that a matching has a good characterization. That is, one can decide if a given edge subset I is a matching in polynomial time.

By combining the rank formula in Theorem 2.1 with Iwata–Murota's minimax formula [14] (or Fortin–Reutenauer's one [3] with $\text{rank } A = \text{nc-rank } A$), we obtain the following combinatorial and algebraic minimax theorem between matchings and vector spaces, which is used for the validity of the optimality of a matching.

Corollary 2.2.

$$\max\{r(I) \mid I : \text{matching}\} = \min \left\{ 2\mu + 2\nu - \sum_{\alpha} \dim X_{\alpha} - \sum_{\beta} \dim Y_{\beta} \right\},$$

where the minimum is taken over all vector spaces $X_{\alpha} \subseteq U_{\alpha}$ and $Y_{\beta} \subseteq V_{\beta}$ such that $A_{\alpha\beta}(X_{\alpha}, Y_{\beta}) = \{0\}$ for α and β .

An *optimality witness* of I is a tuple of vector spaces X_α and Y_β for α, β satisfying $A_{\alpha\beta}(X_\alpha, Y_\beta) = \{0\}$ and $r(I) = 2\mu + 2\nu - \sum_\alpha \dim X_\alpha - \sum_\beta \dim Y_\beta$. Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.2 verify that I is maximum if there exists an optimality witness for I .

For a matching I , the *canonical substitution* \tilde{A}_I of A_I is the matrix over \mathbf{F} obtained from assigning 1 to $x_{\alpha\beta}$ for $\alpha\beta \in I$ and 0 to $x_{\alpha\beta}$ for $\alpha\beta \notin I$. Then the following holds; the proof is given in Section 2.3.2.

Proposition 2.3. *For a matching I , it holds that $\text{rank } A_I = \text{rank } \tilde{A}_I$.*

By Proposition 2.3, for an arbitrary ground field \mathbf{F} , $\text{rank } \tilde{A}_I = \text{rank } A$ holds for a maximum matching I . Since our algorithm outputs a maximum matching in $O((\mu\nu)^2 \min\{\mu, \nu\})$ time, we obtain a maximum rank substitution in the same time. While the *maximum rank completion problem*, the problem of computing the maximum rank substitution of a symbolic matrix of the form (1.1), is NP-hard in general if $|\mathbf{F}|$ is small [1], the class of (2×2) -type generic partitioned matrices constitutes a new tractable class of the maximum rank completion problem for arbitrary \mathbf{F} .

Theorem 2.4. *The maximum rank completion problem for a (2×2) -type generic partitioned matrix of the form (1.2) can be solved in $O((\mu\nu)^2 \min\{\mu, \nu\})$ time.*

From the rank formula in Theorem 2.1, we obtain an explicit expression of the left/right kernel of the canonical substitution \tilde{A}_I . For a matching I , define

$$\ker_I(\alpha) := \begin{cases} U_\alpha & \text{if } \deg_I(\alpha) = 0, \\ \ker_L(A_{\alpha\beta}) & \text{if } \alpha \text{ is incident only to one rank-1 edge } \alpha\beta \text{ in } I, \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

Also let $\ker_I(\beta)$ be the vector subspace of V_β such that “L”, α , and U in (2.4) are replaced with “R”, β , and V , respectively.

Corollary 2.5. *If I is a matching, then $\ker_L(\tilde{A}_I) = \bigoplus_\alpha \ker_I(\alpha)$ and $\ker_R(\tilde{A}_I) = \bigoplus_\beta \ker_I(\beta)$.*

Proof. We only show $\ker_L(\tilde{A}_I) = \bigoplus_\alpha \ker_I(\alpha)$. It is clear that $\ker_L(\tilde{A}_I) \supseteq \bigoplus_\alpha \ker_I(\alpha)$. Hence it suffices to prove $\dim(\ker_L(\tilde{A}_I)) = \sum_\alpha \dim(\ker_I(\alpha))$. Let κ be the number of isolated rank-2 edges in I . By the definition of $\ker_I(\alpha)$, we have $\sum_\alpha \dim(\ker_I(\alpha)) = 2\mu - 2\kappa - (|I| - \kappa) = 2\mu - r(I)$. On the other hand, it holds that $\dim(\ker_L(\tilde{A}_I)) = 2\mu - \text{rank } \tilde{A}_I = 2\mu - r(I)$ by Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 2.3. Thus we have $\dim(\ker_L(\tilde{A}_I)) = \sum_\alpha \dim(\ker_I(\alpha))$. \square

2.3 Proofs

For a row subset M and column subset N of A , we denote by $A[M, N]$ the submatrix of A with row set M and column set N . Let \mathcal{C} be the set of non-isolated connected components. Note that any component in \mathcal{C} is rank-1. For $C \in \mathcal{C}$, we denote by C_L (resp. C_R) the set of α (resp. β) belonging to C . In this proof, A_C is also regarded as $A_C[L, R]$ for simplicity, where L (resp. R) is the row subset (resp. column subset) corresponding to C_L (resp. C_R). That is, A_C is a $2|C_L| \times 2|C_R|$ matrix obtained by the deletion of all zero rows (resp. columns) corresponding to $\alpha \notin C_L$ (resp. $\beta \notin C_R$) from A .

2.3.1 Proof of Theorem 2.1

(If part). Suppose that I satisfies (Deg), (Path), (Cycle), and (VL). We show $\text{rank } A_I > \text{rank } A_{I \setminus \{\alpha\beta\}}$ for every $\alpha\beta \in I$. By (Deg), each connected component of I forms a path or a

cycle. It is clear that

$$\text{rank } A_I = \sum \{\text{rank } A_{\alpha\beta} \mid \alpha\beta \in I : \alpha\beta \text{ is isolated}\} + \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \text{rank } A_C. \quad (2.5)$$

If $\alpha\beta$ is isolated in I , then $\text{rank } A_{I \setminus \{\alpha\beta\}} = \text{rank } A_I - \text{rank } A_{\alpha\beta} < \text{rank } A_I$. Thus, in the following, we prove $\text{rank } A_C > \text{rank } A_{C \setminus \{\alpha\beta\}}$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\alpha\beta \in C$. We only consider the case where C is a cycle component in I ; the argument for a path component in I is similar. Suppose that C consists of $+$ -edges $\alpha_1\beta_1, \alpha_2\beta_2, \dots, \alpha_k\beta_k$ and $-$ -edges $\beta_1\alpha_2, \beta_2\alpha_3, \dots, \beta_k\alpha_1$. Choose a valid labeling $U_\alpha^+, U_\alpha^-, V_\beta^+, V_\beta^-$ for I . Take nonzero vectors $u_\alpha^+ \in U_\alpha^+, u_\alpha^- \in U_\alpha^-, v_\beta^+ \in V_\beta^+$, and $v_\beta^- \in V_\beta^-$ for each α and β . By $U_\alpha^+ \neq U_\alpha^-$ and $V_\beta^+ \neq V_\beta^-$, the 2×2 matrices $S_\alpha := \begin{bmatrix} u_\alpha^+ \\ u_\alpha^- \end{bmatrix}$ and $T_\beta := \begin{bmatrix} v_\beta^+ & v_\beta^- \end{bmatrix}$ are both nonsingular. By the conditions (2.2) and (2.3), it holds that

$$S_\alpha A_{\alpha\beta} T_\beta = \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} u_\alpha^+ \\ u_\alpha^- \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bullet & 0 \\ 0 & \bullet \end{bmatrix} & \text{if } \alpha\beta \text{ is rank-2,} \\ \begin{bmatrix} u_\alpha^+ \\ u_\alpha^- \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v_\beta^+ & v_\beta^- \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \text{if } \alpha\beta \text{ is a rank-1 } +- \text{edge,} \\ \begin{bmatrix} u_\alpha^+ \\ u_\alpha^- \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v_\beta^+ & v_\beta^- \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \text{if } \alpha\beta \text{ is a rank-1 } -- \text{edge} \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

$$S_\alpha A_{\alpha\beta} T_\beta = \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} u_\alpha^+ \\ u_\alpha^- \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v_\beta^+ & v_\beta^- \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \text{if } \alpha\beta \text{ is a rank-1 } +- \text{edge,} \\ \begin{bmatrix} u_\alpha^+ \\ u_\alpha^- \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v_\beta^+ & v_\beta^- \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \text{if } \alpha\beta \text{ is a rank-1 } -- \text{edge} \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

$$\begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} u_\alpha^+ \\ u_\alpha^- \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bullet & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \text{if } \alpha\beta \text{ is a rank-1 } -- \text{edge} \end{cases} \quad (2.8)$$

for each $\alpha\beta \in C$, where \bullet represents some nonzero element in \mathbf{F} . Let S and T be the block-diagonal matrices with diagonal blocks $S_{\alpha_1}, S_{\alpha_2}, \dots, S_{\alpha_k}$ and $T_{\beta_1}, T_{\beta_2}, \dots, T_{\beta_k}$, respectively. By (2.6)–(2.8), we obtain

$$SA_C T = \begin{bmatrix} u_{\alpha_1}^+ & v_{\beta_1}^+ & v_{\beta_2}^+ & \cdots & v_{\beta_{k-1}}^+ & v_{\beta_k}^+ & v_{\beta_1}^- & v_{\beta_2}^- & \cdots & v_{\beta_{k-1}}^- & v_{\beta_k}^- \\ u_{\alpha_2}^+ & \bullet & * & & & & & & & & \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & & & & & & & \\ u_{\alpha_{k-1}}^+ & & & \bullet & * & & & & & & \\ u_{\alpha_k}^+ & & & & \bullet & * & & & & & \\ \hline u_{\alpha_1}^- & & & & & & \bullet & & & & * \\ u_{\alpha_2}^- & & & & & & * & \bullet & & & \\ \vdots & & & & & & & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ u_{\alpha_{k-1}}^- & & & & & & & & * & \bullet & \\ u_{\alpha_k}^- & & & & & & & & & * & \bullet \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2.9)$$

where \bullet represents some nonzero element in $\mathbf{F}(x)$ and $*$ can be a zero/nonzero element; $*$ is nonzero if and only if the corresponding edge is rank-2. Let A_C^+ and A_C^- denote the submatrices of $SA_C T$ with the $+$ indices and $-$ indices, respectively. Then it holds that $\text{rank } A_C = \text{rank } SA_C T = \text{rank } A_C^+ + \text{rank } A_C^-$.

If the $u_{\alpha_i}^+ v_{\beta_j}^+$ -th entry of A_C^+ is nonzero, then it is of the form $ax_{\alpha_i\beta_j}$ with some nonzero $a \in \mathbf{F}$. This implies that all nonzero entries in A_C^+ have different variables. Since all entries represented by bullets in (2.9) are nonzero, it holds $\text{rank } A_C^+ = k$. By a similar argument, it also holds $\text{rank } A_C^- = k$. Thus we obtain $\text{rank } A_C = 2k = |C|$.

On the one hand, by (Cycle), one of the $+$ -edges is rank-1, which implies that one of the asterisks in A_C^+ is zero. Hence we have $\text{rank } A_C^+ > \text{rank } A_{C \setminus \{\alpha\beta\}}^+$ for any $--$ -edge $\alpha\beta$ in C . Similarly $\text{rank } A_C^- > \text{rank } A_{C \setminus \{\alpha\beta\}}^-$ holds for any $+-$ -edge $\alpha\beta$ in C . Thus we obtain $\text{rank } A_C > \text{rank } A_{C \setminus \{\alpha\beta\}}$ for all $\alpha\beta \in C$.

(Only-if part and the rank formula). Suppose that I is a matching. We first show that I satisfies (Deg), (Path), and (Cycle) by contraposition.

(Deg). We only consider the case of $\deg_I(\alpha) \geq 3$ for some α ; the case of $\deg_I(\beta) \geq 3$ is similar. Let $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$ be distinct nodes with $\alpha\beta_1, \alpha\beta_2, \alpha\beta_3 \in I$. There are a row subset M and a column subset N such that $|M| = |N| = \text{rank } A_I$ and $\det A_I[M, N] \neq 0$. Take any monomial of the expansion of $\det A_I[M, N]$. Since the row size of $A_{\alpha\beta}$ is 2, at least one of the variables $x_{\alpha\beta_1}, x_{\alpha\beta_2}$, and $x_{\alpha\beta_3}$, say $x_{\alpha\beta_1}$, does not appear in the monomial. Hence it holds that $\det A_{I \setminus \{\alpha\beta_1\}}[M, N] \neq 0$. This means $\text{rank } A_{I \setminus \{\alpha\beta_1\}} = \text{rank } A_I$. Thus I is not a matching.

(Path). Let $C \subseteq I$ be a non-isolated path component. If an end edge e of C is rank-2, then $\text{rank } A_C = \text{rank } A_{C \setminus \{\alpha\beta\}}$, where $\alpha\beta$ is the edge incident to e in C . Indeed, $A_{C \setminus \{\alpha\beta\}}$ can be obtained from A_C via elementary row or column operations using A_e . This implies that I is not a matching.

(Cycle). Let $C \subseteq I$ be a cycle component. Suppose that all $+-$ -edges in C are rank-2. Let C^- be the subset of C consisting of $--$ -edges. Then it holds that $\text{rank } A_C = \text{rank } A_{C \setminus C^-}$. Indeed, $\text{rank } A_{C \setminus C^-} \leq \text{rank } A_C$ immediately follows. On the other hand, we have $\text{rank } A_C \leq |C| = \text{rank } A_{C \setminus C^-}$ since A_C is a $|C| \times |C|$ matrix and $A_{C \setminus C^-}$ is a block-diagonal matrix with rank-2 diagonal blocks $A_{\alpha\beta}$. This implies that I is not a matching.

(The rank formula: $\text{rank } A_I = r(I)$). Recall that C_L (resp. C_R) is the set of α (resp. β) belonging to C . It suffices to show $\text{rank } A_C = |C|$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$ by (2.5). If C is a cycle component or a path component with even length, the inequality $\text{rank } A_C \leq \min\{2|C_L|, 2|C_R|\} = |C|$ immediately follows. For a path component C with odd length, the square matrix A_C has nontrivial kernel by (Path). Hence $\text{rank } A_C < 2|C_L| (= 2|C_R|)$. Thus, by $|C| = 2|C_L| - 1$, we obtain $\text{rank } A_C \leq |C|$. On the other hand, let M and N be index sets such that $|M| = |N| = \text{rank } A_C$ and $\text{rank } A_C[M, N] = \text{rank } A_C$. Since I is a matching, C is also a matching. Hence, if we substitute 0 for $x_{\alpha\beta}$ in $\det A_C[M, N]$, then it becomes 0. By the factor theorem, the polynomial $\det A_C[M, N]$ can be divided by $x_{\alpha\beta}$ for all $\alpha\beta \in C$, that is, $\det A_C[M, N] = c \cdot \prod_{\alpha\beta \in C} x_{\alpha\beta}$ for some nonzero polynomial $c \in \mathbf{F}[x]$. This implies $\text{rank } A_C \geq |C|$.

(VL). We can assume that I satisfies (Deg), (Path), and (Cycle). By the argument for the rank formula, it suffices to show that, if I violates (VL), then $\text{rank } A_C < |C|$ for some $C \in \mathcal{C}$. In the proof for (VL), a vector space Z over \mathbf{F} is also regarded as one over $\mathbf{F}(x)$ by the scalar extension $\mathbf{F}(x) \otimes Z$. Note that $A_{\alpha\beta}(X, Y) = \{0\}$ if and only if $A_{\alpha\beta}x_{\alpha\beta}(X, Y) = \{0\}$, in which the former X, Y are vector spaces over \mathbf{F} and the latter X, Y are over $\mathbf{F}(x)$.

For each $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and nodes α, β in C , let $U_\alpha^+, U_\alpha^- \subseteq U_\alpha$ and $V_\beta^+, V_\beta^- \subseteq V_\beta$ be 1-dimensional vector spaces satisfying (2.2) and (2.3). Such spaces for γ with $\deg_I(\gamma) = 2$ are uniquely determined. For a node α with $\deg_I(\alpha) = 1$ that is incident to a rank-1 $+-$ -edge $\alpha\beta$, U_α^+ is uniquely determined as $\ker_L(A_{\alpha\beta})$ by (2.2); set $U_\alpha^- \neq U_\alpha^+$. Similar arguments hold for the other cases.

Suppose that I violates (VL). Then there is a vertex γ with $\deg_I(\gamma) = 2$ such that its $+$ -space and $--$ -space coincide; we call such γ *degenerate*. Let $C \in \mathcal{C}$ be a connected component containing a degenerate node. In the following, we construct vector spaces $X \subseteq \bigoplus_{\alpha \in C_L} U_\alpha$ and $Y \subseteq \bigoplus_{\beta \in C_R} V_\beta$ such that $A_C(X, Y) = \{0\}$ and $(2|C_L| + 2|C_R|) - (\dim X + \dim Y) < |C|$, implying $\text{rank } A_C \leq (2|C_L| + 2|C_R|) - (\dim X + \dim Y) < |C|$.

We first consider the case where C is a path component with odd length; the case where C is a path component with even length is similar. Suppose $C = (\alpha_1\beta_1, \beta_1\alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k\beta_k)$. Without loss of generality, assume that $\alpha_1\beta_1$ and $\alpha_k\beta_k$ are $+-$ -edges and α_p with $1 < p \leq k$ is degenerate. Let $X_{\alpha_1} := U_{\alpha_1}$, $X_{\alpha_i} := U_{\alpha_i}^-$ for $1 < i \leq p$, and $X_{\alpha_j} := U_{\alpha_j}^+$ for $p < j \leq k$. Similarly, let

$Y_{\beta_i} := V_{\beta_i}^+$ for $1 \leq i < p$, $Y_{\beta_j} := V_{\beta_j}^-$ for $p \leq j < k$, and $Y_{\beta_k} := V_{\beta_k}$. Namely, the end vertices are associated with 2-dimensional vector spaces, and the other vertices have 1-dimensional vector spaces. Define $X := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in C_L} X_\alpha$ and $Y := \bigoplus_{\beta \in C_R} Y_\beta$. Then one can see $A_C(X, Y) = \{0\}$ and $(2|C_L| + 2|C_R|) - (\dim X + \dim Y) < |C|$. Indeed, the latter is clear. The former follows from the conditions (2.2) and (2.3) of $U_\alpha^+, U_\alpha^-, V_\beta^+, V_\beta^-$ and $U_{\alpha_p}^+ = U_{\alpha_p}^-$.

We next consider the case where C is a cycle component. By (Cycle), there are a rank-1 +-edge $\alpha_1\beta_1$, and a rank-1 --edge $\beta_k\alpha_{k+1}$. Suppose that C is a cycle of $\alpha_1\beta_1$, a β_1 - β_k path, $\beta_k\alpha_{k+1}$, and an α_{k+1} - α_1 path. We may assume that a degenerate node α_p belongs to the β_1 - β_k path ($\beta_1\alpha_2, \alpha_2\beta_2, \dots, \alpha_k\beta_k$). Let $X_{\alpha_i} := U_{\alpha_i}^-$ for $1 < i \leq p$, $X_{\alpha_j} := U_{\alpha_j}^+$ for $p < j \leq k$, and $X_\alpha := U_\alpha$ for other α . Similarly, let $Y_{\beta_i} := V_{\beta_i}^+$ for $1 \leq i < p$, $Y_{\beta_j} := V_{\beta_j}^-$ for $p \leq j \leq k$, and $Y_\beta := \{0\}$ for other β . Namely, the vertices belonging to the β_1 - β_k path are associated with 1-dimensional vector spaces, and the other vertices α (resp. β) have 2-dimensional (resp. 0-dimensional) vector spaces. Then one can see $A_C(X, Y) = \{0\}$ and $(2|C_L| + 2|C_R|) - (\dim X + \dim Y) < |C|$ by a similar argument as for the above path case.

2.3.2 Proof of Proposition 2.3

Let I be a matching. Also let M and N be a row subset and a column subset of A_I , respectively, with $|M| = |N| = \text{rank } A_I$ and $\text{rank } A_I[M, N] = \text{rank } A_I$. We denote by \mathcal{C}' the set of rank-1 connected components. By the proof of Theorem 2.1 on the rank formula with $\text{rank } A_C = |C|$ for $C \in \mathcal{C}'$, we have

$$\det A_I[M, N] = a \cdot \prod \{x_{\alpha\beta}^2 \mid \alpha\beta \text{ is an isolated rank-2 edge in } I\} \cdot \prod \{x_{\alpha\beta} \mid \alpha\beta \in C : C \in \mathcal{C}'\}$$

for some nonzero $a \in \mathbf{F}$. By assigning 1 to all $x_{\alpha\beta}$ with $\alpha\beta \in I$, we obtain $\det \tilde{A}_I[M, N] = a \neq 0$, implying $\text{rank } \tilde{A}_I = \text{rank } A_I$.

3 Augmenting space-walk

Our proposed algorithm is an augmenting-path type algorithm, where we use the concept of *augmenting space-walk*, introduced in this section. An outline of our algorithm is as follows. Let I be a matching of A . We first search an optimality witness for I or an augmenting space-walk for I . In the former case, we have $\text{rank } A = \text{rank } A_I$, and hence output $r(I)$ by Theorem 2.1. In the latter case, we update a matching I to another matching I^* with $\text{rank } A_{I^*} > \text{rank } A_I$ via the augmenting space-walk.

For a vector space $X \subseteq U_\alpha$, let $X^{\perp\alpha\beta}$ (or $X^{\perp\beta\alpha}$) denote the orthogonal vector space with respect to $A_{\alpha\beta}$:

$$X^{\perp\alpha\beta} (= X^{\perp\beta\alpha}) := \{y \in V_\beta \mid A_{\alpha\beta}(x, y) = 0 \text{ for all } x \in X\}.$$

For a vector space $Y \subseteq V_\beta$, $Y^{\perp\alpha\beta}$ (or $Y^{\perp\beta\alpha}$) is defined analogously.

3.1 Definition

Our augmenting path concept, named *augmenting space-walk*, simulates a part of the Wong sequence needed for the augmentation; see Section 3.3 for details. We first define the components of augmenting space-walks. Let I be a matching of A . An *outer walk* for I is a walk $(\beta_1\alpha_1, \alpha_1\beta_2, \dots, \beta_k\alpha_k)$ in G such that $\beta_i\alpha_i \in E \setminus I$ and $\alpha_i\beta_{i+1}$ is an isolated rank-2 edge in I for each i . An *outer space-walk* for I is a sequence $\mathcal{P} = (Y_1, \beta_1\alpha_1, X_1, \alpha_1\beta_2, \dots, \beta_k\alpha_k, X_k)$ such that

- $(\beta_1\alpha_1, \alpha_1\beta_2, \dots, \beta_k\alpha_k)$ is an outer walk for I , and

- for each i , vector subspaces $Y_i \subseteq V_{\beta_i}$ and $X_i \subseteq U_{\alpha_i}$ satisfy $Y_i \not\subseteq \ker_{\mathbb{R}}(A_{\alpha_i\beta_i})$, $X_i = Y_i^{\perp\alpha_i\beta_i}$, and $Y_{i+1} = X_i^{\perp\alpha_i\beta_{i+1}}$.

Note $\dim X_i \leq 1$ and $\dim Y_i \geq 1$ for each i . The initial vertex β_1 and last vertex α_k of \mathcal{P} are denoted by $\beta(\mathcal{P})$ and $\alpha(\mathcal{P})$, respectively. Also the initial space Y_1 and last space X_k of \mathcal{P} are denoted by $Y(\mathcal{P})$ and $X(\mathcal{P})$, respectively.

An *inner walk* for I is a walk $(\alpha_1\beta_1, \beta_1\alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k\beta_k)$ in G such that it belongs to a rank-1 connected component of I and $\beta_i\alpha_{i+1}$ is rank-2 for each i . We here fix signs $+/-$ of edges and a valid labeling. An *inner space-walk* for I is a sequence $\mathcal{Q} = (X_1, \alpha_1\beta_1, Y_1, \beta_1\alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k\beta_k, Y_k)$ such that

- $(\alpha_1\beta_1, \beta_1\alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k\beta_k)$ is an inner walk for I , and
- for each i , (X_i, Y_i) is equal to $(U_{\alpha_i}^+, V_{\beta_i}^-)$ if $\alpha_i\beta_i$ is a $+$ -edge, and is equal to $(U_{\alpha_i}^-, V_{\beta_i}^+)$ if $\alpha_i\beta_i$ is a $-$ -edge.

The initial vertex α_1 and last vertex β_k of \mathcal{Q} are denoted by $\alpha(\mathcal{Q})$ and $\beta(\mathcal{Q})$, respectively. Also the initial space X_1 and last space Y_k of \mathcal{Q} are denoted by $X(\mathcal{Q})$ and $Y(\mathcal{Q})$, respectively.

We denote by $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \circ (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_\ell)$ the concatenation of sequences (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) and $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_\ell)$, i.e.,

$$(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \circ (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_\ell) := \begin{cases} (a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_\ell) & \text{if } a_k \neq b_1, \\ (a_1, \dots, a_k, b_2, \dots, b_\ell) & \text{if } a_k = b_1. \end{cases}$$

We consider an alternating concatenation

$$\mathcal{T} := \mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \mathcal{P}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{Q}_m \circ \mathcal{P}_m$$

of outer space-walks $\mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_m$ and inner space-walks $\mathcal{Q}_1, \dots, \mathcal{Q}_m$, in which the following connection condition, called *compatibility*, is required for each i :

- $\beta(\mathcal{Q}_i) = \beta(\mathcal{P}_i)$ and $Y(\mathcal{Q}_i) = Y(\mathcal{P}_i)$.
- $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_i) = \alpha(\mathcal{Q}_{i+1})$, and $X(\mathcal{P}_i) \neq U_{\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_{i+1})}^-$ if $X(\mathcal{Q}_{i+1}) = U_{\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_{i+1})}^+$, and $X(\mathcal{P}_i) \neq U_{\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_{i+1})}^+$ if $X(\mathcal{Q}_{i+1}) = U_{\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_{i+1})}^-$.

An *augmenting space-walk* \mathcal{T} is a compatible concatenation $\mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \mathcal{P}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{Q}_m \circ \mathcal{P}_m$ for I such that

$$(A_{\text{init}}) \quad Y(\mathcal{P}_0) = \ker_I(\beta(\mathcal{P}_0)) \neq \{0\} \text{ and}$$

$$(A_{\text{last}}) \quad X(\mathcal{P}_m) \neq \ker_I(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)) \neq \{0\}.$$

Note that the union of the underlying walks of $\mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{Q}_1, \mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{Q}_m, \mathcal{P}_m$ also forms a walk in G . By $X(\mathcal{P}_m) \leq 1$, (A_{last}) is equivalent to $X(\mathcal{P}_m) \not\subseteq \ker_I(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)) \neq \{0\}$.

An augmenting space-walk is said to be *irredundant* if every vertex appears at most twice in \mathcal{T} and, in the case where a vertex α (resp. β) appears twice in \mathcal{T} as $(\dots, \beta\alpha, X, \dots, \beta'\alpha, X' \dots)$ (resp. $(\dots, \alpha\beta, Y, \dots, \alpha'\beta, Y' \dots)$), it holds $X \not\subseteq X'$ (resp. $Y \not\subseteq Y'$). In the following, we assume that an augmenting space-walk is always irredundant. Indeed, our algorithm in Section 3.1 outputs an irredundant augmenting space-walk. Also, any redundant augmenting space-walk can be converted to an irredundant one in $O(|E|)$ time by shortening procedures in Section 4; in fact, the irredundancy is maintained during the entire augmentation procedure.

An augmenting space-walk actually augments a matching. The following provides the validity of our augmenting procedure.

Theorem 3.1. *For a matching I and an augmenting space-walk for I , we can obtain a matching I^* with $\text{rank } A_{I^*} > \text{rank } A_I$ in $O(|E|^2)$ time.*

The augmentation procedure is the most difficult but intriguing part of this paper, and the proof of Theorem 3.1 is given in Section 4.

3.2 Finding an augmenting space-walk

In this subsection, we present an algorithm for finding either an optimality witness or an augmenting space-walk, which is inspired by the computation of the Wong sequence; see Section 3.3 for details.

Theorem 3.2. *For a matching I , we can find either an optimality witness or an augmenting space-walk for I in $O(|E|)$ time.*

Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 implies Theorem 1.1, since at most $\min\{\mu, \nu\}$ augmentations occur in the algorithm. The proof of Theorem 3.2 is given in Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 below.

In order to find an optimality witness or an augmenting space-walk, we introduce a *label* for each vertex γ , which is a vector subspace of U_α if $\gamma = \alpha$, and that of V_β if $\gamma = \beta$. Each pair (γ, Z) of a vertex γ and a label Z at γ has a back pointer to another pair (γ', Z') , which represents that “ Z is added to the label set $\text{label}(\gamma)$ through Z' and $\gamma'\gamma$.” At the end of the algorithm, we obtain either an optimality witness for I by composing labels or an augmenting space-walk by tracking back pointers and concatenating them.

3.2.1 Labeling procedure

For each vertex γ , let $\text{label}(\gamma)$ be a label set (or a set of vector spaces) of γ . While updating, let

$$X_\alpha^* := \bigcap_{X \in \text{label}(\alpha)} X, \quad Y_\beta^* := \sum_{Y \in \text{label}(\beta)} Y$$

for each α and β , where $X_\alpha^* := U_\alpha$ if $\text{label}(\alpha) = \emptyset$, and $Y_\beta^* := \{0\}$ if $\text{label}(\beta) = \emptyset$. As initialization, let $\text{label}(\beta) := \{\ker_I(\beta)\}$ for β with $\ker_I(\beta) \neq \{0\}$, and $\text{label}(\gamma) := \emptyset$ for other γ .

The initial stage of the labeling procedure is to check whether there is a triple (α, β, Y) such that $\alpha\beta \in E \setminus I$, $Y \in \text{label}(\beta)$, and $Y^{\perp\alpha\beta} \not\supseteq X_\alpha^*$. If there is no such triple, then output X_α^* and Y_β^* for α, β as an optimality witness for I , and stop the procedure. Otherwise choose such a triple (α, β, Y) . There are three cases:

- (A) $\deg_I(\alpha) = 0$, or α belongs to a rank-1 connected component C such that $\deg_I(\alpha) = 1$ and $Y^{\perp\alpha\beta} \neq \ker_I(\alpha) \in \{U_\alpha^+, U_\alpha^-\}$.
- (B) α is incident to the isolated rank-2 edge $\alpha\beta'$ in I .
- (C) α belongs to a rank-1 connected component C such that $\deg_I(\alpha) = 2$, or $\deg_I(\alpha) = 1$ and $Y^{\perp\alpha\beta} = \ker_I(\alpha) \in \{U_\alpha^+, U_\alpha^-\}$.

(A). In this case, we have $Y^{\perp\alpha\beta} \neq \ker_I(\alpha) \neq \{0\}$ (cf. (A_{last}) in Section 3.1). Define the back pointer from $(\alpha, Y^{\perp\alpha\beta})$ to (β, Y) , and go to Section 3.2.2 to obtain an augmenting space-walk.

(B). This case will be an expansion of an outer space-walk. Update

$$\text{label}(\alpha) \leftarrow \text{label}(\alpha) \cup \{Y^{\perp\alpha\beta}\}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\text{label}(\beta') \leftarrow \text{label}(\beta') \cup \{(Y^{\perp\alpha\beta})^{\perp\alpha\beta'}\} \quad (3.2)$$

and define the back pointers from $(\alpha, Y^{\perp\alpha\beta})$ to (β, Y) and from $(\beta', (Y^{\perp\alpha\beta})^{\perp\alpha\beta'})$ to $(\alpha, Y^{\perp\alpha\beta})$. Return to the initial stage.

(C). This case will be an addition of an inner space-walk. Update

$$\text{label}(\alpha) \leftarrow \begin{cases} \text{label}(\alpha) \cup \{U_\alpha^+\} & \text{if } Y^{\perp\alpha\beta} = U_\alpha^+, \\ \text{label}(\alpha) \cup \{U_\alpha^-\} & \text{if } Y^{\perp\alpha\beta} = U_\alpha^-, \\ \text{label}(\alpha) \cup \{U_\alpha^+, U_\alpha^-\} & \text{if } U_\alpha^+ \neq Y^{\perp\alpha\beta} \neq U_\alpha^-; \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

see the compatibility condition in Section 3.1. For each X newly added to $\text{label}(\alpha)$, do the following: Define the back pointer from (α, X) to (β, Y) . Choose the longest inner space-walk \mathcal{Q} in C such that $\alpha = \alpha(\mathcal{Q})$ and $X = X(\mathcal{Q})$, where we can assume $X = X(\mathcal{Q}) = U_\alpha^+$ (if $X = X(\mathcal{Q}) = U_\alpha^-$, then we change all signs in the argument below). For each vertex γ in \mathcal{Q} , add to $\text{label}(\gamma)$ the subspace of \mathcal{Q} at γ if $\text{label}(\gamma)$ does not have it:

$$\text{label}(\gamma) \leftarrow \begin{cases} \text{label}(\gamma) \cup \{U_\gamma^+\} & \text{if } \gamma = \alpha, \\ \text{label}(\gamma) \cup \{V_\gamma^-\} & \text{if } \gamma = \beta. \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

Define the back pointers of newly added labels along \mathcal{Q} .

Lemma 3.3. *If the algorithm outputs X_α^* and Y_β^* for each α, β , then it is an optimality witness for I . In addition, the running-time is $O(|E|)$.*

Proof. In the initial phase, it holds $r(I) = 2\mu + 2\nu - \sum_\alpha \dim X_\alpha^* - \sum_\beta \dim Y_\beta^*$. Since the sum of $\dim X_\alpha^*$ and $\dim Y_\beta^*$ for α, β does not change during the algorithm, it suffices to show $A_{\alpha\beta}(X_\alpha^*, Y_\beta^*) = \{0\}$ for all $\alpha\beta \in E$ on the outputs X_α^* and Y_β^* .

For $\alpha\beta \in E \setminus I$, we have $A_{\alpha\beta}(X_\alpha^*, Y_\beta^*) = \{0\}$ by the termination condition. For a rank-2 edge $\alpha\beta \in I$, we have $Y^{\perp\alpha\beta} \in \text{label}(\alpha)$ if $Y \in \text{label}(\beta)$. Hence it holds that $A_{\alpha\beta}(X_\alpha^*, Y_\beta^*) \subseteq A_{\alpha\beta}(\bigcap_{Y \in \text{label}(\beta)} Y^{\perp\alpha\beta}, \sum_{Y \in \text{label}(\beta)} Y) = \{0\}$. For a rank-1 edge $\alpha\beta \in I$, we can assume that $\alpha\beta$ is a $+$ -edge. Then $U_\alpha^+ = \ker_L(A_{\alpha\beta})$ and $V_\beta^+ = \ker_R(A_{\alpha\beta})$. If $V_\beta^- \in \text{label}(\beta)$ then $U_\alpha^+ \in \text{label}(\alpha)$, since an inner space-walk \mathcal{Q} reaching (β, V_β^-) comes from (α, U_α^+) . Thus, if $V_\beta^- \notin \text{label}(\beta)$ then $A_{\alpha\beta}(X_\alpha^*, Y_\beta^*) \subseteq A_{\alpha\beta}(X_\alpha^*, \ker_R(A_{\alpha\beta})) = \{0\}$, and if $V_\beta^- \in \text{label}(\beta)$ then $A_{\alpha\beta}(X_\alpha^*, Y_\beta^*) \subseteq A_{\alpha\beta}(\ker_L(A_{\alpha\beta}), Y_\beta^*) = \{0\}$.

By $|\text{label}(\gamma)| \leq 2$ for each γ , every edge in E is checked at most two times during the labeling procedure; the labeling procedure can be done in $O(|E|)$ time. \square

3.2.2 Back tracking

Suppose that we have (α, X) with $X \in \text{label}(\alpha)$ and $X \neq \ker_I(\alpha) \neq \{0\}$. By tracking the back pointer, we obtain an augmenting space-walk for I . As initialization, define $\mathcal{T} := (Y, \beta\alpha, X)$, where (α, X) has the back pointer to (β, Y) . Observe $\beta\alpha \notin I$ and $Y \not\subseteq \ker_R(A_{\alpha\beta})$, which implies that $(Y, \beta\alpha, X)$ is an outer space-walk of I .

We update \mathcal{T} as follows. Let Y and $\beta\alpha$ be the initial space and initial edge of \mathcal{T} , respectively. Suppose that (β, Y) has the back pointer to (α', X) and (α', X) has the back pointer to (β', Y') . Then update

$$\mathcal{T} \leftarrow (Y', \beta'\alpha', (Y')^{\perp\beta'\alpha'}) \circ (X, \alpha'\beta, Y) \circ \mathcal{T}.$$

If (β', Y') has no back pointer, i.e., $Y' = \ker_{\beta'}(I)$, then output the resulting \mathcal{T} as an augmenting space-walk. Otherwise, consider (β', Y') of the resulting \mathcal{T} , and repeat the above update. Clearly, the running-time of the back tracking procedure is $O(|E|)$.

Then the following holds.

Lemma 3.4. *The output \mathcal{T} is an augmenting space-walk for I .*

Proof. We consider when the back pointers from (β, Y) to (α', X) and from (α', X) to (β', Y') are defined. If the former is defined in the update (3.2) and the latter in (3.1), then $(Y')^{\perp\beta'\alpha} = X$ and $(Y', \beta'\alpha, (Y')^{\perp\beta'\alpha}) \circ (X, \alpha\beta, Y)$ constitutes a part of an outer space-walk of I . If the former is defined in the update (3.4) and the latter in (3.3), then $(Y', \beta'\alpha, (Y')^{\perp\beta'\alpha})$ and $(X, \alpha\beta, Y)$ constitute a part of an outer and inner space-walk of I , respectively. If both the former and latter are defined in the update (3.4), then $(Y')^{\perp\beta'\alpha} = X$ and $(Y', \beta'\alpha, (Y')^{\perp\beta'\alpha}) \circ (X, \alpha\beta, Y)$ constitutes a part of an inner space-walk of I . Thus the output \mathcal{T} forms an augmenting space-walk for I . In particular, \mathcal{T} is irredundant, since no label appears twice in \mathcal{T} by the description of the labeling procedure. \square

By Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4, we obtain Theorem 3.2.

3.3 Augmenting space-walk and Wong sequence

This subsection is devoted to clarifying the relationship between augmenting space-walk and Wong sequence, with highlighting the motivation behind our algorithm. The contents of this subsection are irrelevant to Section 4 (the validity of the algorithm).

Let A be an $m \times n$ symbolic matrix of the form (1.1), not necessarily partitioned. Let \tilde{A} be a substitution of A . For a vector space $X \subseteq \mathbf{F}^m$, we denote by

$$X^{\perp\tilde{A}} := \{y \in \mathbf{F}^n \mid \tilde{A}(x, y) = 0 \text{ for all } x \in X\},$$

the orthogonal vector space with respect to \tilde{A} . For a vector space $Y \subseteq \mathbf{F}^n$, $Y^{\perp A_i}$ is defined analogously. In addition, let

$$Y^{\perp A} := \bigcap_{i=1}^k Y^{\perp A_i}.$$

The (orthogonal version of) *Wong sequence* [11] for (A, \tilde{A}) is a sequence X^0, Y^1, X^1, \dots of vector spaces determined by $X^0 := \mathbf{F}^m$, $Y^i := (X^{i-1})^{\perp\tilde{A}}$, and $X^i := (Y^i)^{\perp A}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$. By $\mathbf{F}^m = X^0 \supseteq X^1 \supseteq \dots$ and $\ker_{\mathbf{R}}(\tilde{A}) = Y^1 \supseteq Y^2 \supseteq \dots$, the limits X^∞, Y^∞ are obtained by $\min\{m, n\}$ iterations and satisfy $Y^\infty = (X^\infty)^{\perp\tilde{A}}$ and $X^\infty = (Y^\infty)^{\perp A}$. In [11], they showed $\text{rank } A = \text{rank } \tilde{A}$ if $\ker_{\mathbf{L}}(\tilde{A}) \subseteq X^\infty$, which is used as an ‘‘optimality witness’’ of \tilde{A} in IQS-algorithm [13].

Let us consider a general partitioned matrix $A = (A_{\alpha\beta})$ of the form (1.2), where $A_{\alpha\beta}$ is an $m_\alpha \times n_\beta$ matrix. The partitioned structure of A simplifies the computation of $(Y)^{\perp A}$. Indeed, $X = (Y)^{\perp A}$ is represented as $X = \bigoplus_{\alpha} X_{\alpha}$ for

$$X_{\alpha} = \left(\bigcap_{\beta} (\text{proj}_{\beta}(Y))^{\perp A_{\alpha\beta}} \right),$$

where $\text{proj}_{\beta}(Y)$ denotes the projection of $Y \subseteq \bigoplus_{\beta} \mathbf{F}^{n_{\beta}}$ to the β -th coordinate. Thus, the essential part to obtain the Wong sequence is the computation of $\text{proj}_{\beta}((\bigoplus_{\alpha} X_{\alpha})^{\perp\tilde{A}})$.

Consider the case where each $A_{\alpha\beta}$ is 1×1 . As mentioned in Introduction, computing $\text{rank } A$ is equivalent to computing the size of a maximum matching of the bipartite graph G corresponding to the nonzero pattern of A . In this case, $X_{\alpha} = \{0\}$ if α is incident to some edge $\alpha\beta$ in G with $\text{proj}_{\beta}(Y) = \mathbf{F}$, and $X_{\alpha} = \mathbf{F}$ otherwise. Suppose further that \tilde{A} is the canonical substitution of A with respect to a (bipartite) matching I . Then $Y_{\beta} := \text{proj}_{\beta}((\bigoplus_{\alpha} X_{\alpha})^{\perp\tilde{A}}) = \{0\}$ if β is incident

to an edge $\alpha\beta$ in I with $X_\alpha = \mathbf{F}$, and $Y_\beta = \mathbf{F}$ otherwise. In particular, for $Y^1 = \ker_{\mathbf{R}}(\tilde{A})$, the β -th projection of Y^1 is \mathbf{F} if and only if β is unmatched by I . The computation of the Wong sequence is nothing but the BFS search for an augmenting path in G ; the node set $\{\alpha \mid X_\alpha = \{0\}\} \cup \{\beta \mid Y_\beta = \mathbf{F}\}$ in the i -th phase coincides with the reachable node set from the unmatched nodes via the BFS search for an augmenting path in i steps. The optimality condition $\ker_{\mathbf{L}}(\tilde{A}) \subseteq X_\infty$ holds if and only if there is no augmenting path for the current matching I . The above argument says that the matching structure of I can allow us to compute $\text{proj}_\beta((\bigoplus_\alpha X_\alpha)^{\perp \tilde{A}})$ in a combinatorial manner.

We then consider a (2×2) -type generic partitioned matrix A . In fact, the definition of an augmenting space-walk and our labeling procedure for A are essentially the computation of the Wong sequence for (A, \tilde{A}_I) , where I is a matching of A . The vector spaces X_α^* and Y_β^* in the labeling procedure (Section 3.2.1) play a role of the above X_α and $\text{proj}_\beta((\bigoplus_\alpha X_\alpha)^{\perp \tilde{A}_I})$, respectively. If β is incident to an isolated rank-2 edge $\alpha\beta$ in I , then $\text{proj}_\beta((\bigoplus_\alpha X_\alpha)^{\perp \tilde{A}_I}) = (X_\alpha)^{\perp \alpha\beta}$, which corresponds to (B) in the labeling procedure. If β belongs to a rank-1 connected component of I , then $\text{proj}_\beta((\bigoplus_\alpha X_\alpha)^{\perp \tilde{A}_I})$ can be determined by inner space-walks as follows.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose that β belongs to a rank-1 connected component of I . If there is an inner space-walk \mathcal{Q} for I from some α to β such that $Y(\mathcal{Q}) = V_\beta^+$ and $X_\alpha \not\supseteq U_\alpha^+$, then $\text{proj}_\beta((\bigoplus_\alpha X_\alpha)^{\perp \tilde{A}_I}) \supseteq V_\beta^+$. Otherwise, $\text{proj}_\beta((\bigoplus_\alpha X_\alpha)^{\perp \tilde{A}_I}) \subseteq V_\beta^-$.*

The analogous statement interchanged $+$ with $-$ also holds. These explain (C).

Proof. We may assume that I itself is a rank-1 connected component. As in the proof of Theorem 2.1 (Section 2.3.1), via a basis transformation, we can change \tilde{A}_I as a matrix of the form (2.9). For notational simplicity, we use $1^+, 2^+, \dots, k^+, 1^-, 2^-, \dots, k^-$ as the row and column indices of \tilde{A}_I after the transformation. Then U_α^+ and U_α^- are the vector spaces spanned by the α^+ -th and α^- -th unit vectors, respectively. The same holds for V_β^+ and V_β^- . We denote by $a_{\alpha\beta}^+$ and $a_{\alpha\beta}^-$ the $\alpha^+\beta^+$ -th and $\alpha^-\beta^-$ -th (nonzero) entries of \tilde{A}_I , respectively.

Suppose first that the if-condition in the statement of Lemma 3.5 holds. That is, suppose that, e.g., $X_1 \not\supseteq U_1^+$ and that β belongs to the maximal inner space-walk \mathcal{Q} with $\alpha(\mathcal{Q}) = 1$ and $X(\mathcal{Q}) = U_1^-$. By $X_1 \not\supseteq U_1^+$, there is $c \in \mathbf{F}$ such that any $x \in \bigoplus_\alpha X_\alpha$ has of the form

$$x = \begin{array}{cccc|cccc} & 1^+ & & & & 1^- & & & \\ & cp & * & \cdots & * & p & * & \cdots & * \end{array}$$

for some $p \in \mathbf{F}$. We can construct $y \in (\bigoplus_\alpha X_\alpha)^{\perp \tilde{A}_I}$ such that

$$\tilde{A}_I y = \begin{array}{cccc|cccc} & 1^+ & & & & 1^- & & & \\ & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -c & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{array}. \quad (3.5)$$

Indeed, such y is given as

$$y = \begin{array}{cccc|cccc} & 1^+ & & & & 1^- & & & 2^- \\ & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & -\frac{c}{a_{11}^+} & \frac{ca_{21}^-}{a_{11}^+ a_{22}^-} & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{array},$$

where the nonzero entries of y can be determined along inner paths starting from 1 so that (3.5) is satisfied. In particular, the nodes in \mathcal{Q} correspond to the nonzero entries in the $+$ part of y . Since β belongs to \mathcal{Q} , it holds $\text{proj}_\beta((\bigoplus_\alpha X_\alpha)^{\perp \tilde{A}_I}) \supseteq V_\beta^+$, which implies the if-part.

Let \mathcal{Q}' denote the maximal inner space-walk with $\beta(\mathcal{Q}') = \beta$ and $Y(\mathcal{Q}') = V_\beta^+$; the “otherwise” condition is equivalent to $X_\alpha \supseteq U_\alpha^+$ for any α in \mathcal{Q}' . We show $y \notin (\bigoplus_\alpha X_\alpha)^{\perp \tilde{A}_I}$ for any y with a nonzero β^+ -th entry, which implies $\text{proj}_\beta((\bigoplus_\alpha X_\alpha)^{\perp \tilde{A}_I}) \subseteq V_\beta^-$. Suppose to the contrary that there is $y \in (\bigoplus_\alpha X_\alpha)^{\perp \tilde{A}_I}$ with a nonzero β^+ -th entry. Let $\alpha\beta$ be the last edge of \mathcal{Q}' . By $X_\alpha \supseteq U_\alpha^+$, the α^+ -th entry of $x \in \bigoplus_\alpha X_\alpha$ can be arbitrary. Hence, if $\alpha(\mathcal{Q}') = \alpha$, i.e., α is incident only to $\alpha\beta$ in I , or α is incident to two edges $\alpha\beta$ and $\alpha\beta'$ in I and $\alpha\beta'$ is rank-1, then $x^\top \tilde{A}_I y \neq 0$ for $x \in \bigoplus_\alpha X_\alpha$ having nonzero only on the α^+ -th entry, a contradiction. Otherwise, α is incident to two edges $\alpha\beta$ and $\alpha\beta'$ in I and $\alpha\beta'$ is rank-2. In this case, the β'^+ -th entry of y must be nonzero for $y \in (\bigoplus_\alpha X_\alpha)^{\perp \tilde{A}_I}$. By repeating the same argument, we obtain a contradiction at the initial edge of \mathcal{Q}' . \square

While the computation of the Wong sequence corresponds to the BFS of an auxiliary graph, our algorithm does not. An augmenting space-walk partially simulates the Wong sequence for deriving $\ker_L(\tilde{A}_I) \not\subseteq X^\infty$.

4 Augmentation

In order to prove Theorem 3.1, we present an augmentation procedure for a given matching I and an augmenting space-walk \mathcal{T} with respect to I . The procedure is an inductive construction that repeats to replace (I, \mathcal{T}) by (I', \mathcal{T}') . Here I' is relaxed to be a *quasi-matching*, which is a weaker notion than matching, with $r(I') = r(I)$ and \mathcal{T}' is an augmenting space-walk for I' . In the base case (I, \mathcal{T}) , it holds $r(I') > r(I)$. The irredundancy of (I, \mathcal{T}) always holds in the augmentation procedure, which is easily verified.

4.1 Preliminaries

We here introduce several notions for the augmentation procedure and the proof of its validity. For an outer or inner space-walk $\mathcal{R} = (Z_1, \gamma_1\gamma_2, Z_2, \gamma_2\gamma_3, \dots, \gamma_{k-1}\gamma_k, Z_k)$, we define $\mathcal{R}[\gamma_i, \gamma_j]$ by the subsequence of \mathcal{R} from Z_i to Z_j if $i < j$, and by the subsequence of the inverse of \mathcal{R} from Z_i to Z_j if $i > j$. In particular, if γ_i is the initial vertex γ_1 of \mathcal{R} , then we denote $\mathcal{R}[\gamma_1, \gamma_j]$ by $\mathcal{R}(\gamma_j)$. If γ_j is the last vertex γ_k of \mathcal{R} , then we denote $\mathcal{R}[\gamma_i, \gamma_k]$ by $\mathcal{R}(\gamma_i)$. The same notation is used for a walk R in G . For an outer or inner space-walk \mathcal{R} , we denote the underlying walk of \mathcal{R} by its italic style R . Note that an inner space-walk \mathcal{Q} is uniquely determined from its underlying inner walk Q .

4.1.1 Quasi-matching

In our algorithm, we utilize a weaker notion than matching. An edge subset $I \subseteq E$ is called a *quasi-matching* or *q-matching* if I satisfies (Deg), (VL), (Path), and the following weaker condition (q-Cycle) than (Cycle):

(q-Cycle) Each cycle component of I has at least one rank-1 edge.

From a q-matching I' , we easily obtain a matching I with $r(I) \geq r(I')$; see Lemma 4.1 in Section 4.1.2 below.

We naturally extend an augmenting space-walk for a q-matching I . Note here that, as a matching in Section 2.2, if I satisfies (Deg), (Path), and (q-Cycle) then two labels on any vertex with degree 2 are uniquely determined. (VL) requires that they are different.

4.1.2 Elimination

Let I be an edge subset satisfying (Deg), (q-Cycle), and (VL) (note that (Path) is not imposed). The *elimination* is an operation of modifying I to a matching I' with $r(I') \geq r(I)$ as follows. If C is a cycle component of I such that all $+$ -edges in C are rank-2, i.e., C violating (Cycle), then we remove all $-$ -edges from C . Suppose that C is a non-isolated path component of I such that one of the end edges is rank-2, i.e., C violates (Path). We may assume that C is of the form $(\alpha_1\beta_1, \beta_1\alpha_2, \dots)$ and $\alpha_1\beta_1$ is rank-2. Then we remove $\beta_1\alpha_2, \beta_2\alpha_3, \dots, \beta_\ell\alpha_{\ell+1}$ for the maximum $\ell \geq 1$ such that all $\alpha_1\beta_1, \alpha_2\beta_2, \dots, \alpha_\ell\beta_\ell$ are rank-2. If the other end edge is not removed and is also rank-2, do the same procedure from this edge in the reverse way.

Observe that the elimination operation to a cycle component does not change r , and to a path component does not decrease r . Thus the following holds.

Lemma 4.1. *Let I be an edge subset satisfying (Deg), (q-Cycle), and (VL) and I' the edge subset obtained from I by the elimination. Then I' is a matching with $r(I') \geq r(I)$.*

4.1.3 Propagation

Let $P = (\beta_1\alpha_1, \alpha_1\beta_2, \dots, \beta_k\alpha_k)$ be an outer walk. For a vector subspace $Y_1 \subseteq V_{\beta_1}$, the *front-propagation* $Y_1 \triangleright P$ is a sequence $(Y_1, \beta_1\alpha_1, X_1, \alpha_1\beta_2, Y_2, \dots, Y_k, \beta_k\alpha_k, X_k)$ such that $X_i = (Y_i)^{\perp_{\beta_i\alpha_i}}$ and $Y_{i+1} = (X_i)^{\perp_{\alpha_i\beta_{i+1}}}$ for each i . For a vector subspace $X'_k \subseteq U_{\alpha_k}$, the *back-propagation* $P \triangleleft X'_k$ for P and X'_k is a sequence $(Y'_1, \beta_1\alpha_1, X'_1, \alpha_1\beta_2, Y'_2, \dots, Y'_k, \beta_k\alpha_k, X'_k)$ such that $Y'_i = (X'_i)^{\perp_{\alpha_i\beta_i}}$ and $X'_{i-1} = (Y'_i)^{\perp_{\beta_i\alpha_{i-1}}}$ for each i . Note that an outer space-walk \mathcal{P} coincides with $Y(\mathcal{P}) \triangleright P$; recall that $Y(\mathcal{P})$ denotes the initial space of \mathcal{P} . We often use the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Let \mathcal{P} be an outer space-walk with $\alpha := \alpha(\mathcal{P})$ and $\beta := \beta(\mathcal{P})$, and $X \subseteq U_\alpha$ and $Y \subseteq V_\beta$ be nonzero vector subspaces.*

- (1) *If $X \neq X(\mathcal{P})$, then the vector subspaces at each position in \mathcal{P} and in $P \triangleleft X$ are different.*
- (2) *In addition, if $Y \neq Y(P \triangleleft X)$, then the vector subspaces at each position in $Y \triangleright P$ and in $P \triangleleft X$ are different, and $Y \triangleright P$ forms an outer space-walk.*

Proof. The both immediately follow from the fact that, if $\alpha\beta$ is rank-2 then $X' \not\subseteq X$ implies $(X')^{\perp_{\alpha\beta}} \not\subseteq X^{\perp_{\alpha\beta}}$, and if $\alpha\beta$ is rank-1 then $X \not\subseteq \ker_L(A_{\alpha\beta})$ implies $X^{\perp_{\alpha\beta}} = \ker_R(A_{\alpha\beta})$. \square

A *truncated outer walk* is a walk of the form $P[\alpha]$ for some α belonging to an outer walk P . We will consider the front-/back-propagation for truncated outer walks in the same way. The same statement of Lemma 4.2 (2) holds for a truncated outer walk $P[\alpha]$ and a vector subspace of X_α not including the space of $P \triangleleft X$ at α .

Let R be a truncated outer walk with the initial vertex $\alpha(\mathcal{P})$. We denote $\mathcal{P} \circ (X(\mathcal{P}) \triangleright R)$ by $\mathcal{P} \triangleright R$ for simplicity.

4.1.4 Decremental quantity θ

In order to estimate the time complexity, we introduce a quantity θ which decreases during the algorithm. Let I be a q-matching and \mathcal{T} an augmenting space-walk for I . The *extended support* of \mathcal{T} is the union of the underlying walk T of \mathcal{T} and the rank-1 connected components intersecting with T . Our procedure will be done within the extended support. An edge $\alpha\beta \in I$ is said to be *inner-double* if $\alpha\beta$ appears twice in the union of inner space-walks of \mathcal{T} .

Let $N(I, \mathcal{T})$ be the number of edges in the extended support of \mathcal{T} and $D_{\text{inner}}(I, \mathcal{T})$ the number of inner-double edges in \mathcal{T} . Define $\theta(I, \mathcal{T}) := N(I, \mathcal{T}) + D_{\text{inner}}(I, \mathcal{T})$. Clearly $\theta(I, \mathcal{T})$ is bounded by $O(|E|)$.

4.2 Initial stage

We start to describe the augmentation procedure. Let $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \mathcal{P}_1 \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{Q}_m \circ \mathcal{P}_m$ be an augmenting space-walk for I . We consider the following condition (N_{outer}):

(N_{outer}) Suppose that a vertex γ in \mathcal{P}_m appears twice in \mathcal{T} , where the first appearance occurs in \mathcal{P}_ℓ with $\ell \leq m$. Then the subspace at the first appearance of γ in \mathcal{P}_ℓ is equal to the subspace at the last appearance of γ at $P_m \triangleleft \ker_I(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m))$.

When \mathcal{T} violates (N_{outer}), we replace \mathcal{T} by another augmenting space-walk as follows. Suppose that γ appears twice in \mathcal{T} as in (N_{outer}), but the subspace of \mathcal{P}_ℓ at the first γ is different from the subspace of $P_m \triangleleft \ker_I(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m))$ at the second γ . Choose the first such γ in \mathcal{P}_ℓ . Note that, if $\gamma \neq \alpha$, then $\gamma = \beta(\mathcal{P}_m) = \beta(\mathcal{P}_\ell)$. Update \mathcal{T} as

$$\mathcal{T} \leftarrow \begin{cases} \mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell & \text{if } \gamma = \alpha(\mathcal{P}_m), \\ \mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell \circ (\mathcal{P}_\ell(\alpha] \triangleright P_m[\alpha)) & \text{if } \gamma = \alpha \neq \alpha(\mathcal{P}_m), \\ \mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell \circ (Y(\mathcal{Q}_\ell) \triangleright P_m) & \text{if } \gamma = \beta(\mathcal{P}_m) = \beta(\mathcal{P}_\ell). \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

(In fact, the first case never occurs in the procedure, provided the initial augmenting space-walk is obtained in the algorithm in Section 3.2.)

Clearly the resulting \mathcal{T} is a compatibly-concatenated space-walk and satisfies (A_{init}). Consider the case of $\gamma = \alpha \neq \alpha(\mathcal{P})$. (The other cases are similar.) Since the subspace X of \mathcal{P}_ℓ at the first α is different from the subspace of $P_m \triangleleft \ker_I(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m))$ at α , the last space of $X \triangleright P_m[\alpha]$ is different from $\ker_I(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m))$ by Lemma 4.2 (2). This implies that $\mathcal{P}_\ell(\alpha] \triangleright P_m[\alpha)$ is a single outer space-walks for I , and that (A_{last}) holds. Thus the new \mathcal{T} is an augmenting space-walk for I .

By this update, θ strictly decreases. Indeed, clearly D_{inner} does not increase. If $\ell = m$, then, by the irredundancy and the definition of $\gamma = \alpha$, the edge in $P_m \setminus I$ incident to the second γ exits the extended support of the new \mathcal{T} . Hence N decreases by at least one. If $\ell < m$, then the irredundancy implies the following: If $\gamma = \alpha$, then the last edge of $P_m[\alpha]$ exits the extended support of the new \mathcal{T} . If $\gamma = \beta(\mathcal{P}_m) = \beta(\mathcal{P}_\ell)$, then the initial edge of \mathcal{P}_ℓ exits. Hence N decreases by at least one. Checking (N_{outer}) and the update (4.1) can be done in $O(|E|)$.

Now \mathcal{T} satisfies (N_{outer}). We let $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \mathcal{P}_1 \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{Q}_m \circ \mathcal{P}_m$ again by re-index. An outer space-walk is said to be *simple* if its underlying walk is actually a path, i.e., does not use the same edge twice. There are three cases:

- $m = 0$ and \mathcal{P}_0 is simple.
- $m \geq 1$ and \mathcal{P}_m is simple.
- \mathcal{P}_m is not simple.

In the first case, we obtain a matching I^* with $r(I^*) > r(I)$ in $O(|E|)$ as required and the augmentation procedure terminates, which is dealt with in Section 4.3. In the second and third cases, we basically modify (I, \mathcal{T}) in $O(|E|)$ time so that θ strictly decreases, and then return to the initial stage. In a certain situation of the second case, we obtain a larger matching in $O(|E|)$ as required and terminate the procedure. They are dealt with in Sections 4.4 and 4.5, respectively. Since θ is bounded by $O(|E|)$ here, the time complexity of the augmentation procedure is bounded by $O(|E|^2)$. This implies Theorem 3.1.

4.3 Base case: $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{P}_0$ and \mathcal{P}_0 is simple

Define

$$I^* := I \cup P_0,$$

where P_0 is regarded as an edge set. Then the following holds.

Lemma 4.3. I^* satisfies (Deg), (q-Cycle), (VL), and $r(I^*) > r(I)$.

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{P}_0 = (Y_1, \beta_1\alpha_1, X_1, \alpha_1\beta_2, \dots, \beta_k\alpha_k, X_k)$ ($k \geq 1$). One can easily check that I^* satisfies (Deg), (q-Cycle), and $r(I^*) > r(I)$; (Deg) follows from $\deg_I(\gamma) \leq 1$ for all γ belonging to P_0 . We show that I^* satisfies (VL), i.e., I^* has a valid labeling. We can assume that, if $\deg_I(\alpha_k) = 1$ then α_k is incident to a $--$ -edge in I , i.e., $\beta_1\alpha_1, \beta_2\alpha_2, \dots, \beta_k\alpha_k$ are $+-$ -edges in I' . If $\deg_I(\alpha_k) = 1$, then define $U_{\alpha_k}^-$ as $\ker_I(\alpha_k)$. If $\deg_I(\alpha_k) = 0$, then define $U_{\alpha_k}^-$ as any 1-dimensional subspace of U_{α_k} different from X_k . Consider the back-propagation $P_0 \triangleleft U_{\alpha_k}^-$. Define $V_{\beta_i}^+$ as the propagated space at β_i and $U_{\alpha_i}^-$ as the propagated space at α_i for all i . Note that the above propagated spaces are 1-dimensional and that $V_{\beta_i}^+ = \ker_R(A_{\alpha_i\beta_i})$ if $\beta_i\alpha_i$ is rank-1.

The other labeling $(U_{\alpha_i}^+, V_{\beta_i}^-)$ are defined as (X_i, Y_i) if both X_i and Y_i are both 1-dimensional. In this case, by Lemma 4.2 (1), we have $U_{\alpha_i}^+ \neq U_{\alpha_i}^-$ and $V_{\beta_i}^+ \neq V_{\beta_i}^-$ for each i . If some Y_i is 2-dimensional (equivalently X_{i-1} is zero-dimensional), then $\deg_I(\beta_1) = 0$ and $\beta_j\alpha_j$ is rank-2 for $j = 1, 2, \dots, i-1$. In this case, consider the maximum index i with this property and define $V_{\beta_i}^-$ as any 1-dimensional subspace different from $\ker_R A_{\alpha_i\beta_i} = V_{\beta_i}^+$. Then define $U_{\alpha_{j-1}}^+ := (V_{\beta_j}^-)^{\perp \beta_j\alpha_{j-1}}$ and $V_{\beta_{j-1}}^- := (U_{\alpha_{j-1}}^+)^{\perp \alpha_{j-1}\beta_j}$ for each j . Note $U_{\alpha_i}^+ = \ker_L(A_{\alpha_i\beta_i})$ if $\beta_i\alpha_i$ is rank-1. By a similar argument as Lemma 4.2 (1), we have $U_{\alpha_i}^+ \neq U_{\alpha_i}^-$ and $V_{\beta_i}^+ \neq V_{\beta_i}^-$.

The resulting labeling is valid for I^* . Indeed, we have already seen $U_{\alpha_i}^+ \neq U_{\alpha_i}^-$ and $V_{\beta_i}^+ \neq V_{\beta_i}^-$. The orthogonal property (2.2) is satisfied by the construction. As seen above, we have $(U_{\alpha_i}^+, V_{\beta_i}^+) = (\ker_L(A_{\alpha_i\beta_i}), \ker_R(A_{\alpha_i\beta_i}))$ if $\beta_i\alpha_i$ is rank-1, which implies (2.3). We need to consider the case where β_1 already belongs to a path component C . Say, β_1 is incident to $\beta_1\alpha$ (with $\alpha \neq \alpha_1$) that is an end edge of C , then the validness requires that $\beta_1\alpha$ is a $--$ -edge in I^* . If C contains α_k , then $\beta_1\alpha$ is necessarily a (rank-1) $--$ -edge (with $Y_{\beta_1} = \ker_R(A_{\alpha\beta_1})$). Otherwise we can assume by re-coloring that $\beta_1\alpha$ is a $--$ -edge. Thus we obtain a valid labeling for I^* . \square

We apply the elimination to I^* . By Lemma 4.1, the resulting set is a desired augmentation. The augmentation procedure terminates. This update can be clearly done in $O(|E|)$ time.

4.4 \mathcal{P}_m is simple and $m \geq 1$

Suppose that $m \geq 1$ and \mathcal{P}_m is simple. We consider the following condition:

(N_{inner}) For any $\ell \leq m - 2$, there is no inner space-walk \mathcal{Q} such that it admits a compatible concatenation $\mathcal{P}_\ell \circ \mathcal{Q}$ with $\beta(\mathcal{Q}) = \beta(\mathcal{P}_m) = \beta(\mathcal{Q}_m)$, and $Y(\mathcal{Q})$ is different from the initial space of $P_m \triangleleft \ker_I(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m))$.

Note that (N_{inner}) clearly holds if $m = 1$.

Suppose that (N_{inner}) is violated for some $\ell \leq m - 2$. Consider minimum such ℓ . Update \mathcal{T} as

$$\mathcal{T} \leftarrow \mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell \circ \mathcal{Q} \circ (Y(\mathcal{Q}) \triangleright P_m). \quad (4.2)$$

The resulting \mathcal{T} is a compatibly-concatenated space-walk for I . (A_{init}) clearly holds. Since $Y(\mathcal{Q})$ is different from the initial space of $P_m \triangleleft \ker_I(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m))$, we have (A_{last}) by Lemma 4.2 (2). Thus the resulting \mathcal{T} is an augmenting space-walk for I .

This update can be done in $O(|E|)$ time, since it suffices to find \mathcal{P}_ℓ and \mathcal{Q} violating (N_{inner}) and compute the front-propagation. Note that the last outer space-walk remains simple.

By re-index, we let $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \mathcal{P}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{Q}_m \circ \mathcal{P}_m$ again. (Note that the new m can be smaller than the old m .) Here θ can increase. Let Δ denote the increase of θ in the modification (4.2), where $\Delta := 0$ if θ does not increase. Then the following holds:

Lemma 4.4. $\Delta \leq |Q_m| - 1$.

Proof. It suffices to consider the case of $\Delta > 0$. Obviously, the update (4.2) does not increase N . Let F and F' denote the set of inner-double edges in the old Q_m and the new Q_m , respectively. Then $\Delta \leq |F'| - |F|$ holds. Hence it suffices to prove $|F| > 0$ if F' coincides with the new Q_m . We can assume that the initial edge of the new Q_m is a $+$ -edge. The equality $F' = Q_m$ implies that there exists an inner space-walk Q_ℓ with $\ell < m$ in \mathcal{T} including Q_m . Then the initial edge of Q_ℓ must be a $-$ -edge; otherwise \mathcal{T} violates (N_{inner}) , a contradiction. Since Q_ℓ contains both the $+$ -edge and the $-$ -edge incident to $\beta(\mathcal{P}_m)$, Q_ℓ intersects with the old Q_m . Hence $|F| > 0$, as required. \square

Now \mathcal{T} satisfies (N_{inner}) . Let C be the rank-1 connected component containing Q_m , and β^* denote the last vertex $\beta(Q_m)$ of Q_m . We can assume that the last edge of Q_m is a $+$ -edge, which implies $Y(Q_m) = V_{\beta(Q_m)}^-$. Let Q^+ and Q^- be the maximal inner walks in C such that the last vertex is β^* and the last edge is a $+$ -edge and a $-$ -edge, respectively. We denote by α^+ and α^- the initial vertices of Q^+ and of Q^- , respectively. See e.g., Figure 1. Let Y^\vee be the initial space of $P_m \triangleleft \ker_I(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m))$. Note that $V_{\beta^*}^-$ is different from Y^\vee . Consider the following two cases:

- C is a cycle component.
- C is a path component.

They are dealt with in Sections 4.4.1 and 4.4.2, respectively.

4.4.1 C is a cycle component

There are additional two cases:

- C has a rank-1 $-$ -edge.
- C has no rank-1 $-$ -edge.

Case 1: C has a rank-1 $-$ -edge. In this case, it holds that α^+ is incident to a rank-1 $-$ -edge which does not belong to Q^+ . Define

$$I' := (I \cup P_m) \setminus \{\text{all } +\text{-edges in } Q^+\}. \quad (4.3)$$

Lemma 4.5. I' satisfies (Deg), (q-Cycle), (VL), and $r(I') = r(I)$.

Proof. One can easily check that I' satisfies (Deg), (q-Cycle), and $r(I') = r(I)$. We show that I' also satisfies (VL). We can assume that $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)$ is incident to a $-$ -edge in I , since $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)$ does not belong to C . The labels on the vertices in P_m are determined in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 4.3.

Let $(\beta^* = \beta_1\alpha_1, \alpha_1\beta_2, \dots)$ be the maximal path in C consisting of rank-2 edges such that the initial vertex is β^* and the initial edge is a $-$ -edge. Then we define $U_{\alpha_i}^- := (V_{\beta_i}^+)^{\perp\beta_i\alpha_i}$ and $V_{\beta_{i-1}}^+ := (U_{\alpha_i}^-)^{\perp\alpha_i\beta_{i-1}}$ for each i . On the other hand, we do not change $U_{\alpha_i}^+$ and $V_{\beta_i}^-$. Then this labeling is valid for I' . Indeed, by (A_{last}) and Lemma 4.2 (1), we have $V_{\beta}^- \neq V_{\beta}^+$. Hence $U_{\alpha_i}^+ \neq U_{\alpha_i}^-$ and $V_{\beta_i}^+ \neq V_{\beta_i}^-$ hold for each i . \square

If I' satisfies (Path), then I' is a q-matching with $r(I') = r(I)$. Otherwise we apply the elimination operation to I' from $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)$ so that (Path) holds. The resulting set, also denoted by I' , is a q-matching with $r(I') \geq r(I)$ (in fact $r(I') = r(I)$) by Lemma 4.1.




Figure 1: Modification in Section 4.4.1. The thick lines and the thin lines represent edges in I and in $E \setminus I$, respectively. The solid lines and the wavy lines represent rank-2 edges and rank-1 edges, respectively. The blue lines and the red lines represent deleted edges from I and added edges to I by the modification (4.3), respectively. The dashed paths and the solid paths represent outer/inner space-walks in \mathcal{T} and in \mathcal{T}' , respectively.

We then modify \mathcal{T} to obtain an augmenting space-walk \mathcal{T}' for I' . Define

$$\mathcal{T}' := \mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{Q}_{m-1} \circ (\mathcal{P}_{m-1} \triangleright Q^+[\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_m), \alpha^+]), \quad (4.4)$$

where $Q^+[\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_m), \alpha^+]$ forms a truncated outer walk since all $--$ edges in Q^+ are isolated rank-2 edges in I' . See Figure 1. Then the following holds.

Lemma 4.6. \mathcal{T}' is an augmenting space-walk for I' .

Proof. \mathcal{T}' clearly satisfies (A_{init}) . By $X(\mathcal{P}_{m-1}) \neq U_{\alpha(\mathcal{P}_{m-1})}^-$ and Lemma 4.2 (2), $X(\mathcal{P}_{m-1}) \triangleright Q^+[\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_m), \alpha^+]$ forms an outer space-walk for I' , and the last space of $X(\mathcal{P}_{m-1}) \triangleright R$ is different from $U_{\alpha^+}^-$ and from $\ker_{I'}(\alpha^+) (\supseteq U_{\alpha^+}^-)$. Thus \mathcal{T}' satisfies (A_{last}) .

The new q-matching I' is obtained from I by addition and deletion. Therefore some inner and outer space-walks for I are no longer those for I' . In particular, \mathcal{P}_ℓ and \mathcal{Q}_ℓ ($\ell \leq m-1$) in (4.4) are not necessarily outer and inner space-walks for I' . We however show that such space-walks can admit another compatible concatenation structure, which results that \mathcal{T}' is a compatibly-concatenated space-walk for I' .

(1). First we examine the effect of the relabeling of V_β^+ and U_α^- on the subwalk of Q^- of rank-2 edges ending β^* in the case of $Y^\vee \neq V_{\beta^*}^+$. We may assume that the elimination cannot reach C (otherwise the relabeled vertices belong to isolated rank-2 edges in I' ; see (2) below). In this case, by (N_{inner}) , there is no outer space-walk \mathcal{P}_ℓ ending vertex α in Q^- with the last space $X(\mathcal{P}_\ell) \neq U_\alpha^+$. (Otherwise we could concatenate $\mathcal{P}_\ell \circ Q^-[\alpha, \beta^*] \circ \mathcal{P}_m$ compatibly, violating (N_{inner}) .) Consequently, if \mathcal{Q}_ℓ meets Q^- , then it is still an inner space-walk for I' with unchanged labels; it enters α with $X(\mathcal{Q}_\ell) = U_\alpha^+ = X(\mathcal{P}_{\ell-1})$, leaves β with $Y(\mathcal{Q}_\ell) = V_\beta^-$, and does not meet Q^+ (even if C is a cycle).

(2). Second we consider the effect of addition of P_m to I' , particularly when a previous outer walk P_ℓ shares edges in P_m . (We see in (4) below that such edges cannot be eliminated.) The intersection $P_m \cap P_\ell$ is the disjoint union of subwalks (each of which must consist of rank-2 edges by the irredundancy). Consider a subwalk starting α in P_m , which has (newly assigned) label U_α^+ at α by (N_{outer}) and runs abreast with P_m and labels U_\bullet^+ and V_\bullet^- . It leaves P_m at β , or it ends at $\alpha(P_m)$ with label $\ker_I(\alpha(P_m))$. For the former case, $\mathcal{P}_\ell[\alpha, \beta]$ is an inner space-walk for I' in which $\mathcal{P}_\ell[\alpha] \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell[\alpha, \beta] \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell[\beta]$ is compatibly concatenated. For the latter case, since C is a cycle, we have $\alpha(P_m) \neq \alpha^-$ and $\mathcal{P}_\ell[\alpha, \alpha(P_m)]$ is compatibly concatenated with $\mathcal{Q}_{\ell+1}$ to become a single inner space-walk for I' . The other possible subwalk starts at initial vertex β^* of P_m . In this case, \mathcal{Q}_ℓ stretches to a single inner space-walk $\mathcal{Q}_\ell \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell[\beta]$ or $\mathcal{Q}_\ell \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell \circ \mathcal{Q}_{\ell+1}$, compatibly concatenated with the next space-walk.

(3). Third we consider the effect of deletion of the $+$ -edges in Q^+ from I . Suppose that \mathcal{Q}_ℓ shares edges in Q^+ . By (2) above and re-index, we can regard $\mathcal{P}_{\ell-1}$ and \mathcal{P}_ℓ as outer space-walks for I' . By (N_{inner}) , the intersection $\mathcal{Q}_\ell \cap Q^+$ is a subwalk such that it starts at the $--$ -edge $\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_\ell)\beta'$ with $X(\mathcal{Q}_\ell) = U_{\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_\ell)}^- = X(\mathcal{P}_{\ell-1})$ or it starts at the $+$ -edge $\beta^*\alpha'$ with the subspace $V_{\beta^*}^+$ at β^* . For the former case, $\mathcal{P}_{\ell-1} \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell$ is a single outer space-walk for I' if it leaves a vertex β in Q^+ , and $\mathcal{P}_\ell \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell = (\mathcal{P}_\ell \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell[\alpha^+]) \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell[\alpha^+]$ is a compatible concatenation of outer and inner paths for I' otherwise (i.e., it ends at α^+). The latter case is similar: $\mathcal{Q}_\ell \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell = \mathcal{Q}_\ell[\beta^*] \circ (\mathcal{Q}_\ell[\beta^*] \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell)$ is a compatible concatenation of inner and outer paths, or $\mathcal{Q}_\ell = \mathcal{Q}_\ell[\beta^*] \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell[\beta^*, \alpha^+] \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell[\alpha^+]$ is that of inner, outer, and inner space-walks.

(4). Finally we consider the effect of elimination operation. It occurs precisely when the last vertex $\alpha(P_m)$ of P_m is not incident to any edge in I and the last edge of P_m is rank-2. By (N_{outer}) , removed edges in P_m cannot be shared by any previous outer walk P_ℓ . Furthermore, if all edges in P_m are rank-2, then the elimination enters C and removes all $--$ -edges in Q^- . Hence we have to consider the situation where some inner space-walk \mathcal{Q}_ℓ meets Q^- . By the same argument as (1), (N_{inner}) implies that \mathcal{Q}_ℓ must start at $+$ -edge in Q^- with $X(\mathcal{Q}_\ell) = U_{\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_\ell)}^+ = X(\mathcal{P}_{\ell-1})$, leaves $\beta(\mathcal{Q}_\ell)$ with $Y(\mathcal{Q}_\ell) = V_{\beta(\mathcal{Q}_\ell)}^-$ (and does not meet Q^+ even if C is a cycle). Now, if \mathcal{Q}_ℓ is included in Q^- , then $\mathcal{P}_{\ell-1} \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell$ is a single outer space-walk for I' . Otherwise \mathcal{Q}_ℓ passes through the initial vertex α^- of Q^- . Then $\mathcal{P}_{\ell-1} \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell[\alpha]$ is a single outer space-walk compatible with the inner space-walk $\mathcal{Q}_\ell[\alpha]$.

Summarizing, \mathcal{T}' is viewed as a compatibly-concatenated space-walk for I' . \square

Let $(I, \mathcal{T}) \leftarrow (I', \mathcal{T}')$. This update can be done in $O(|E|)$ time, since we can compute the front-propagation in $O(|E|)$ time. The following holds on θ :

Lemma 4.7. θ decreases by at least $|Q_m|$.

Proof. An edge $\alpha\beta \in Q_m$ contributes only to N if $\alpha\beta$ was used only once in \mathcal{T} , and to N and D_{inner} if $\alpha\beta$ was used twice in \mathcal{T} . In the former case, by the transformation (4.5), $\alpha\beta$ exits the extended support of \mathcal{T} , decreasing N by one. In the latter case, $\alpha\beta$ exits an inner space-walk, decreasing D_{inner} by one. \square

By Lemma 4.7, the quantity of θ decrease by at least $|Q_m|$. Hence the difference of θ between the one before (4.2) and the one after (4.4) is bounded by $\Delta - |Q_m|$; θ strictly decreases by Lemma 4.4. Return to the initial stage (Section 4.2).

Case 2: C has no rank-1 $--$ -edge. Define

$$I' := I \setminus \{\text{all } +- \text{edges in } C\}.$$

It is clear that I' is a q -matching with $r(I') = r(I)$. Suppose that C consists of the disjoint union of Q_m and Q . Note that $Q \circ P_m$ is a truncated outer walk for I' .

Suppose that $\mathcal{P}_{m-1} \triangleright (Q \circ P_m)$ forms a single outer space-walk for I' and its last space is different from $\ker_I(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)) = \ker_{I'}(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m))$. Then define

$$\mathcal{T}' := \mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{Q}_{m-1} \circ (\mathcal{P}_{m-1} \triangleright (Q \circ P_m)). \quad (4.5)$$

This is an augmenting space-walk for I' . Indeed, (A_{init}) is obvious. By (N_{inner}) , every inner space-walk \mathcal{Q}_ℓ ($\ell \leq m-1$) sharing edges in C starts at a $--$ edge with $X(\mathcal{Q}_\ell) = U_{\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_\ell)}^- = X(\mathcal{P}_{\ell-1})$. By the same argument as (3) in Lemma 4.6, $\mathcal{P}_{\ell-1} \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell$ forms a single outer space-walk for I' . (A_{last}) immediately follows from the assumption on $\mathcal{P}_{m-1} \triangleright (Q \circ P_m)$.

Let $(I, \mathcal{T}) \leftarrow (I', \mathcal{T}')$. This update can be done in $O(|E|)$ time, since we can compute the front-propagation in $O(|E|)$ time. By the same argument as in Lemma 4.7, θ strictly decreases. Return to the initial stage (Section 4.2).

Suppose not. In this case, we obtain an augmenting space-walk \mathcal{T}' for I (not for I') such that the situation reduces to Case 1. By the assumption, the propagated space Y of $\mathcal{P}_{m-1} \triangleright (Q \circ P_m)$ at $\beta^* = \beta(\mathcal{Q}_m) = \beta(Q)$ coincides with Y^\vee . Note $Y^\vee \neq V_{\beta^*}^-$. We also have $Y^\vee \neq V_{\beta^*}^+$. Indeed, by the compatibility of $(\mathcal{P}_{m-1}, \mathcal{Q}_m)$, we have $X(\mathcal{P}_{m-1}) \neq U_{\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_m)}^-$. Hence Y is different from $V_{\beta^*}^+$. It also holds that $X(\mathcal{P}_{m-1}) \neq U_{\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_m)}^+$ and no rank-1 edge exists in Q . Indeed, otherwise the propagated space of $\mathcal{P}_{m-1} \triangleright (Q \circ P_m)$ at β^* is $V_{\beta^*}^- \neq Y^\vee$. Thus define

$$\mathcal{T}' := \mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{P}_{m-1} \circ \mathcal{Q} \circ (V_{\beta^*}^+ \triangleright P_m), \quad (4.6)$$

where $\mathcal{Q} = (U_{\alpha_1}^-, \alpha_1\beta_1, V_{\beta_1}^+, \beta_1\alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k\beta_k, V_{\beta_k}^+ = V_{\beta^*}^+)$ is the inner space-walk corresponding to Q . Then \mathcal{T}' is an augmenting space-walk for I . Indeed, (A_{init}) clearly holds. The compatibility of $(\mathcal{P}_{m-1}, \mathcal{Q})$ follows from $X(\mathcal{P}_{m-1}) \neq U_{\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_m)}^+$. By $Y^\vee \neq V_{\beta^*}^+$ and Lemma 4.2, we have (A_{last}) .

Let $(I, \mathcal{T}) \leftarrow (I', \mathcal{T}')$. This update can be done in $O(|E|)$ time, since we can construct the inner space-walk \mathcal{Q} and compute the front-propagation $V_{\beta^*}^+ \triangleright P_m$ in $O(|E|)$ time. The following holds on θ :

Lemma 4.8. θ decreases by at least Δ .

Proof. By the proof of Lemma 4.4, Δ is at most the number $\tilde{\Delta}$ of inner-double edges in \mathcal{Q}_m . By (N_{inner}) and $V_{\beta^*}^+ \neq Y^\vee \neq V_{\beta^*}^-$, there is no outer space-walk \mathcal{P}_ℓ with $\ell < m-1$ that intersects Q . Hence, in the transformation (4.6), the last inner walk \mathcal{Q} of \mathcal{T}' has no inner-double edge by (N_{inner}) . Thus θ decreases by at least $\tilde{\Delta}$. \square

By Lemmas 4.4 and 4.8, θ is not greater than that in the beginning of Section 4.4. Now \mathcal{T} satisfies (N_{inner}) . Since there was at least one $+-$ edge in C by $(q\text{-Cycle})$ and the last edge of the last inner space-walk \mathcal{Q} of \mathcal{T} is a $--$ edge, the resulting augmenting space-walk \mathcal{T} also satisfies the assumption of Case 1. Go to Case 1 (with $\Delta = 0$).

4.4.2 C is a path component

In this case, as in the previous case (Section 4.4.1), let I' be defined by (4.3).

Lemma 4.9. I' satisfies (Deg) , $(q\text{-Cycle})$, (VL) , and $r(I') = r(I)$.

Proof. In addition to the proof of Lemma 4.5, we need to consider the case where $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)$ belongs to C and $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)$ is incident to a $+-$ edge $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)\beta'$ of C in I . In this case, $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)$ and α^+ belong to the same connected component C' of $I \setminus \{\text{all } +- \text{edges in } Q^+\}$; note that β^* does not belong to C' . Thus, after deleting the $+-$ edges in Q^+ , we swap the signs $+$ and $-$ for all edges in C'

and the corresponding valid labelings so that $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)\beta'$ is a $--$ edge. This coloring matches that of the resulting component containing β^* . Then the labels on the vertices in P_m are determined in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 4.5. \square

If I' satisfies (Path), then I' is a q-matching with $r(I') = r(I)$. Otherwise we apply the elimination operation to I' from $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)$. The resulting set, also denoted by I' , is a q-matching with $r(I') \geq r(I)$ by Lemma 4.1.

We consider additional two patterns:

(A) $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m) = \alpha^+$.

(B) $\deg_I(\beta^*) = 1$.

If neither (A) nor (B) holds, then define \mathcal{T}' as (4.4). If $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m) \neq \alpha^-$, then, by the same argument as in Lemma 4.6 (Case 1 of Section 4.4.1), \mathcal{T}' is an augmenting space-walk for I' . If $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m) = \alpha^-$, then we need to consider the effect of addition of P_m to I' in addition to Lemma 4.6 (2). Suppose that a previous outer walk P_ℓ shares edges in P_m . Then it can happen that P_m ends at α^- with label $\ker_I(\alpha^-)$ since C is a path component. In this case, the maximal common suffix of P_m and P_ℓ is compatibly concatenated with $\mathcal{Q}_{\ell+1} \cap \mathcal{Q}^-$ to become a single inner space-walk for I' . By the same argument as in Lemma 4.7, the difference of θ between the one before (4.2) and the one after this update is bounded by $\Delta - |Q_m|$; θ strictly decreases by Lemma 4.4. Return to the initial stage (Section 4.2).

In the following, we consider the case where (A) or (B) holds.

Case 1: Only (A) holds. Suppose first that the last edge of \mathcal{P}_m is rank-1. In this case, the elimination does not occur. Define \mathcal{T}' as (4.4). Then \mathcal{T}' is an augmenting space-walk for I' . Indeed, \mathcal{T}' satisfies (A_{init}) and is a compatibly-concatenated space-walk for I' by the same argument as in Lemma 4.6. (A) implies that $\deg_I(\alpha^+) = 1$ and α^+ is incident to a rank-1 in I . Hence the last space of $\mathcal{P}_{m-1} \triangleright \mathcal{Q}^+[\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_m), \alpha^+]$ is $\ker_I(\alpha^+) \neq \{0\}$. On the other hand, since \mathcal{T} satisfies (A_{last}) for I , $X(\mathcal{P}_m)$ is different from $\ker_I(\alpha^+)$. By $\ker_{I'}(\alpha^+) = \ker_{I'}(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)) = X(\mathcal{P}_m)$, \mathcal{T}' satisfies (A_{last}) for I' .

Suppose next that the last edge of \mathcal{P}_m is rank-2. Then the elimination from $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)$ occurs; let D denote the set of removed edges by the elimination. Consider the path $P_m \cup \mathcal{Q}^-$. Denote by α^* the farthest vertex from $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)$ in $P_m \cup \mathcal{Q}^-$ such that it is incident to a deleted edge in D . Let R be the subpath in $P_m \cup \mathcal{Q}^-$ from $\alpha^+ = \alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)$ to α^* . Note here that its direction is the reverse of P_m , and $\ker_{I'}(\alpha^*) \neq \{0\}$. See Figure 2.

Consider outer space-walks \mathcal{P}_ℓ ($\ell \leq m$) having the following property.

(p1) P_ℓ meets $R \cap P_m$.

Note that \mathcal{P}_m always satisfies (p1).

We next classify previous inner space-walks Q_k ($k \leq m-1$) meeting R (when the elimination enters \mathcal{Q}^-). In this case, it holds $\alpha^* = \alpha^-$.

(q1-1) \mathcal{Q}_k meets $R \cap \mathcal{Q}^-$ and $\mathcal{P}_{k-1} \triangleright \mathcal{Q}^-[\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_k), \alpha^-]$ is an outer space-walk for I' such that its last space is different from $\ker_{I'}(\alpha^-) \neq \{0\}$.

(q1-2) \mathcal{Q}_k meets $R \cap \mathcal{Q}^-$ such that it is not the case of (q1-1).

Choose \mathcal{P}_ℓ with minimum ℓ satisfying (p1). Also choose Q_k with minimum k satisfying (q1-1). (If such an index does not exist, we let it to be $+\infty$ below.) Suppose $\ell < k$. If $\ell < m$, then




Figure 2: Modification in Case 1 of Section 4.4.2; the definitions of all lines and paths are the same as in fig. 1.

there is α in P_ℓ such that α is incident to an edge in D and $\mathcal{P}_\ell[\alpha]$ does not meet D except α . Indeed, otherwise \mathcal{Q}_ℓ satisfies (q1-1), a contradiction to $\ell < k$. Define

$$\mathcal{T}' := \begin{cases} \mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell \circ (\mathcal{P}_\ell[\alpha] \triangleright R[\alpha, \alpha^*]) & \text{if } \ell < m, \\ \mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{Q}_{m-1} \circ (\mathcal{P}_{m-1} \triangleright (Q^+[\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_m), \alpha^+] \circ R)) & \text{if } \ell = m, \end{cases} \quad (4.7)$$

where $R[\alpha, \alpha^*]$ and $Q^+[\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_m), \alpha^+] \circ R$ form truncated outer-walk since all edges in $I' \cap (Q^+[\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_m), \alpha^+] \circ R)$ are isolated rank-2 edges. If $k \leq \ell$, then define

$$\mathcal{T}' := \mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{Q}_{k-1} \circ (\mathcal{P}_{k-1} \triangleright Q^-[\alpha(\mathcal{P}_{k-1}), \alpha^-]), \quad (4.8)$$

where $Q^-[\alpha(\mathcal{P}_k), \alpha^-]$ forms a truncated outer-walk.

Lemma 4.10. *If $\ell < k$, then \mathcal{T}' of the form (4.7) is an augmenting space-walk for I' . If $k \geq \ell$, then \mathcal{T}' of the form (4.8) is an augmenting space-walk for I' .*

Proof. (A_{init}) is obvious. If the elimination from $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)$ stops within P_m , then $\ker_{I'}(\alpha^*) (\neq \{0\})$ is the space of \mathcal{P}_m at α^* . Otherwise we have $\alpha^* = \alpha^-$ and hence $\ker_{I'}(\alpha^*) \supseteq U_{\alpha^-}^+$.

We first consider the case of $\ell < k$, particularly, $\ell < \min(m, k)$; the case of $\ell = m < k$ is similar. By (N_{outer}), the space X of \mathcal{P}_ℓ at α is equal to the propagated space of $P_m \triangleleft \ker_I(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m))$ at α . If the elimination from $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)$ stops within P_m , then the last space X^* of $X \triangleright R[\alpha, \alpha^*]$ is the propagated space of $P_m \triangleleft \ker_I(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m))$ at α^* . By Lemma 4.2 (1), $\mathcal{P}_\ell[\alpha] \triangleright R[\alpha, \alpha^*]$ forms an outer space-walk for I' . Also we have $X^* \neq \ker_{I'}(\alpha^*)$. Hence \mathcal{T}' of the form (4.7) satisfies (A_{last}). If the elimination enters Q^- , then the propagated space of $X \triangleright R[\alpha, \alpha^*]$ at β^* is Y^\vee . By $Y^\vee \neq V_{\beta^*}$, the last space of $X \triangleright R[\alpha, \alpha^*]$ is different from $U_{\alpha^-}^+$. Thus \mathcal{T}' of the form (4.7) satisfies (A_{last}).

For the case of $k \leq \ell$, the assumption of (q1-1) immediately implies that \mathcal{T}' of the form (4.7) satisfies (A_{last}).

Finally we see previous inner space-walks $Q_{k'}$ satisfying (q1-2), where $k' \leq \ell$ if $\ell < k$, and $k' < k$ if $k \leq \ell$. If the last space $X(\mathcal{P}_{k'-1})$ is different from $U_{\alpha(\mathcal{P}_{k'-1})}^+$, then $Q_{k'}$ satisfies (q1-1), which contradicts the minimality of k . Hence we have $X(\mathcal{P}_{k'-1}) = U_{\alpha(\mathcal{P}_{k'-1})}^+$. By the same argument as (4) in Lemma 4.6, if $Q_{k'}$ is included in Q^- , then $\mathcal{P}_{k'-1} \circ Q_{k'} \circ \mathcal{P}_{k'}$ is a single outer space-walk for I' . If $Q_{k'}$ passes through the initial vertex α^- of Q^- , then $\mathcal{P}_{k'-1} \circ Q_{k'}(\alpha^-)$ is a single outer space-walk compatible with the inner space-walk $Q_{k'}[\alpha^-]$. Hence \mathcal{T}' is a compatibly-concatenated space-walk.

Summarizing, \mathcal{T}' is an augmenting space-walk. \square

Let $(I, \mathcal{T}) \leftarrow (I', \mathcal{T}')$. This update can be done in $O(|E|)$ time, since we can find \mathcal{P}_ℓ satisfying (p1) or Q_k satisfying (q1-1), and compute several front-propagation in $O(|E|)$ time. By the same argument as in Lemma 4.4, the quantity of θ decrease by at least $|Q_m|$. Recall that we execute the transformations in Case 2 of Section 4.4.2 after the update (4.2). Hence the difference of θ between the one before (4.2) and the one after the transformations in Case 2 of Section 4.4.2 is bounded by $\Delta - |Q_m|$; θ strictly decreases by Lemma 4.4. Return to the initial stage (Section 4.2).

Case 2: Only (B) holds. Let \mathcal{T}' be defined as (4.4). By $\deg_{I'}(\beta^*) = 1$, the elimination operation is applied from β^* if the edge incident to β^* in I' is rank-2. If such elimination does not occur, then the procedure is precisely the same as Case 1 of Section 4.4.2. Suppose that such elimination occurs. There are two cases: the elimination from β^* stops within P_m and the elimination goes through P_m to enter the rank-1 component C' (for I) containing $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)$. The latter occurs precisely when all edges of P_m are rank-2 and $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)$ has degree one in I . We will deal with the both cases simultaneously.

Let D denote the set of removed edges by the elimination from β^* . Our main analysis concerns the situations where previous inner and outer space-walks meet edges in D . Consider the path $P_m \cup C'$, where $C' = \emptyset$ if $\deg_I(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)) = 0$. Let β^0 be the farthest vertex from β^* in $P_m \cup C'$ such that it is incident to a deleted edge in D . Let L be the subpath in $P_m \cup C'$ from β^0 to β^* . Note here that its direction is the reverse of P_m , and $\ker_I(\beta^0) \neq \{0\}$. We may assume that all edges in $D \cap L$ are $+$ -edges.

Consider previous outer space-walks \mathcal{P}_ℓ ($\ell \leq m-1$) having the following property.

- (p2) \mathcal{P}_ℓ meets $L \cap P_m$ and does not end at $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)$, i.e., there is a vertex β in P_m such that $\mathcal{P}_\ell[\beta]$ meets P_m only at β .

See Figure 3. In the case where the elimination stops within P_m , the outer space-walk \mathcal{P}_ℓ meeting D always satisfies (p).

We next classify previous inner space-walks Q_k ($k \leq m-1$) meeting L (when the elimination enters the rank-1 component C' of I) as follows:

- (q2-0) Q_k passes through β^0 to enter L and leaves L at β with label V_β^+ .
- (q2-1) Q_k starts with $+$ -edge in L and leaves L at β with label V_β^- .
- (q2-2) Q_k starts with $--$ -edge in L and leaves L at β with label V_β^+ such that $\mathcal{P}_{k-1} \triangleright (Q_k \circ P_k)$ is an outer space-walk for I' and compatibly concatenated with Q_{k+1} .
- (q2-3) Q_k starts with $--$ -edge in L and leaves L at β with label V_β^+ such that it is not the case of (q2-2).

Note that if \mathcal{P}_ℓ ends at $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)$, then $\ell < m-1$ and the next $Q_{\ell+1}$ is in the case of (q2-1).




Figure 3: Modification in Case 2 of Section 4.4.2; the definitions of all lines and paths are the same as in Figure 1.

Choose P_ℓ with maximum ℓ satisfying (p2). Also choose Q_k with maximum k satisfying (q2-1) or (q2-3). (If such an index does not exist, we let it to be $-\infty$ below.) If $\ell \geq k$ and $\ell > -\infty$, then consider the vertex β in (p2), and replace the prefix $\mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell$ of \mathcal{T}' by

$$(\ker_{I'}(\beta^0) \triangleright L(\beta)) \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell[\beta]. \quad (4.9)$$

If $\ell < k$, then consider the vertex β in (q2-1) or (q2-3), replace the prefix $\mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{Q}_k \circ \mathcal{P}_k$ of \mathcal{T}' by

$$\ker_{I'}(\beta^0) \triangleright (L(\beta) \circ P_k). \quad (4.10)$$

For each inner space-walk $Q_{k'}$ satisfying (q2-2) with $k' \geq \max(\ell, k)$, replace the subsequence $\mathcal{P}_{k'-1} \circ Q_{k'} \circ \mathcal{P}_{k'}$ by a single outer space-walk $\mathcal{P}_{k'-1} \triangleright (Q_{k'} \circ P_{k'})$.

Lemma 4.11. \mathcal{T}' is an augmenting space-walk for I' .

Proof. Assume that the elimination operation is applied from β^* . By the same argument as in Lemma 4.6, (A_{last}) holds. Consider (A_{init}) . If we do not replace the prefix $\mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell$ of \mathcal{T}' in the update, i.e., $\ell = k = -\infty$, obviously (A_{init}) holds. Otherwise we replace it by either (4.9) or (4.10).

Suppose the former case ($\ell \geq k$ and $\ell > -\infty$). By (N_{outer}) , the subspace of \mathcal{P}_ℓ at β is equal to the propagated space of $P_m \triangleleft \ker_I(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m))$ at β . Furthermore one can see that the last space of $\ker_{I'}(\beta^0) \triangleright L(\beta)$ coincides with the propagated space of $P_m \triangleleft \ker_I(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m))$ at β as follows. If L is included in P_m , $\ker_{I'}(\beta^0)$ is the propagated space of $P_m \triangleleft \ker_I(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m))$ at β^0 , which implies the desired identity. Suppose that L properly includes P_m . Since L is a subpath in a rank-1 connected component, $\ker_{I'}(\beta^0) = V_{\beta^0}^-$ if $\deg_{I'}(\beta^0) = 1$, and $\ker_{I'}(\beta^0) = V_{\beta^0}$ if $\deg_{I'}(\beta^0) = 0$. The propagated space of $\ker_{I'}(\beta^0) \triangleright L$ at $\gamma \in L$ is equal to $V_{\beta'}^-$ if $\gamma = \beta'$ (except for $\gamma = \beta^0$ in case of $\deg_{I'}(\beta^0) = 0$) and to $U_{\alpha'}^+$ if $\gamma = \alpha'$. Hence the propagated space of $\ker_{I'}(\beta^0) \triangleright L$ at $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)$ is equal to $U_{\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)}^+$, implying the desired identity. Thus $(\ker_{I'}(\beta^0) \triangleright L(\beta)) \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell[\beta]$ forms an outer space-walk for I' , implying (A_{init}) . In addition, $(\ker_{I'}(\beta^0) \triangleright L(\beta)) \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell[\beta]$ is clearly compatible with Q_ℓ .

Suppose the latter case ($\ell < k$). If Q_k satisfies (q2-1), then the propagated space of $\ker_{I'}(\beta^0) \triangleright L$ at β is $V_{\beta'}^-$ by the above argument, which coincides with the subspace of Q_k at β . Hence $\ker_{I'}(\beta^0) \triangleright (L(\beta) \circ P_k)$ forms a single outer space-walk for I' . In addition, since the last space of

$\ker_{I'}(\beta^0) \triangleright (L(\beta] \circ P_k)$ coincides with that of \mathcal{P}_k , $\ker_{I'}(\beta^0) \triangleright (L(\beta] \circ P_k)$ is compatible with \mathcal{Q}_{k+1} . If \mathcal{Q}_k satisfies (q2-3), then we have $X(\mathcal{P}_{k-1}) \neq U_{\alpha(\mathcal{P}_{k-1})}^-$. Indeed, otherwise the last space of \mathcal{P}_{k-1} coincides with $Y(\mathcal{Q}_k)$, which contradicts the compatibility of $(\mathcal{Q}_k, \mathcal{P}_k)$. Thus, by Lemma 4.2, $\ker_{I'}(\beta^0) \triangleright (L(\beta] \circ P_k) = (\ker_{I'}(\beta^0) \triangleright L(\beta]) \circ (V_{\beta}^- \triangleright P_k)$ forms a single outer space-walk for I' . In addition, the last space of $\ker_{I'}(\beta^0) \triangleright (L(\beta] \circ P_k)$ is different from that of $\mathcal{P}_{k-1} \triangleright (\mathcal{Q}_k \circ P_k)$, implying that $\ker_{I'}(\beta^0) \triangleright (L(\beta] \circ P_k)$ is compatible with \mathcal{Q}_{k+1} .

We next show that \mathcal{T}' is a compatibly-concatenated space-walk for I' . We have already seen the compatibility between the first outer space-walk and the first inner space-walk in \mathcal{T}' above. We have already dealt in (3) and (4) in Lemma 4.6 with the cases where some $\mathcal{Q}_{k'}$ with $\max(\ell, k) < k' < m$ meets deleted edges in \mathcal{Q}^+ and where some $\mathcal{P}_{k'}$ with $\max(\ell, k) < k' < m$ meets undeleted edges in P_m , respectively: $\mathcal{P}_{k'-1} \circ \mathcal{Q}_{k'} \circ \mathcal{P}_{k'}$ forms a concatenation of outer and inner space-walks for I' in the former case, and $\mathcal{P}_{k'} \circ \mathcal{Q}_{k'+1}$ forms a concatenation of outer and inner space-walks for I' in the latter case.

Thus it suffices to see previous inner space-walks $\mathcal{Q}_{k'}$ with $\max(\ell, k) < k' < m$ satisfying (q2-0) or (q2-2). Suppose that $\mathcal{Q}_{k'}$ satisfies (q2-0). Then, by the same argument as (3) in Lemma 4.6, $\mathcal{Q}_{k'}(\beta^0]$ remains an inner space-walk and $\mathcal{Q}_{k'}(\beta^0] \circ \mathcal{P}_{k'}$ forms an outer space-walk for I' . The compatibility of $\mathcal{Q}_{k'}(\beta^0]$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{k'}(\beta^0] \circ \mathcal{P}_{k'}$ clearly holds. Suppose that $\mathcal{Q}_{k'}$ satisfies (q2-2). Obviously $\mathcal{P}_{k'-1} \triangleright (\mathcal{Q}_{k'} \circ P_{k'})$ forms an outer space-walk for I' . The assumption says that $\mathcal{P}_{k'-1} \triangleright (\mathcal{Q}_{k'} \circ P_{k'})$ is compatible with $\mathcal{Q}_{k'+1}$. \square

Let $(I, \mathcal{T}) \leftarrow (I', \mathcal{T}')$. By the same argument as in Case 1, this update can be done in $O(|E|)$ time and θ strictly decreases. Return to the initial stage (Section 4.2).

Case 3: Both (A) and (B) hold. If P_m has a rank-1 edge, then we can simply combine the arguments in Cases 1 and 2 above. That is, we first define \mathcal{T}' as (4.4) if the last edge of P_m is rank-1, and as (4.7) if the last edge of P_m is rank-2. Note here that, by $\mathcal{Q}^- = \emptyset$, there is no inner space-walks in \mathcal{T}' satisfying (q1-1) or (q1-2) in Case 1. Let \mathcal{R} be the maximum prefix of \mathcal{T}' that coincides with a prefix of \mathcal{T} . Namely, if the last edge of P_m is rank-1, or the last edge of P_m is rank-2 and $\ell = m$ in (4.7), then $\mathcal{R} := \mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{Q}_{m-1} \circ \mathcal{P}_{m-1}$, and if the last edge of P_m is rank-2 and $\ell < m$ in (4.7), then $\mathcal{R} := \mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{Q}_{\ell} \circ \mathcal{P}_{\ell}(\alpha]$, where the definitions of ℓ and α are given in Case 1. Let ℓ denote the last index of \mathcal{R} again.

In addition, suppose that there is $\mathcal{P}_{\ell'}$ with $\ell' \leq \ell$ such that it satisfies (p2) with β belonging to \mathcal{R} in Case 2. Then, for such maximum ℓ' , we replace the prefix $\mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{P}_{\ell'}$ of \mathcal{T}' by $(\ker_{I'}(\beta^0) \triangleright L(\beta]) \circ \mathcal{P}_{\ell'}[\beta]$ as (4.9). Here the definitions of β and β^0 are given in Case 2. Note that, since P_m has a rank-1 edge, there is no inner space-walk in \mathcal{T}' satisfying (q2-0), (q2-1), (q2-2), or (q2-3) in Case 2. By the same arguments as in the proofs of Lemmas 4.10 and 4.11, the resulting \mathcal{T}' is an augmenting space-walk for I' .

Let $(I, \mathcal{T}) \leftarrow (I', \mathcal{T}')$. By the same arguments as in Cases 1 and 2, this update can be done in $O(|E|)$ time and θ strictly decreases. Return to the initial stage (Section 4.2).

Suppose that P_m has no rank-1 edge. Then one can see $r(I') > r(I)$. Thus the resulting set is a desired augmentation. The augmentation procedure terminates. This update can be clearly done in $O(|E|)$ time.

4.5 \mathcal{P}_m is not simple

Suppose that the last outer space-walk \mathcal{P}_m of \mathcal{T} is not simple. Let β_0 be the vertex such that $\mathcal{P}_m[\beta_0)$ contains β_0 twice and the other vertices once; such β_0 exists by the assumption. Then \mathcal{P}_m is of the form

$$\mathcal{P}_m = (\dots, X_0, \alpha_0 \beta_0, Y_0, \beta_0 \alpha_1, X_1, \alpha_1 \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_k \beta_k = \alpha_0 \beta_0, Y_k, \beta_k \alpha_{k+1}, \dots),$$




Figure 4: Modification in Section 4.5.1; the definitions of all lines and paths are the same as in Figure 1.

where $\beta_0\alpha_1, \alpha_1\beta_1, \dots$ are distinct. Let us denote by \mathcal{P}_m^\vee the back-propagation $P_m \triangleleft \ker_I(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m))$, which has been already computed in the initial stage (Section 4.2). For $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k$, let X_i^\vee and Y_i^\vee be the subspaces of \mathcal{P}_m^\vee at α_i and at β_i , respectively. By (N_{outer}) , we have $X_0 = X_k^\vee$. Consider the two cases: all $\beta_0\alpha_1, \beta_1\alpha_2, \dots, \beta_{k-1}\alpha_k$ are rank-2, and at least one of $\beta_0\alpha_1, \beta_1\alpha_2, \dots, \beta_{k-1}\alpha_k$ is rank-1.

4.5.1 All $\beta_0\alpha_1, \beta_1\alpha_2, \dots, \beta_{k-1}\alpha_k$ are rank-2

Define

$$I' := (I \cup \{\beta_0\alpha_1, \beta_1\alpha_2, \dots, \beta_{k-1}\alpha_k\}) \setminus \{\alpha_k\beta_k = \alpha_0\beta_0, \alpha_1\beta_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}\beta_{k-1}\}.$$

It is clear that I' is a q-matching with $r(I') = r(I)$.

We then modify \mathcal{T} to obtain an augmenting space-walk \mathcal{T}' for I' as follows. Let \mathcal{P}_ℓ be the first outer space-walk in \mathcal{T} that intersects with $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k = \alpha_0$; note that such ℓ exists since \mathcal{P}_m contains them. Let α be the first appearance of such a vertex in \mathcal{P}_ℓ , and suppose $\alpha = \alpha_s$. By (N_{outer}) , the subspace at α in \mathcal{P}_ℓ coincides with X_s^\vee . Then define

$$\mathcal{T}' := \mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell(\alpha) \circ \mathcal{P}_m^\vee[\alpha_s, \beta_0] \circ (Y_0^\vee \triangleright P_m[\beta_k]). \quad (4.11)$$

See Figure 4.

We show that \mathcal{T}' is an augmenting space-walk for I' . (A_{init}) is obvious. Since $X_k^\vee \neq X_k$ and all $\beta_0\alpha_1, \beta_1\alpha_2, \dots, \beta_{k-1}\alpha_k$ are rank-2, we have $Y_0^\vee \neq Y_0$. Also, by $X_0 = X_k^\vee$, we have $Y_0 = Y_k^\vee$. Thus the last space Y_0^\vee of $\mathcal{P}_m^\vee[\alpha_s, \beta_0]$ is different from Y_k^\vee . By Lemma 4.2 (2), the last space of $Y_0^\vee \triangleright P_m[\beta_k]$ does not include $\ker_I(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m))$. This implies (A_{last}) . By the definitions of \mathcal{P}_ℓ and α , the prefix $\mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell(\alpha)$ does not intersect with $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k$ except for α . Hence $\mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell(\alpha)$ remains a compatibly-concatenated space-walk for I' . In addition, since $\alpha_s\beta_{s-1}, \beta_{s-1}\alpha_{s-1}, \dots, \alpha_1\beta_0$ are distinct, $\mathcal{P}_\ell(\alpha) \circ \mathcal{P}_m^\vee[\alpha_s, \beta_0] \circ (Y_0^\vee \triangleright P_m[\beta_k])$ forms a single outer space-walk for I' , which is clearly compatible with \mathcal{Q}_ℓ . These imply that \mathcal{T}' is an augmenting space-walk for I' .

Let $(I, \mathcal{T}) \leftarrow (I', \mathcal{T}')$. This update can be done in $O(|E|)$ time, since we can find such \mathcal{P}_ℓ in (4.11) and compute the front-propagation in $O(|E|)$ time. Furthermore D_{inner} does not increase and N strictly decreases; the edge $\alpha_0\beta_0 = \alpha_k\beta_k$ exits the extended support of the new \mathcal{T} . Hence θ strictly decreases. Return to the initial stage (Section 4.2).

4.5.2 At least one of $\beta_0\alpha_1, \beta_1\alpha_2, \dots, \beta_{k-1}\alpha_k$ is rank-1

Let r be the maximum index with $1 \leq r \leq k$ such that $\beta_{r-1}\alpha_r$ is rank-1. Then define

$$I' := (I \cup P_m[\beta_0]) \setminus \{\alpha_r\beta_r, \alpha_{r+1}\beta_{r+1}, \dots, \alpha_k\beta_k\}.$$

Lemma 4.12. I' satisfies (Deg), (q-Cycle), (VL), and $r(I') = r(I)$.

Proof. We can easily see that I' satisfies (Deg), (q-Cycle), and $r(I') = r(I)$. We show that I' satisfies (VL). We may assume that $\beta_k\alpha_{k+1}$ is a $--$ -edge in I' , namely, $\beta_k\alpha_{k+1}, \beta_{k+1}\alpha_{k+2}, \dots$ are $--$ -edges and $\beta_0\alpha_1, \beta_1\alpha_2, \dots, \beta_{r-1}\alpha_r$ are $+-$ -edges. For each α, β belonging to $P_m[\beta_k]$, define U_α^+ and V_β^- as in Lemma 4.3. Note $V_{\beta_i}^- = \ker_R(A_{\alpha_{i+1}\beta_i})$ if $\beta_i\alpha_{i+1}$ with $i \geq k$ is rank-1. For α, β belonging to $P_m[\alpha_r, \beta_0]$, define U_α^+ and V_β^- as the propagated spaces of $P_m[\alpha_r, \beta_0] \triangleleft V_{\beta_k}^-$ at α and at β , respectively. Here $V_{\beta_k}^- = Y_k^\vee$ holds by (N_{outer}). Note $U_{\alpha_{i+1}}^+ = \ker_L(A_{\alpha_{i+1}\beta_i})$ if $\beta_i\alpha_{i+1}$ with $0 \leq i \leq r-1$ is rank-1.

Next define $U_{\alpha_r}^-$ as any 1-dimensional subspace of U_{α_r} different from $U_{\alpha_r}^+ = \ker_L(A_{\alpha_r\beta_{r-1}})$, where $\ker_L(A_{\alpha_r\beta_{r-1}})$ is equal to the space of \mathcal{P}_m at α_r . Then, for each α, β belonging to $P_m[\alpha_r, \beta_0] \circ P_m[\beta_k]$, define U_α^- and V_β^+ as the propagated spaces of $U_{\alpha_r}^- \triangleright (P_m[\alpha_r, \beta_0] \circ P_m[\beta_k])$ at α and at β , respectively. Here $V_{\beta_0}^+ = Y_0^\vee$ holds, which is different from $Y_k^\vee = V_{\beta_k}^-$. Hence, by Lemma 4.2, we have $U_\alpha^+ \neq U_\alpha^-$ and $V_\beta^+ \neq V_\beta^-$ for each α, β . One can see that, if $\beta_i\alpha_{i+1}$ with $0 \leq i \leq r-1$ is rank-1 then $V_{\beta_i}^+ = \ker_R(A_{\alpha_{i+1}\beta_i})$, and if $\beta_i\alpha_{i+1}$ with $i \geq k$ is rank-1 then $U_{\alpha_{i+1}}^- = \ker_L(A_{\alpha_{i+1}\beta_i})$. This implies (2.3). The orthogonal property (2.2) is satisfied by the construction. \square

If $\deg_I(\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)) = 1$ or the last edge of \mathcal{P}_m is rank-1, then I' satisfies (Path), which implies that I' is a q-mathcing. Otherwise the end edge of the path component of I' is rank-2. We apply the elimination operation to I' from $\alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)$ so that (Path) holds. The resulting set, also denoted by I' , is a q-mathcing with $r(I') \geq r(I)$ (in fact $r(I') = r(I)$) by Lemma 4.1.

We next modify \mathcal{T} to obtain an augmenting space-walk \mathcal{T}' for I' as follows. Let \mathcal{P}_ℓ be the first outer space-walk in \mathcal{T} that intersects with $\alpha_r, \alpha_{r+1}, \dots, \alpha_k$. Let α be the first appearance of such a vertex in \mathcal{P}_ℓ , and suppose $\alpha = \alpha_s$. By (N_{outer}), the subspace of U_α in \mathcal{P}_ℓ at α coincides with X_s^\vee . Then define

$$\mathcal{T}' := \mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell(\alpha) \circ \mathcal{P}_m^\vee[\alpha_s, \alpha_r]; \quad (4.12)$$

see Figure 5.

Lemma 4.13. \mathcal{T}' is an augmenting space-walk for I' .

Proof. (A_{init}) is obvious. By $X_r^\vee \not\subseteq X_r = \ker_L(A_{\beta_{r-1}\alpha_r})$, we have (A_{last}). The suffix $\mathcal{P}_\ell(\alpha) \circ \mathcal{P}_m^\vee[\alpha_s, \alpha_r]$ forms a single outer space-walk for I' , since $\alpha_s\beta_{s-1}, \beta_{s-1}\alpha_{s-1}, \dots, \beta_r\alpha_r$ are distinct. We verify that the prefix $\mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell(\alpha)$ is viewed as a compatibly-concatenated space-walk for I' . This implies that \mathcal{T}' is an augmenting space-walk for I' .

By the definitions of \mathcal{P}_ℓ and α , the prefix $\mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell(\alpha)$ does not intersect with $\alpha_r, \alpha_{r+1}, \dots, \alpha_k$ except for α . By the irredundancy, $\mathcal{P}_0 \circ \mathcal{Q}_1 \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{Q}_\ell \circ \mathcal{P}_\ell(\alpha)$ does not meet $\alpha_0 = \alpha_k$ and $\beta_0 = \beta_k$. Hence it suffices to consider the case where there is $\ell' < \ell$ such that $\mathcal{P}_{\ell'}$ intersects with $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{r-1}, \alpha_{k+1}, \dots, \alpha(\mathcal{P}_m)$. Note that $\mathcal{P}_{\ell'} \cap P_m$ forms the disjoint union of several subwalks of $\mathcal{P}_{\ell'}$. By the same argument as (4) in Lemma 4.6, no edge in $\mathcal{P}_{\ell'} \cap P_m[\beta_k]$ is deleted from I via the elimination operation. By (2) in Lemma 4.6, each subwalk in $\mathcal{P}_{\ell'} \cap P_m$ must consist of rank-2 edges. Hence it holds $\mathcal{P}_{\ell'} \cap P_m = (\mathcal{P}_{\ell'} \cap P_m[\beta_0, \beta_{r-1}]) \cup (\mathcal{P}_{\ell'} \cap P_m[\beta_k])$.

Take a subpath P belonging to $\mathcal{P}_{\ell'} \cap P_m$. If no edge in P is deleted from I via the elimination operation, then, by the same argument as in (2) in Lemma 4.6, the corresponding sequence with




Figure 5: Modification in Section 4.5.1; the definitions of all lines and paths are the same as in Figure 1.

spaces to P forms an inner space-walk for I' , or constitutes a part of an inner space-walk for I' . If an edge in P is deleted from I via the elimination operation, then P belongs to $P_{\ell'} \cap P_m[\beta_0, \beta_{r-1}]$; we can assume $P = (\alpha_i \beta_i, \beta_i \alpha_{i+1}, \dots, \alpha_j \beta_j)$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq r-1$. Since there is no rank-1 edge in P , all $\beta_i \alpha_{i+1}, \beta_{i+1} \alpha_{i+2}, \dots, \beta_{j-1} \alpha_j$ are deleted from I via the elimination operation. Hence P remains a part of an outer space-walk for I' . \square

Let $(I, \mathcal{T}) \leftarrow (I', \mathcal{T}')$. This update can be done in $O(|E|)$ time, since we can find the maximum index r with $1 \leq r \leq k$ such that $\beta_{r-1} \alpha_r$ is rank-1 and such \mathcal{P}_ℓ in (4.12) in $O(|E|)$ time. Also θ strictly decreases by the same argument as in Section 4.5.1. Return to the initial stage (Section 4.2).

5 Concluding remarks

This article provides the first combinatorial blow-up-free algorithm for Edmonds' problem for a (2×2) -type generic partitioned matrix. We end this paper with the following remarks.

Bit-complexity. We verify that, in the case of $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{Q}$, the required bit-size during the algorithm is polynomially bounded. Without loss of generality, we assume that each entry of $A_{\alpha\beta}$ is an integer.

Consider the algorithm for finding an augmenting space-walk. During the algorithm, a 1-dimensional vector subspace $Z \subseteq \mathbf{F}^2$ is represented as a nonzero vector $z \in Z$. In the initial phase, for each $\alpha\beta \in I$ such that $\alpha\beta$ is rank-1 and $\deg_I(\beta) = 1$, we can take an integer nonzero vector $y_\beta \in \ker_{\mathbf{R}}(A_{\alpha\beta})$ with the bit-length bounded in a polynomial of the bit-size of $A_{\alpha\beta}$. In the update phase, we compute $X^{\perp_{\alpha\beta}}$ and $Y^{\perp_{\alpha\beta}}$ for $X \subseteq U_\alpha$ and $Y \subseteq V_\beta$, respectively. This can be simulated as follows. Here we only consider the case of computing $X^{\perp_{\alpha\beta}}$. Suppose $\text{rank } A_{\alpha\beta} = 1$ and that we have an integer nonzero vector $x \in X$ at hand. Then $X^{\perp_{\alpha\beta}} = V_\beta$ if $x \in \ker_{\mathbf{L}}(A_{\alpha\beta})$, and $X^{\perp_{\alpha\beta}} = \ker_{\mathbf{R}}(A_{\alpha\beta})$ if $x \notin \ker_{\mathbf{L}}(A_{\alpha\beta})$. Suppose $\text{rank } A_{\alpha\beta} = 2$ and $A_{\alpha\beta} = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix}$ and $x = \begin{bmatrix} s \\ t \end{bmatrix}$. Then a nonzero vector $y = \begin{bmatrix} -(cs + dt) \\ as + bt \end{bmatrix}$ belongs to $X^{\perp_{\alpha\beta}}$. By $\log(|cs + dt|) = \log|c| + \log|s|$ if $dt = 0$, $\log(|cs + dt|) = \log|d| + \log|t|$ if $cs = 0$, and $\log(|cs + dt|) \leq \log(|csdt|(1/|cs| + 1/|dt|)) \leq \log 2 + \log|c| + \log|d| + \log|s| + \log|t|$, we have $\text{bit}(y) = \text{bit}(A_{\alpha\beta}) + \text{bit}(x) + O(1)$, where $\text{bit}(\cdot)$ is the bit-length of the argument. Hence the bit-length is polynomially bounded in finding an augmenting space-walk.

The case of the augmentation procedure is similar. Thus, in the whole process, the bit-size is polynomially bounded.

On general generic partitioned matrices. A *generic partitioned matrix* [10] is a matrix A of the form (1.2) with an $m_\alpha \times n_\beta$ matrix $A_{\alpha\beta}$ over \mathbf{F} for α and β . Iwata and Murota [14] observed $\text{rank } A \neq \text{nc-rank } A$ for a generic partitioned matrix A in general; in particular, they gave such a matrix consisting only of 2×2 and 3×2 blocks. It is known [8] that Edmonds' problem is equivalent to the problem of computing the rank of a generic partitioned matrix.

Our matching concept can be easily generalized to one for a generic partitioned matrix. We hope that this matching notion can lead to a blow-up-free algorithm for a generic partitioned matrix such that its rank and nc-rank coincide, and hence to a polynomial-time algorithm for Edmonds' problem.

A simpler and faster algorithm. There exists a combinatorial $O(\mu\nu \min\{\mu, \nu\})$ -time algorithm for Edmonds' problem for a (2×2) -type generic partitioned matrix of the form (1.2), which is faster than the algorithm proposed in this paper. An outline of the faster algorithm is as follows:

1. Compute an augmenting walk $T := (\beta_1\alpha_1, \alpha_1\beta_2, \dots, \beta_k\alpha_k)$ (without spaces) by the breath-first search version of the algorithm in Section 3.2.
2. For $i = k, k-1, \dots, 2$, update I as

$$I \leftarrow \begin{cases} I \cup \{\beta_i\alpha_i\} & \text{if } \alpha_i \text{ is incident only to } \alpha_i\beta_{i-1} \text{ in } I \text{ and } \alpha_i\beta_{i-1} \text{ is rank-2,} \\ I \setminus \{\alpha_i\beta_{i-1}\} & \text{if } \alpha_i \text{ is incident to } \beta_i\alpha_i \text{ and } \alpha_i\beta_{i-1} \text{ in } I, \\ (I \cup \{\alpha_i\beta_i\}) \setminus \{\alpha_i\beta_{i-1}\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then add $\beta_1\alpha_1$ to I .

3. Apply the elimination operation to I in Section 4.1.2, and output the resulting I .

In fact, our algorithm in Section 4 coincides with this simpler algorithm if (N_{outer}) and (N_{inner}) always hold and redundant eliminations are omitted. The proof of the validity of this algorithm is considerably more complicated. Hence we presented the current version of the algorithm.

Acknowledgments

We thank the anonymous reviewers of for their helpful comments. The authors were supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP17K00029. The first author was supported by JST PRESTO Grant Number JPMJPR192A, Japan. The second author was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP19J01302, 20K23323, 20H05795, Japan. This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of an article published in *Mathematical Programming*. The final authenticated version is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-021-01676-5>.

References

- [1] J. F. Buss, G. S. Frandsen, and J. O. Shallit. The computational complexity of some problems of linear algebra. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 58:572–596, 1999.
- [2] J. Edmonds. Systems of distinct representatives and linear algebra. *Journal of Research of the National Bureau of Standards*, 71B(4):241–245, 1967.

- [3] M. Fortin and C. Reutenauer. Commutative/noncommutative rank of linear matrices and subspaces of matrices of low rank. *Séminaire Lotharingien de Combinatoire*, 52:B52f, 2004.
- [4] S. Fujishige, T. Király, K. Makino, K. Takazawa, and S. Tanigawa. Minimizing submodular functions on diamonds via generalized fractional matroid matchings. EGRES Technical Reports, TR-2014-14, 2014.
- [5] A. Garg, L. Gurvits, R. Oliveira, and A. Wigderson. Operator scaling: Theory and applications. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 20:223–290, 2020.
- [6] M. Hamada and H. Hirai. Maximum vanishing subspace problem, CAT(0)-space relaxation, and block-triangularization of partitioned matrix. arXiv:1705.02060, 2017.
- [7] M. Hamada and H. Hirai. Computing the nc-rank via discrete convex optimization on CAT(0) spaces. *SIAM Journal on Applied Geometry and Algebra*, to appear.
- [8] H. Hirai. Computing the degree of determinants via discrete convex optimization on Euclidean buildings. *SIAM Journal on Applied Geometry and Algebra*, 3(3):523–557, 2019.
- [9] T. Ishikawa. Max-rank matrix completion via Wong sequence (in Japanese). Bachelor thesis, The University of Tokyo, 2018.
- [10] H. Ito, S. Iwata, and K. Murota. Block-triangularizations of partitioned matrices under similarity/equivalence transformations. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 15(4):1226–1255, 1994.
- [11] G. Ivanyos, M. Karpinski, Y. Qiao, and M. Santha. Generalized Wong sequences and their applications to Edmonds’ problems. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 81:1373–1386, 2015.
- [12] G. Ivanyos, Y. Qiao, and K. V. Subrahmanyam. Non-commutative Edmonds’ problem and matrix semi-invariants. *Computational Complexity*, 26:717–763, 2017.
- [13] G. Ivanyos, Y. Qiao, and K. V. Subrahmanyam. Constructive non-commutative rank computation is in deterministic polynomial time. *Computational Complexity*, 27:561–593, 2018.
- [14] S. Iwata and K. Murota. A minimax theorem and a Dulmage–Mendelsohn type decomposition for a class of generic partitioned matrices. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 16(3):719–734, 1995.
- [15] V. Kabanets and R. Impagliazzo. Derandomizing polynomial identity tests means proving circuit lower bounds. *Computational Complexity*, 13:1–46, 2004.
- [16] F. Kuivinen. On the complexity of submodular function minimisation on diamonds. *Discrete Optimization*, 8:459–477, 2011.
- [17] L. Lovász. On determinants, matchings, and random algorithms. In *International Symposium on Fundamentals of Computation Theory (FCT’79)*, 1979.
- [18] L. Lovász. Singular spaces of matrices and their application in combinatorics. *Boletim da Sociedade Brasileira de Matemática*, 20(1):87–99, 1989.
- [19] T. Oki. On solving (non)commutative weighted Edmonds’ problem. In *Proceedings of the 47th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP’20)*, volume 168 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 89:1–89:14, 2020.

- [20] J. T. Schwartz. Fast probabilistic algorithms for verification of polynomial identities. *Journal of the ACM*, 27(4):701–717, 1980.
- [21] W. T. Tutte. The factorization of linear graphs. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 22(2):107–111, 1947.