

# On the Complexity of Recognizing Integrality and Total Dual Integrality of the $\{0, 1/2\}$ -Closure

Matthias Brugger\*

Andreas S. Schulz\*

## Abstract

The  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -closure of a rational polyhedron  $\{x: Ax \leq b\}$  is obtained by adding all Gomory-Chvátal cuts that can be derived from the linear system  $Ax \leq b$  using multipliers in  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ . We show that deciding whether the  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -closure coincides with the integer hull is strongly NP-hard. A direct consequence of our proof is that, testing whether the linear description of the  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -closure derived from  $Ax \leq b$  is totally dual integral, is strongly NP-hard.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $P = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax \leq b\}$  with  $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$  and  $b \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  be a rational polyhedron. The integer hull of  $P$  is denoted by  $P_I = \text{conv}(P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n)$ . Any inequality of the form  $u^T Ax \leq \lfloor u^T b \rfloor$  where  $u \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$  and  $u^T A \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  is valid for  $P_I$ . Inequalities of this kind are called *Gomory-Chvátal cuts* for  $P$  [5, 16]. The intersection of all halfspaces corresponding to Gomory-Chvátal cuts yields the *Gomory-Chvátal closure*  $P'$  of  $P$ . In fact,  $[0, 1]$ -valued multipliers  $u$  suffice (see, e.g., [7]), i.e.,

$$P' = \{x \in P : u^T Ax \leq \lfloor u^T b \rfloor, u \in [0, 1]^m, u^T A \in \mathbb{Z}^n\}.$$

Caprara and Fischetti [4] introduced the family of Gomory-Chvátal cuts with multipliers  $u \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}^m$ . We refer to them as  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -cuts. The  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -closure of  $P$  is defined as

$$P_{\frac{1}{2}}(A, b) := \{x \in P : u^T Ax \leq \lfloor u^T b \rfloor, u \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}^m, u^T A \in \mathbb{Z}^n\}.$$

Note that  $P_{\frac{1}{2}}(A, b)$  depends on the system  $Ax \leq b$  defining the polyhedron  $P$ . From the definition, it follows that  $P_I \subseteq P' \subseteq P_{\frac{1}{2}}(A, b) \subseteq P$ .

$\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -cuts are prominent in polyhedral combinatorics; examples of classes of inequalities that can be derived as  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -cuts include the blossom inequalities for the matching polytope [5, 11] and the odd-cycle inequalities for the stable set polytope [14]. Both classes of inequalities can be separated in polynomial time [14, 20]. In general, though, separation (and, thus, optimization) over the  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -closure of polyhedra is NP-hard: Caprara and Fischetti [4] show that the following *membership problem* for the  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -closure is strongly coNP-complete (see also [13, Theorem 2]).

Given  $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  and  $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{Q}^n$  such that  $\hat{x} \in P := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax \leq b\}$ , decide whether  $\hat{x} \in P_{\frac{1}{2}}(A, b)$ .

---

\*Operations Research, Department of Mathematics, Technische Universität München, Germany.

E-mail: {matthias.brugger, andreas.s.schulz}@tum.de

Supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation with funds from the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF).

The membership problem remains strongly coNP-complete even when  $Ax \leq b$  defines a polytope in the 0/1 cube, as shown by Letchford, Pokutta and Schulz [19]. It is, however, well known that testing membership in the Gomory-Chvátal closure belongs to  $\text{NP} \cap \text{coNP}$  if restricted to polyhedra  $P$  with  $P' = P_I$  (see, e.g., [1]), which naturally includes all polyhedra  $P$  whose  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -closure coincides with  $P_I$ . For instance, the relaxation of the matching polytope given by nonnegativity and degree constraints has this property: If we add the blossom inequalities, the resulting linear system is sufficient to describe the integer hull [11], and it is even totally dual integral (TDI) [10]. This motivates the following research questions that are the subject of this paper: What is the computational complexity of recognizing rational polyhedra whose  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -closure coincides with the integer hull, and of deciding whether adding all  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -cuts produces a TDI system?

Related questions for the Gomory-Chvátal closure have been studied by Cornuéjols and Li [9]. They prove that, given a rational polyhedron  $P$  with  $P_I = \emptyset$ , deciding whether  $P' = \emptyset$  is weakly NP-complete. This immediately implies weak NP-hardness of verifying  $P' = P_I$ . Cornuéjols, Lee and Li [8] extend these hardness results to the case when  $P$  is contained in the 0/1 cube. Moreover, they show that deciding whether a constant number of Gomory-Chvátal inequalities is sufficient to obtain the integer hull is weakly NP-hard, even for polytopes in the 0/1 cube. In this paper, we establish analogous hardness results for the  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -closure. Our main result is the following theorem, where  $\mathbb{1}$  denotes the all-one vector.

**Theorem 1.** *Given  $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$  and  $b \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  with  $P := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax \leq b\} \subseteq [0, 1]^n$ , deciding whether  $P_{\frac{1}{2}}(A, b) = P_I$  is strongly NP-hard, even when the inequalities  $-x \leq 0$  and  $x \leq \mathbb{1}$  are part of the system  $Ax \leq b$ .*

We give a proof of this theorem in the next section. Our proof implies several further hardness results, which we explain in Section 3. In particular, deciding whether adding all  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -cuts to a given linear system  $Ax \leq b$  produces a TDI system, is strongly NP-hard. We also establish strong NP-hardness of the following problems: deciding whether the  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -closure coincides with the Gomory-Chvátal closure; deciding whether a constant number of  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -cuts suffices to obtain the integer hull. Finally, we give a hardness result for the membership problem for the  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -closure, which is slightly stronger than the one of Letchford, Pokutta and Schulz [19].

## 2 Proof of Theorem 1

*Proof of Theorem 1.* We reduce from STABLE SET:

Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph and  $k \in \mathbb{N}, k \geq 2$ . Does  $G$  have a stable set of size at least  $k$ ?

It is well known that STABLE SET is strongly NP-hard [18]. Note that the problem remains strongly NP-hard if restricted to graphs with minimum degree at least 2: Given an instance of STABLE SET specified by  $G$  and  $k$ , we construct a new graph  $G'$  by adding two dummy nodes to  $G$  as well as all edges with at least one endpoint being a dummy node. Every node in  $G'$  has degree at least 2, and every stable set in  $G'$  of size  $k \geq 2$  is a stable set in  $G$  of the same size.

Consider an instance of STABLE SET given by  $G = (V, E)$  and  $k \geq 2$ . By the above observation, we may assume that every node in  $V$  has degree at least 2. Note that  $|V| =: n \geq 3$  and  $|E| =: m \geq 3$  in this case. Let  $A := 2 \cdot \mathbb{1}\mathbb{1}^T - M^T$  where  $M \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times n}$  denotes the edge-node incidence matrix of  $G$  and  $\mathbb{1}$  is the all-one vector of appropriate dimension. We

define a polytope  $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  by the following system of inequalities:

$$0 \leq x \leq \mathbb{1} \tag{1}$$

$$Ax \leq 2 \cdot \mathbb{1} \tag{2}$$

$$(2k-3)\mathbb{1}^T x \geq 2k-3 \tag{3}$$

**Claim 1.**  $P_I = \{x \in P: \mathbb{1}^T x = 1\}$ .

*Proof of Claim 1.* If we add all inequalities in (2), we obtain the valid inequality  $2(n-1)\mathbb{1}^T x \leq 2n$ . Every integral point  $x$  in  $P$  therefore satisfies  $\mathbb{1}^T x = 1$ . Since  $A \in \{1, 2\}^{n \times m}$ , it is easy to check that every unit vector is indeed contained in  $P$ . We conclude that

$$P_I = \{x \in [0, 1]^m: \mathbb{1}^T x = 1\} \supseteq \{x \in P: \mathbb{1}^T x = 1\} \supseteq P_I. \quad \diamond$$

The  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -cuts that can be derived from (1)–(3) are all the inequalities of the following two types with  $u \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}^n$  and  $v \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}^m$ :

$$\sum_{i=1}^m (2u^T \mathbb{1} + \lfloor v_i - (Mu)_i \rfloor) x_i \leq 2u^T \mathbb{1} + \lfloor v^T \mathbb{1} \rfloor \tag{4}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^m (2u^T \mathbb{1} - (k-1) + \lfloor \frac{1}{2} + v_i - (Mu)_i \rfloor) x_i \leq 2u^T \mathbb{1} - (k-1) + \lfloor \frac{1}{2} + v^T \mathbb{1} \rfloor \tag{5}$$

The first type (4) defines all cuts that are derived only from (1) and (2), whereas the second type (5) also uses inequality (3). The vector  $u$  is the vector of multipliers for inequalities (2) while  $v$  collects the multipliers for the upper bounds in (1).

In what follows,  $P_{\frac{1}{2}}$  denotes the  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -closure of  $P$  defined by (1)–(3) together with (4) and (5) for all  $u \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}^n$  and  $v \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}^m$ .

**Claim 2.**  $P_{\frac{1}{2}} = P_I$  if and only if there is a  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -cut equivalent to  $\mathbb{1}^T x \leq 1$ .

*Proof of Claim 2.* If there is such a cut, then  $P_{\frac{1}{2}} \subseteq \{x \in P: \mathbb{1}^T x \leq 1\} = P_I$  by Claim 1. To see the “only if” part, consider the vector  $y = (\frac{1}{n} + \varepsilon)\mathbb{1}$  for some small  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Clearly,  $y \notin P_I$  since  $\mathbb{1}^T y > 1$ . We claim that there is a choice for  $\varepsilon$  such that  $y \in P$  and  $y$  satisfies all  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -cuts except those that are equivalent to  $\mathbb{1}^T x \leq 1$ . First observe that every cut (of either type (4) or (5)) as well as every inequality in (2) and (3) may be written as  $a^T x \leq \alpha$  for some  $a \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ ,  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}$  where  $a_i \leq \alpha$  for all  $i \in [m]$  and  $\alpha \leq m+n$ . If  $\alpha \leq 0$ , we clearly have  $a^T y \leq \alpha$  since  $y \geq \frac{1}{m}\mathbb{1}$ . If  $\alpha > 0$  and  $a^T x \leq \alpha$  is not equivalent to  $\mathbb{1}^T x \leq 1$ , then  $a_i < \alpha$  for at least one  $i \in [m]$ . It follows that  $a^T y \leq \alpha - \frac{1}{m} + \varepsilon(m\alpha - 1)$ . For instance, taking  $\varepsilon := \frac{1}{m^2(m+n)}$  yields  $a^T y \leq \alpha$  as desired.  $\diamond$

In particular, the proof of Claim 2 shows that the inequality  $\mathbb{1}^T x \leq 1$  is not valid for  $P$ .

**Claim 3.** No cut of type (4) is equivalent to  $\mathbb{1}^T x \leq 1$ .

*Proof of Claim 3.* Let  $u \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}^n$  and  $v \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}^m$ . If  $u = 0$ , (4) is dominated by the sum of the inequalities  $\lfloor v_i - (Mu)_i \rfloor x_i \leq 0$  for all  $i \in [m]$ . Note that these are valid for  $P$  since  $\lfloor v_i - (Mu)_i \rfloor \leq 0$  for all  $i \in [m]$ . If  $v = 0$ , the cut (4) is a trivial cut which is only derived from inequalities in the description of  $P$  with even right-hand sides. Hence, we may assume that both  $u \neq 0$  and  $v \neq 0$ . It suffices to show that  $\lfloor v_i - (Mu)_i \rfloor < \lfloor v^T \mathbb{1} \rfloor$  for at least one  $i \in [m]$ . If  $v^T \mathbb{1} \geq 1$ , there is nothing to show. Now let  $v^T \mathbb{1} = \frac{1}{2}$  and suppose for the sake of contradiction that  $\lfloor v_i - (Mu)_i \rfloor \geq 0$  for all  $i \in [m]$ . It follows that  $Mu \leq v$ . Since every column of  $M$  has at least two nonzero entries by assumption, we obtain  $u = 0$ , a contradiction.  $\diamond$

**Claim 4.** A cut of type (5) induced by  $u \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}^n$  and  $v \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}^m$  is equivalent to  $\mathbb{1}^T x \leq 1$  if and only if  $v = 0$ ,  $2Mu \leq \mathbb{1}$ , and  $2u^T \mathbb{1} \geq k$ .

*Proof of Claim 4.* Suppose first that  $v \neq 0$ . Then, for every  $i \in [m]$ , we have  $\lfloor \frac{1}{2} + v_i - (Mu)_i \rfloor \leq 1 \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{2} + v^T \mathbb{1} \rfloor$ . This holds with equality for all  $i \in [m]$  simultaneously only if  $v_i = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $v^T \mathbb{1} \leq 1$ , contradicting  $m \geq 3$ . Thus, no inequality of the form (5) with  $v \neq 0$  has identical coefficients that coincide with the right-hand side. We may therefore assume that  $v = 0$ .

If  $2u^T \mathbb{1} \leq k - 1$ , inequality (5) is redundant: It is the sum of the inequalities  $(2u^T \mathbb{1} - (k - 1))\mathbb{1}^T x \leq 2u^T \mathbb{1} - (k - 1)$  and  $\lfloor \frac{1}{2} - (Mu)_i \rfloor x_i \leq 0$  for all  $i \in [m]$ , all of which are valid for  $P$ . Assuming that  $2u^T \mathbb{1} \geq k$ , inequality (5) is equivalent to  $\mathbb{1}^T x \leq 1$  if and only if  $(Mu)_i \leq \frac{1}{2}$  for all  $i \in [m]$ .  $\diamond$

Putting together Claims 2 to 4, we conclude that  $P_{\frac{1}{2}} = P_I$  if and only if there exists some  $u \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}^n$  such that  $2u$  is the incidence vector of a stable set in  $G$  of size at least  $k$ .  $\square$

### 3 Further hardness results

A careful analysis of the proof of Theorem 1 shows that, if the polytopes  $P$  constructed in the reduction satisfy  $P_{\frac{1}{2}} = P_I$ , there is a single  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -cut that certifies this (see Claim 2). This observation immediately implies the following corollary.

**Corollary 1.** Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  be a fixed constant. Given  $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$  and  $b \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  with  $P := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax \leq b\} \subseteq [0, 1]^n$ , deciding whether one can obtain  $P_I$  by adding at most  $k$   $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -cuts is strongly NP-hard, even when  $k = 1$ , and  $-x \leq 0$  and  $x \leq \mathbb{1}$  are part of the system  $Ax \leq b$ .

Moreover, let us remark that  $P' = P_I$  for the polytopes  $P$  arising from the reduction. This follows from the fact that for  $n \geq 3$ , the inequality  $\mathbb{1}^T x \leq \lfloor 2n/2(n-1) \rfloor = 1$  is a Gomory-Chvátal cut for  $P$ , see the proof of Claim 1.

**Corollary 2.** Given  $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$  and  $b \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  with  $P := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax \leq b\} \subseteq [0, 1]^n$ , deciding whether  $P_{\frac{1}{2}}(A, b) = P'$  is strongly NP-hard, even when  $-x \leq 0$  and  $x \leq \mathbb{1}$  are part of the system  $Ax \leq b$ .

The linear systems arising from our reduction have another interesting property. The inequality description (1)–(5) of  $P_{\frac{1}{2}}$  in the proof of Theorem 1 is a TDI system if and only if  $P_{\frac{1}{2}} = P_I$ . This can be seen as follows. Since any polyhedron defined by a TDI system with integer right-hand sides is integral [12], it suffices to show the “if” part. Suppose that  $P_{\frac{1}{2}} = P_I$ . By the proof of Theorem 1, there exist vectors  $u', u'' \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}^n$  such that  $2Mu' \leq \mathbb{1}$ ,  $2Mu'' \leq \mathbb{1}$ ,  $2(u')^T \mathbb{1} = k$ , and  $2(u'')^T \mathbb{1} = k - 2 \geq 0$  (see Claim 4). The cuts of type (5) derived with  $u'$  and  $u''$  (where we take  $v = 0$ ) are the inequalities  $\mathbb{1}^T x \leq 1$  and  $-\mathbb{1}^T x \leq -1$ , respectively. The system defined by these two inequalities and  $x \geq 0$  is a subsystem of (1)–(5) that is sufficient to describe  $P_{\frac{1}{2}}$  (see Claim 1) and that is readily seen to be TDI: Let  $c \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ . We can assume w.l.o.g. that  $c_1$  is the largest coefficient of  $c$ . It follows that  $\max\{c^T x : x \in P_{\frac{1}{2}}\} = c_1$ . It suffices to show that the inequality  $c^T x \leq c_1$  is a nonnegative integer linear combination of the selected subsystem. Indeed, it is the sum of  $c_1 \mathbb{1}^T x \leq c_1$  (which is a nonnegative integer multiple of  $\mathbb{1}^T x \leq 1$  or  $-\mathbb{1}^T x \leq -1$ ) and  $-(c_1 - c_i)x_i \leq 0$  for all  $i \in [m]$ . The above argument shows the following result.

**Corollary 3.** Let  $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$  and  $b \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ . Deciding whether the system given by  $Ax \leq b$  and all  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -cuts derived from it is TDI, is strongly NP-hard, even when  $-x \leq 0$  and  $x \leq \mathbb{1}$  are part of the system  $Ax \leq b$ .

Further note that the presence of the constraints  $x \leq \mathbb{1}$  in (1) is not essential for our reduction in the proof of Theorem 1. In fact, the upper bounds are redundant: For every  $i \in [m]$ , consider a row of  $A$  such that the entry in column  $i$  is equal to 2. Such a row exists because  $n \geq 3$ . The corresponding inequality in (2) together with the nonnegativity constraints  $-x_j \leq 0$  (possibly twice) for all  $j \neq i$  yields  $2x_i \leq 2$  for all  $x \in P$ . As the only relevant cuts among (4) and (5) are those with  $v = 0$ , we conclude that all of the above results still hold true when the upper bounds  $x \leq \mathbb{1}$  are not part of the input.

Another byproduct of our proof of Theorem 1 is that the membership problem for the  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -closure of polytopes in the 0/1 cube is strongly coNP-complete. This has already been shown by Letchford, Pokutta and Schulz [19]. However, neither of the two different reductions given in [19] constructs linear systems that include both nonnegativity constraints and upper bounds on every variable. When these constraints are required to be part of the input, membership testing remains strongly coNP-complete, as the following result shows.

**Corollary 4.** *The membership problem for the  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -closure of polytopes contained in the 0/1 cube is strongly coNP-complete, even when the inequalities  $-x \leq 0$  and  $x \leq \mathbb{1}$  are part of the input.*

*Proof.* The problem clearly belongs to coNP. To show hardness, we use the same reduction from STABLE SET as in the proof of Theorem 1. The vector  $y$  defined in the proof of Claim 2 satisfies  $y \notin P_{\frac{1}{2}}$  if and only if the instance of STABLE SET is a “yes” instance. The encoding length of  $y$  is polynomial in  $m$  and  $n$  if we choose  $\varepsilon$  as in Claim 2.  $\square$

## 4 Concluding remarks

It is worth pointing out that the problem of recognizing integrality of the  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -closure is in coNP when the membership problem for the  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -closure can be solved in polynomial time: If  $P = \{x : Ax \leq b\}$  is a rational polyhedron with  $P_{\frac{1}{2}}(A, b) \neq P_I$ , it suffices to exhibit a fractional vertex  $\hat{x}$  of  $P_{\frac{1}{2}}(A, b)$  along with a corresponding basis. Then one can verify in polynomial time that  $\hat{x} \in P_{\frac{1}{2}}(A, b)$  and that  $\hat{x}$  is indeed a vertex. This observation can be found in [17, Chapter 9] where it is stated in the context of recognizing  $t$ -perfect graphs. These are the graphs whose stable set polytope is determined by nonnegativity and edge constraints together with the odd-cycle inequalities [6]. In fact, the odd-cycle inequalities can be derived as  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -cuts from the other two classes of inequalities [14]. This means that a graph is  $t$ -perfect if and only if the  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ -closure of the relaxation of its stable set polytope given by nonnegativity and edge constraints is integral. Since a separating odd-cycle inequality can be found in polynomial time [14], recognizing  $t$ -perfection is in coNP. Whether this problem is in NP or in P is not known (see [17, Chapter 9]). However, some classes of  $t$ -perfect graphs are known to be polynomial-time recognizable, including claw-free  $t$ -perfect graphs [2] and bad- $K_4$ -free graphs [15]. Interestingly, for these two classes of graphs, the linear system in [6] that determines the stable set polytope is TDI [3, 21]. It is not known whether this holds true for  $t$ -perfect graphs in general (see [22]).

## References

- [1] S. Boyd, W. R. Pulleyblank. Facet generating techniques. In: W. Cook, L. Lovász, J. Vygen (eds.), *Research Trends in Combinatorial Optimization*, Springer, pp. 33–55 (2009)

- [2] H. Bruhn, O. Schaudt. Claw-free  $t$ -perfect graphs can be recognized in polynomial time. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **30.2**, 832–855 (2016)
- [3] H. Bruhn, M. Stein.  $t$ -perfection is always strong for claw-free graphs. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **24.3**, 770–781 (2010)
- [4] A. Caprara, M. Fischetti.  $\{0, 1/2\}$ -Chvátal-Gomory cuts. *Math. Prog.* **74**, 221–235 (1996)
- [5] V. Chvátal. Edmonds polytopes and a hierarchy of combinatorial problems. *Discrete Math.* **4.4**, 305–337 (1973)
- [6] V. Chvátal. On certain polytopes associated with graphs. *J. Comb. Theory Ser. B* **18**, 138–154 (1975)
- [7] M. Conforti, G. Cornuéjols, G. Zambelli. *Integer Programming*, Springer (2014)
- [8] G. Cornuéjols, D. Lee, Y. Li. On the rational polytopes with Chvátal rank 1. *Math. Prog.* **179**, 21–46 (2020)
- [9] G. Cornuéjols, Y. Li. When the Gomory-Chvátal closure coincides with the integer hull. *Oper. Res. Lett.* **46.2**, 251–256 (2018)
- [10] W. H. Cunningham, A. B. Marsh. A primal algorithm for optimum matching. In: M. L. Balinski, A. J. Hoffman (eds.), *Polyhedral Combinatorics*, Springer, pp. 50–72 (1978)
- [11] J. Edmonds. Maximum matching and a polyhedron with 0, 1-vertices. *J. Res. Natl. Bur. Stand.* **69**, 125–130 (1965)
- [12] J. Edmonds, R. Giles. A min-max relation for submodular functions on graphs. *Ann. Discrete Math.* **1**, 185–204 (1977)
- [13] F. Eisenbrand. On the membership problem for the elementary closure of a polyhedron. *Combinatorica* **19.2**, 297–300 (1999)
- [14] A. M. H. Gerards, A. Schrijver. Matrices with the Edmonds-Johnson property. *Combinatorica* **6.4**, 365–379 (1986)
- [15] A. M. H. Gerards, F. B. Shepherd. The graphs with all subgraphs  $t$ -perfect. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **11.4**, 524–545 (1998)
- [16] R. E. Gomory. An algorithm for integer solutions to linear programs. In: R. L. Graves, P. Wolfe (eds.), *Recent Advances in Mathematical Programming*, McGraw-Hill, pp. 269–302 (1963)
- [17] M. Grötschel, L. Lovász, A. Schrijver. *Geometric Algorithms and Combinatorial Optimization*, Springer (1988)
- [18] R. M. Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In: R. E. Miller, J. W. Thatcher, J. D. Bohlinger (eds.), *Complexity of Computer Computations*, Springer, pp. 85–103 (1972)
- [19] A. N. Letchford, S. Pokutta, A. S. Schulz. On the membership problem for the  $\{0, 1/2\}$ -closure. *Oper. Res. Lett.* **39.5**, 301–304 (2011)
- [20] M. W. Padberg, M. R. Rao. Odd minimum cut-sets and b-matchings. *Math. Oper. Res.* **7.1**, 67–80 (1982)

- [21] A. Schrijver. Strong  $t$ -perfection of bad- $K_4$ -free graphs. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **15.3**, 403–415 (2002)
- [22] A. Schrijver. *Combinatorial Optimization. Polyhedra and Efficiency*, Springer (2003)