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Abstract—This paper investigates two related optimal input selection problems for structured systems. Given are an autonomous system and a set of inputs, where whether an input can directly actuate a state variable is given a priori, and each input has a non-negative cost. The problems are, selecting the minimum cost of inputs, and selecting the inputs with the smallest possible cost with a bound on their cardinality, all to ensure system structural controllability. Those problems are known to be NP-hard in general. In this paper, instead of finding approximation algorithms, we explore classes of systems on which those problems are polynomially solvable. We show subject to the so-called structural controllability, an alternative notion of controllability in the generic sense [10], detailed as follows.

The problems of optimally selecting inputs to achieve structural controllability can be roughly classified into two classes, depending on the objectives. The first class of problems aims at determining the minimum number/cost of input links (typically, the sparsest input matrix) for structural controllability. When there is no constraint on the structure of the input configuration or all the available inputs are dedicated (i.e., each input can actuate at most one state variable), it has been shown these problems can be solved in polynomial time by transforming them to some maximum matching problems [11, 12]. Recently, [13] extends the dedicated input constraint to the so-called source strongly-connected component grouped constraint and shows that if the available inputs satisfy this constraint, then the aforementioned problems are polynomially solvable. Further, [14] shows finding the sparsest interconnection structure (both among states and between inputs and states) for a system to be structurally controllable is NP-hard, if the available interconnections among states are given a priori. The second class of problems intends to find the minimum number/cost of inputs (typically, the input matrix with the smallest number of columns) to achieve structural controllability (we call this class of problems the constrained input selection problems). Note that compared to the first class of problems, selecting an input indicates all the input links incident to this input are selected too. It has been shown this problem has an analytical solution if there is no constraint on the input structure [1]. However, if the available inputs are given a priori (called the constrained case), this problem is generally NP-hard [15, 16] and gives a flow-network based approximation algorithm, where the approximation factor is determined by the maximum degree of input vertices in the constructed flow network.

In this paper, we re-investigate the constrained input selection problems. More precisely, we consider two related problems: selecting the minimum cost of inputs, and selecting the inputs with the smallest possible cost but with a bound on their cardinality, all to ensure system structural controllability. Instead of giving approximation algorithms, we explore conditions under which those problems are polynomially solvable. To the best of our knowledge, no polynomial-time algorithms have been reported for these problems in the non-dedicated input case, except for some trivial cases (c.f., the system structure is strongly-connected). The initial idea of our study is that, since the addressed problems are NP-hard because determining the minimum number of inputs to achieve input-reachability is NP-hard (see Section [11] [15], what happens for the class of maximum geometric multiplicity of the system state transition matrix) [2]. However, if the available input vectors are given a priori, this problem turns out to be NP-hard [2]. The other subclass is about structural controllability, an alternative notion of controllability in the generic sense [10], detailed as follows.

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade, input/output (I/O) selections for a large-scale dynamic system to achieve certain performances have received considerable attentions [1, 2, 3, 4]. Examples include estimation error minimization of the Kalman filter [5] by sensor placement, stabilization by joint I/O selection and feedback design [6], achieving various performances related to controllability/observability [2, 3, 5, 7], etc. This paper is about I/O selections for controllability.

Broadly speaking, problems concerning I/O selections for controllability can be divided into two categories. The first one is selecting inputs to optimize some control energy-related metrics, such as the trace, determinant, or inverse of the minimum eigenvalue of the controllability Gramian [3, 4, 8]. One typical approach to some of those problems is exploiting the modular, submodular, or weak submodular structure of the corresponding optimization problems, which often leads to greedy algorithms with provable approximation guarantees [3]. The second one is to design certain ‘sparse’ inputs for ensuring controllability in the qualitative sense. Depending on what qualitative notion is adopted, this category can also be divided into two subclasses. When the purpose is to ensure controllability in the numerical sense, the minimum number of inputs needed has an analytical expression (i.e., being the
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systems where the latter problem is no longer intractable.

Starting from this point, we show if the input structure satisfies the so-called source strongly-connected component (SCC) separated input constraint, i.e., no inputs can actuate two different source-SCCs simultaneously, the addressed input selection problems both have polynomial time complexity. This condition defines a large class of systems in which the source-SSCs may have certain autonomy/independence so that they do not receive control signals from the same input. We achieve this by first formulating the constrained input selection problems as equivalent integer linear programming (ILP) problems. We then reveal that the corresponding constraint matrices of these ILPs are totally unimodular (TU), under the addressed condition. This inherent structure allows us to solve those ILPs efficiently by simply solving their linear programming (LP) relaxations. In this way, we provide an LP-based method for these problems with polynomial time complexity, under the addressed condition. We remark that the LP-based method has also been used in [13] for solving the minimum cost sparsest input selection problems on a restricted class of systems. Relative to [13], the considered problems here are essentially NP-hard and more intricate as the set cover problem is embedded. The polynomial solvability condition, i.e., the source-SCC separated input constraint, is also more wider than that in [13].

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II gives the problem formulations, and Section III provides some preliminaries in graph theory and structured systems. Section IV presents the main results. Section V provides an illustrative example. The last section concludes this paper.

Notations and terminologies: For two vectors $a$ and $b$, $a \leq b$ means $a_i \leq b_i$ entry-wisely. We say a vector $a$ is integral, if its every element is an integer. For an optimization problem $\min \{\varphi(x) : x \in \Lambda\}$, $\Lambda$ is the feasible region, $x \in \Lambda$ is a feasible solution, the minimum of the objective $\varphi(x)$ on $x \in \Lambda$ is called the optimal (objective) value, or optimum, while the $x$ for which the optimum is attained is called an optimal solution. $1_{n \times m}$ ($0_{n \times m}$) denotes the $n \times m$ matrix with all entries 1 (0).

II. PROBLEM FORMULATIONS

Consider a linear-time invariant system as

$$\dot{x}(t) = \dot{A}x(t) + \dot{B}u(t),$$

in which $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are the state variables and inputs, and $\dot{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\dot{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$.

A structured matrix is a matrix with entries being either fixed zero or a free parameter. Denote the set of $n_1 \times n_2$ structured matrices by $\{(0,*)^{n_1\times n_2}\}$, where $*$ represents the free parameters. Let $\dot{A}$ and $\dot{B}$ be two structured matrices specifying the sparsity patterns of $\dot{A}$ and $\dot{B}$, i.e., $A_{ij} = 0$ implies $\dot{A}_{ij} = 0$, and $B_{ij} = 0$ implies $\dot{B}_{ij} = 0$. In this way, $(\dot{A}, \dot{B})$ is called a realization of $(A, B)$. $(A, B)$ is said to be structurally controllable if there is a realization of it that is controllable. It is well-known that, if $(A, B)$ is structurally controllable, then almost all of its realizations are controllable; otherwise, none is controllable.

Given $B \in \{(0,*)^{n \times m}\}$ and $J \subseteq \{1, \ldots, m\}$, let $B(J)$ be the sub-matrix of $B$ consisting of columns indexed by $J$. Assign a non-negative rational cost $c_i$ to each column of $B$, representing the cost of activating the $i$th input. We say $B$ is dedicated, if each column of $B$ has at most one nonzero entry. With notations above, we consider the following two optimal input selection problems:

Problem $P_1$: minimum cost input selection

$$\min_{\mathcal{J} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, m\}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}} c_i$$

s.t. $(\dot{A}, B(\mathcal{J}))$ structurally controllable \hfill (P1)

Problem $P_2$: cardinality-constrained minimum cost input selection

$$\min_{\mathcal{J} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, m\}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}} c_i$$

s.t. $(\dot{A}, B(\mathcal{J}))$ structurally controllable $|\mathcal{J}| \leq k$ \hfill (P2)

Roughly speaking, problem $P_1$ seeks to select the minimum number of inputs, while problem $P_2$ intends to select the inputs with a bound on their cardinality and with the total cost as small as possible, all to ensure structural controllability. It may happen the optimal solutions to $P_1$ have a much larger cardinality $|\mathcal{J}|$ than those to $P_2$. Therefore, $P_2$ may be desirable, for example, when the activation of new inputs may be more expensive compared to increasing the input costs. Throughout this paper, without losing any generality, the following assumption is adopted:

Assumption 1: $(A, B)$ is structurally controllable.

It is known that problems $P_1$ and $P_2$ are NP-hard in general [13]. The purpose of this paper is to characterize a large class of systems associated with which problems $P_1$ and $P_2$ are polynomially solvable. This characterization contains the dedicated input case as a special one. Our tool is the LP-relaxation, i.e., formulating those problems as ILPs and showing their corresponding LP-relaxations have integral optimal solutions for the specific class of systems characterized in this paper.

III. PRELIMINARIES

This section introduces some preliminaries in graph theory and structured systems.

A directed graph (digraph for short) is denoted by $G = (V, E)$, with $V$ the vertex set and $E$ the edge set. A path in a digraph is a set of ordered edges, in which the terminal vertex of the preceding edge is the starting vertex of the successive edge. A digraph is strongly connected, if for any pair of its vertices, there is a path from each of them to the other. An SCC of a digraph is its subgraph that is strongly connected, and no edges or vertices can be included in this subgraph without breaking its property of being strongly connected. A bipartite graph, which often reads $G = (V_L, V_R, E_{RL})$, is a graph whose vertices can be partitioned into two parts $V_L$ and $V_R$, such that all its edges $E_{RL}$ have end vertices in both parts. A matching of a bipartite graph is a set of edges among which any two do not share a common end vertex. A vertex is matched with respect to a matching if it is contained in this matching. The maximum matching is the matching with as many edges as possible.
Given $A \in \{0, \ast\}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \{0, \ast\}^{n \times m}$, the state digraph is $G(A) = (X, E_A)$, in which $X = \{x_1, ..., x_n\}$ is the set of state vertices, $E_A = \{(x_j, x_i) : A_{ij} \neq 0\}$ is the set of state edges. The system digraph is $G(A, B) = (X \cup U, E_A \cup E_B)$, where the input vertices $U = \{u_1, ..., u_m\}$, the input links (edges) $E_B = \{(u_i, x_j) : B_{ij} \neq 0\}$, corresponding to $G(A, B)$, the bipartite graph associated with $(A, B)$ is defined as $B(A, B) = (X_L, U \cup X_R, E_{XX} \cup E_{UX})$, in which $X_L = \{x_1^L, ..., x_n^L\}$, $X_R = \{x_1^R, ..., x_n^R\}$ are copies of $X$, $U = \{u_1, ..., u_m\}$, $E_{XX} = \{(x_j^R, x_i^L) : A_{ij} \neq 0\}$, and $E_{UX} = \{(u_j, x_i^L) : B_{ij} \neq 0\}$. Suppose $G(A)$ can be decomposed into $n_c$ SCCs, $1 \leq n_c \leq n$, and the $i$th SCC has a vertex set $X_i \subseteq X$ ($1 \leq i \leq n_c$). An SCC is called a source-SCC, if there is no incoming edge to vertices in this SCC from other SCCs in $G(A)$; otherwise, we call it a non-source-SCC. Suppose there are $r$ source-SCCs in $G(A)$, with their indices being $I = \{1, ..., r\}$, $1 \leq r \leq n_c$. For each $i \in I$, let $X_i^L = \{x_j^L \in X_L : x_j \in X_i\}$, and define $E_i = \{(u, x) \in E_{UX} : x \in X_i^L \cup \{u\}\}$ as the set of input links between $U$ and $X_i^L$ in $B(A, B)$. A state vertex $x_i \in X_i$ is said to be input-reachable, if there is a path starting from an input vertex $u \in U$ to $x_i$ in $G(A, B)$, with a little abuse of terminology, if each vertex of $X_i$ is input-reachable in $G(A, B)$, we just say $X_i^L$ is input-reachable in $B(A, B)$.

**Lemma 1 (17):** $(A, B)$ is structurally controllable, if and only if: i) every state vertex $x_i \in X$ is input-reachable, and ii) there is a maximum matching in $B(A, B)$ that matches every $x_i^L \in X_i$.

**IV. MAIN RESULTS**

This section presents the main results. We first formulate problems $P_i$ ($i = 1, 2$) as ILPs. We then provide a condition under which problems $P_i$‘s are polynomially solvable. We do this by showing with this condition, the constraint matrices of the respective ILPs are TU.

**A. ILP formulations of $P_1$ and $P_2$**

In this subsection, we formulate problems $P_1$ and $P_2$ as equivalent ILPs.

In our ILP formulations, we introduce two binary variables $y = \{y_{uv} : (u, v) \in E_{XX} \cup E_{UX}\}$ and $t = \{t_i : i \in U\}$, where $U = \{1, ..., r\}$. In a feasible solution $(y, t)$ to $P_i$ ($i = 1, 2$), $y_{uv} = 1$ indicates the edge $(u, v) \in E_{XX} \cup E_{UX}$ is in a particular maximum matching of $B(A, B)$, and $y_{uv} = 0$ means the contrary. For $i \in U$, $t_i = 1$ means input $u_i$ is selected, while $t_i = 0$ the contrary.

To present the ILP formulations, matrix $w = [w_{ij}] \in \{0, 1\}^{r \times m}$ is introduced as follows: $w_{ij} = 1$ if $(u_j, x_i) \in E_{UX}$ for some $x_i \in X_i$, and $w_{ij} = 0$ if no such $x_i$ exists. In other words, $w_{ij} = 1$ if and only if input $u_j$ directly connects with the source-SCC $X_i$. Let $E_{u_j} = \{(u_j, v) : (u_j, v) \in E_{UX}\}$ be the set of input links incident to $u_j$, $j \in U$.

**Proposition 1:** Under Assumption 1 problem $P_1$ is equivalent to the following ILP $P_1^{\text{ILP}}$ (i.e., their optimal objective values are equal), for $i = 1, 2$, respectively:

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{y, t} & \quad \sum_{i=1}^{m} c_i t_i & (P_1^{\text{ILP}}) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \quad \sum_{(u,v) \in E_{XX} \cup E_{UX}} y_{uv} = 1, \forall v \in X_L \quad (2) \\
& \quad \sum_{(u,v) \in E_{XX} \cup E_{UX}} y_{uv} \leq 1, \forall u \in X_R \cup U \quad (3) \\
& \quad \sum_{j=1}^{m} w_{ij} t_j \geq 1, \forall i \in I \quad (4) \\
& \quad t_j \geq \sum_{(u,v) \in E_{u_j}} y_{uv}, \forall j \in U \quad (5) \\
& \quad y_{uv} \in \{0, 1\}, \forall (u, v) \in E_{XX} \cup E_{UX} \quad (6) \\
& \quad t_i \in \{0, 1\}, \forall i \in U \quad (7)
\end{align*}
\]

Moreover, for an optimal solution $(y^*, t^*)$ to $P_1^{\text{ILP}}$ ($i = 1, 2$), $S^* = \{u_i : t_i^* = 1, i \in U\}$ is an optimal solution to $P_i$.

**Proof:** We first focus on $P_1^{\text{ILP}}$. Let $E_s = \{(u, v) \in E_{XX} \cup E_{UX} : y_{uv} = 1, y \text{ subject to } (2), (3), (6)\}$. Constraint (2) means every vertex of $X_L$ should be an end vertex of exactly one edge in $E_s$, and (5) means each vertex of $X_R \cup U$ can be the end vertex of at most one edge in $E_s$. Therefore, constrains (2), (3), and (6) make sure $E_s$ is a matching of $B(A, B)$ that matches $X_L$. Moreover, constraint (4) means each source-SCC $X_i$ is input-reachable. Constraint (5) ensures that an edge of $E_{u_j}$ is included in the maximum matching $E_s$, then this input $u_j$ is selected (i.e., $t_j \geq 1$). Hence, any feasible solution $(y, t)$ subject to constraints (2) - (7) corresponds to an input selection $S = \{u_i : t_i = 1, i \in U\}$ that makes the resulting system structurally controllable. It then follows immediately that problems $P_1$ and $P_1^{\text{ILP}}$ are equivalent.

For $P_2^{\text{ILP}}$, note constraint (8) ensures the number of selected inputs is no more than $k$. Following a similar manner to the above analysis, the equivalence between $P_2$ and $P_2^{\text{ILP}}$ is obtained. \hfill \square

**Remark 1:** It is notable that constraint (3) ensures that the right-hand side of (5) is at most 1. Therefore, constraints (5) and (7) are compatible.

**Remark 2:** A related problem to problem $P_2$ is selecting the set of inputs to achieve structural controllability with the smallest possible cost, meanwhile the cardinality is no more than any number of inputs ensuring system structural controllability, i.e., $k$ equals to the optimum of problem $P_1$ with unit cost $\{c_i\}$ (denote this value by $N_{P_1}^\ast$). This problem is equivalent to the following ILP

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{y, t} & \quad \sum_{i=1}^{m} (c_i + \gamma) t_i & (P_2^{\text{ILP}}) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \quad (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (8), \text{ and } (7)
\end{align*}
\]
not exceed the increase (at least $\gamma$) caused by the cardinality penalty. Note $\mathcal{P}_3^{ILP}$ is indeed a special case of $\mathcal{P}_1^{ILP}$.

**B. Polynomially solvable cases**

It has been shown in [15] problem $\mathcal{P}_1$ is NP-hard. This fact is also reflected by constraint (4). Note provided that $(X_L, X_R, E_{X X})$ contains a maximum matching that matches $X_L$, the constraints of $\mathcal{P}_1^{ILP}$ reduce to constraints (4) and (7), which is the ILP formulation of the NP-hard set cover problem [13].

A natural question is that, supposing for a certain specific class of systems associated with optimizing $\sum_{i=1}^{m} c_i t_i$ subject to (4) and (7) can be implemented in polynomial time, can problem $\mathcal{P}_1$ (as well as $\mathcal{P}_2$) be solved efficiently? An already-known fact supporting the affirmative answer is that, if each available input is dedicated, then problem $\mathcal{P}_1$ is polynomially solvable. Can we broaden the class of systems on which problem $\mathcal{P}_1$ is polynomially solvable? We shall give a positive answer here.

To this end, we introduce the following constraint, named **source-SCC separated input constraint (SSSI constraint)**. We shall show, this constraint defines a large class of systems with which problems $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ are polynomially solvable.

**Definition 1:** (SSSI constraint) For $(A, B)$ in (1), it satisfies the source-SCC separated input constraint (SSSI constraint), if no input vertices can connect with different source-SCCs simultaneously in $G(A, B)$.

Note the SSSI constraint only requires that two different source-SCCs do not receive input signals from the same input. It does not impose any restrictions on how the inputs connect with state vertices within each SCC (including the source-SCC and the non-source-SCC). Additionally, an input can simultaneously connect with one source-SCC and multiple non-source-SCCs. Hence, the SSSI constraint describes a wider class of input structures than the source-SCC grouped input constraint introduced in [13] (the latter does not allow the existence of an input that simultaneously activates a source-SCC and a non-source SCC). Particularly, the dedicated input structure is a special case of the SSSI constraint. A system that contains only one source-SCC automatically satisfies this constraint (a special case is that $G(A)$ is strongly connected).

We are ready to present the main results as follows. The proofs are postponed to the next subsection.

**Theorem 1:** Suppose $(A, B)$ satisfies Assumption 1 and the SSSI constraint. Then, the following LP-relaxation $\mathcal{P}_1^{LP}$ of $\mathcal{P}_1^{ILP}$ always has an integral optimal solution corresponding to the optimal solution of $\mathcal{P}_1$.

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{y, t} & \quad \sum_{i=1}^{m} c_i t_i \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad (2), (3), (4), \text{and } (5) \\
& \quad 0 \leq y_{uv} \leq 1, \forall (u, v) \in E_{XX} \cup E_{UX} \\
& \quad 0 \leq t_i \leq 1, \forall i \in \mathcal{U}.
\end{align*}
\]

Consequently, for $(A, B)$ satisfying the SSSI constraint, problem $\mathcal{P}_1$ can be solved in polynomial time.

**Theorem 2:** Suppose $(A, B)$ satisfies Assumption 1 and the SSSI constraint. Then, the following LP-relaxation $\mathcal{P}_2^{LP}$ of $\mathcal{P}_2^{ILP}$ always has an integral optimal solution corresponding to the optimal solution of $\mathcal{P}_2$, whenever $\mathcal{P}_2$ is feasible.

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{y, t} & \quad \sum_{i=1}^{m} c_i t_i \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad (2), (3), (4), (5), (8), (12), \text{and } (13).
\end{align*}
\]

Again, for $(A, B)$ satisfying the SSSI constraint, problem $\mathcal{P}_2$ can be solved in polynomial time.

In light of Theorems 1 and 2 problems $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ can be solved in polynomial time whenever the SSSI constraint is met. And they can be solved efficiently via the corresponding LP-relaxations. Using off-the-shelf LP solvers, $\mathcal{P}_1^{LP}$ and $\mathcal{P}_2^{LP}$ can be solved in time $O((|E_{XX} \cup E_{UX}| + m)^2)$. Let $|L|$, where $|E_{XX} \cup E_{UX}| + m$ is the number of decision variables in those LPs, and $L = \log_2(c_{\text{max}}) + \log_2(k) + \log_2(n)$ is the number of input bits, with $c_{\text{max}} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} c_i$ and $\{c_i\}$ being integral. It is easy to see that, without the SSSI constraint, problems $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ are at least as hard as the set cover problem. In this sense, it seems safe to say that, the SSSI constraint defines the ‘most possible’ class of systems on which problems $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ permit polynomial time algorithms. Remarkably, as already mentioned, the SSSI constraint recovers two known polynomially solvable cases: the dedicated input case and the case with a strongly-connected $G(A)$.

The SSSI constraint defines a class of input structures where the source-SCCs may have certain autonomy (independence) so that they do not receive control signals from the same input. Practical systems that may exhibit such an input structure are not rare in social networks, political networks, influence networks, etc. For example, in political networks with multiple parties, the decision group (corresponding to a source-SCC) of each party is in the charge of her party leaders, but is seldom influenced by other parties. In social networks, the source-SCCs could represent groups that are separated by genders, families, countries, or even shared values, such that different source-SCCs (like the decision groups) may not be influenced by the same input.

It is remarked that the flow-network based algorithm in [16], when applied to systems satisfying the SSSI constraint for problem $\mathcal{P}_1$, only achieves a 2-approximation factor, rather than the optimal solution.

**C. Analysis**

This subsection will give the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2. Our main idea is to prove that, the constraints matrices of $\mathcal{P}_1^{ILP}$ and $\mathcal{P}_2^{ILP}$ with the SSSI constraint are both TU.

**Definition 2** (Total unimodularity [22], TU): A matrix $M$ is TU if its every square submatrix has determinant 0, +1, or −1.

It is known that for a polyhedron $P = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Mx \leq b\}$, if $M$ is TU, then $P$ is integral (i.e., every vertex or extreme point of $P$ is integral) for any integral $b$ [23]. According to the fundamental theorem of LP, every optimal solution of an
LP (if exists) is either a vertex of its feasible polyhedron (feasible region), or lies on a face of optimal solutions (i.e., being a convex combination of its vertices that are the optimal solutions). Hence, for an LP \( \{c^T x | M x \leq b, x \in \mathbb{R}^q \} \) with \( M \) being TU, it always has integral optimal solutions for any integral \( b \) and rational \( c \) whenever the optimum exists and is finite \([23]\). It immediately follows that the ILP \( \{c^T x | M x \leq b, x \in \mathbb{Z}^q \} \) with \( M \) being TU can be solved efficiently by simply solving its corresponding LP-relaxation \( \{c^T x | M x \leq b, x \in \mathbb{R}^q \} \). Particularly, this implementation has polynomial time complexity for solving the original ILP \((\text{see } [18, \text{Corollary 5.3b, Theo 16.2}])\) for details on how to recover the integral optimal solutions when the corresponding LP-relaxation returns fractional optimal solutions.

Given \((A, B)\), let \( n_E = |E_{UX} \cup E_{XX}| \), \( n_v = |X_L \cup U \cup X_R| = 2n + m \). Rewrite \( E_{XX} \cup E_{UX} = \{e_1, \ldots, e_{n_E}\} \) and \( X_L \cup U \cup X_R = \{v_1, \ldots, v_{n_v}\} \). Associated with \((A, B)\) we construct two matrices \( M \in \{0, \pm 1\}^{2(n+2m+r+1) \times (n_E + m)} \) and \( \tilde{M} \in \{0, \pm 1\}^{2(n+2m+r+1) \times (n_E + m)} \) for \( P_1^{ILP} \) and \( P_2^{ILP} \), respectively as follows:

\[
M_{ij} = \begin{cases}
1, & \text{if } \vartheta(e_j) \in \partial(e_i), 1 \leq i \leq n_v, 1 \leq j \leq n_E \\
-1, & \text{if } n_v + 1 \leq i \leq n_v + r, n_E + 1 \leq j \leq n_E + m \\
0, & \text{otherwise},
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\tilde{M} = \begin{bmatrix}
M \\
\alpha
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where \( \vartheta(e_j) \) represents the vertices in edge \( e_j \), and \( \alpha = [0_{1 \times n_E}, 1_{1 \times m}] \). It is clear that, in constructing \( M \), the first item corresponds to constraints \( (2) \) and \( (3) \) of \( P_1^{ILP} \), the second item corresponds to constraint \( (4) \), while the third and fourth items to constraint \( (5) \). In addition, \( \alpha \) of \( M \) corresponds to constraint \( (8) \).

The following proposition characterizes the TU property of \( M \) and \( \tilde{M} \) with the SSSI constraint, which is crucial to our results.

**Proposition 2:** Suppose \((A, B)\) satisfies the SSSI constraint. Then, matrices \( M \) and \( \tilde{M} \) are both TU.

Our proof relies on the following characterization of TU.

**Lemma 2** \((22)\): A \( p \times q \) integral matrix \( A = [a_{ij}] \) is TU, if and only if each set \( R \subseteq \{1, \ldots, p\} \) can be divided into two disjoint subsets \( R_1 \) and \( R_2 \) such that

\[
\sum_{i \in R_1} a_{ij} - \sum_{i \in R_2} a_{ij} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}, j = 1, \ldots, q.
\]

**Proof of Proposition 2** \( \Box \): We first prove the TU of \( M \). For the ease of description, suppose corresponding to the respective constraints of \( P_1^{ILP} \), the rows of \( M \) are indexed by \( X_L, U, X_R, w, \) and \( u_1', \ldots, u_m' \), and columns are indexed by \( E_{UX}, E_{XX}, \) and \( t_1, \ldots, t_m \), see Fig. 1 for illustration. We shall prove that every square \( k \times k \) \((k \in \mathbb{N})\) submatrix \( M' \) of \( M \) is TU by induction. For the beginning with \( k = 1 \), \( M' \) is certainly TU since each entry of \( M \) is among \( \{0, \pm 1\} \). Suppose this claim is true for all \((k-1) \times (k-1)\) submatrices \((k \geq 2)\). Consider an arbitrary \( k \times k \) submatrix \( M' \) of \( M \). If \( M' \) contains a column that is zero, then \( \det M' = 0 \). If \( M' \) contains a column that has only one nonzero entry, then \( \det M' = \pm \det M'' \in \{0, \pm 1\} \), where \( M'' \) is the submatrix of \( M' \) after deleting the respective row and column of that nonzero entry. Hence, we only need to consider the case where each column of \( M' \) has at least two nonzero entries. This case will be divided into two subcases, detailed as follows.

**Subcase i:** \( M' \) does not contain rows indexed by \( u_1', \ldots, u_m' \) (corresponding to constraint \( (5) \)). Since every column of \( w = [w_{ij}] \) contains at most one nonzero entry with the SSSI constraint, \( M' \) must consist of rows and columns indexed by subsets of \( X_L \cup U \cup X_R \) and \( E_{UX} \cup E_{XX} \), respectively (corresponding to constraint \( (2) \) and \( (3) \)). Notice that \((X_L \cup U \cup X_R, E_{UX} \cup E_{XX})\) is bipartite with bipartitions \( X_L \) and \( X_R \cup U \), and every column of \( M' \) contains exactly 2 nonzero entries. We can always partition the rows of \( M' \) into two parts \( R_1 \) and \( R_2 \), such that each \( R_1 \) contains exactly one 1 in each of its columns. Consequently, \( \sum_{i \in R_1} M'_{ij} - \sum_{i \in R_2} M'_{ij} = 0 \) for each column of \( M' \). By Lemma 2 \( M' \) is TU.

**Subcase ii:** \( M' \) contains some rows indexed by subsets of \( \{u_1', \ldots, u_m'\} \). Without losing any generality, assume \( M' \) contains rows indexed by \( \{u_1', \ldots, u_p'\} \), \( 1 \leq p \leq m \). Since each column indexed by \( t_1, \ldots, t_m \) contains at most two nonzero entries, \( M' \) must contain rows indexed by the first \( p \) rows of \( w \) and columns indexed by \( \{t_1, \ldots, t_p\} \) (as otherwise there exists a column of \( M' \) that does not have two nonzero entries). Let us partition rows of \( M' \) into disjoint sets \( R_1, R_3, \ldots, R_5 \), such that \( R_1 \) is a subset of \( X_L, R_2 \) is of \( \{u_1, \ldots, u_p\} \), \( R_3 \) is of \( \{u_{p+1}, \ldots, u_m\} \cup X_R, R_4 \) is of the first \( p \) rows of \( w \), and \( R_5 = \{u_1', \ldots, u_p'\} \) (note some sets may be empty). Suppose further in the rows of \( M' \) indexed by \( R_5 \) and columns indexed by \( E_{UX} \cup E_{XX} \), the nonzero columns are indexed by \( C_5 \) (thus \( C_5 \subseteq E_{UX} \cup E_{XX} \)). The remaining columns of \( M' \) are indexed by \( C_5 \). With those partitions, it can be verified that for each column \( j \in C_5 \),

\[
\sum_{i \in R_1} M'_{ij} + \sum_{i \in R_2} M'_{ij} - \sum_{i \in R_3} M'_{ij} + \sum_{i \in R_4} M'_{ij} - \sum_{i \in R_5} M'_{ij} = 0, 1,
\]

which comes from the fact that \( M'_{ij} = 0, \forall i \in R_3 \cup R_4, M'_{ij} = 1, \exists i \in R_5 \), and that each column of \( M'_{ij} \) with rows indexed by \( R_1 \cup R_2 \) has at least one 1 and at most two 1’s.
Similarly, for each column \( j \in \mathcal{C}_5 \),

\[
\sum_{i \in R_4} M'_{ij} + \sum_{i \in R_3} M'_{ij} - \sum_{i \in R_5} M'_{ij} + \sum_{i \in R_1} M'_{ij} - \sum_{i \in R_2} M'_{ij} = 0,
\]

which is due to the fact that, for \( j \in \mathcal{C}_5 \) and belonging to \( \{t_1, \ldots, t_p\} \), there are exactly two \(-1\)'s in the column of \( M' \) indexed by \( j \) with rows indexed by \( R_4 \cup R_5 \), and for \( j \in \mathcal{C}_5 \) belonging to \( E_{UX} \cup E_{XX} \), there are exactly two \(1\)'s in the column of \( M' \) indexed by \( j \) with rows indexed by \( R_1 \cup R_2 \), and \( M'_{ij} = 0 \) for \( i \in R_2, j \in \mathcal{C}_5 \) (note the row indexed by \( u'_i \) with columns indexed by \( E_{UX} \cup E_{XX} \) is the same as the row indexed by \( u_i \) with columns indexed by \( E_{UX} \cup E_{XX} \), \( i = 1, \ldots, m \)). By Lemma 2, \( M' \) is TU.

By induction, we conclude that \( M \) is TU.

**We now prove the TU of \( M \).** We still do this by induction. For the beginning, every \( 1 \times 1 \) submatrix of \( M \) is certainly TU. Assume that every \((k - 1) \times (k - 1)\) submatrix of \( M \) is TU \((k \geq 2)\). Let \( M' \) be a \( k \times k \) submatrix of \( M \). Similar to the above analysis, we only need to show \( M' \) is TU subject to the constraint that each of its columns has at least two nonzero entries. Since we have proven \( M \) is TU, it suffices to show each \( M' \) that contains elements from the last row \( \alpha \) of \( M \) is TU. From the above analysis in **subcase ii**, if every column of \( M' \) indexed by \( E_{UX} \cup E_{XX} \) contains at least two nonzero entries, then there is an assignment of signs for rows of \( M' \) with columns indexed by subsets of \( E_{UX} \cup E_{XX} \), such that their sum is a row vector with entries in \( \{0, 1\} \), in which the rows indexed by the subset of \( \{u'_1, \ldots, u'_m\} \) \((i.e., R_5)\) have sign \(-1\). Moreover, for the columns of \( M' \) indexed by a subset of \( \{t_1, \ldots, t_m\} \), let us assign \(-1\)'s to the signs of rows corresponding to \( \{u'_1, \ldots, u'_m\} \), \( \alpha \), and rows corresponding to \( w \). Then, the sum of those signed rows is a vector with entries in \( \{0, 1\} \). This is because each entry there is the sum of exactly one \(-1\), at least one \(+1\), and at most two \(+1\)'s. Hence, by Lemma 2, \( M' \) is TU. By induction, we know \( M \) is TU.

We are now proving Theorems 1 and 2.

**Proof of Theorem 1** As analyzed above, it suffices to prove that the constraint matrix of \( \mathcal{P}_1^{\text{LP}} \) is TU. To this end, rewrite the constraints of \( \mathcal{P}_1^{\text{LP}} \) as

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
M \\
-M_{eq} \\
I_{n_E + m} + M \\
-I_{n_E + m}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
y \\
t
\end{bmatrix}
\leq
\begin{bmatrix}
1_{n_U} \times 1 \\
-1_{r \times 1} \\
0_{m \times 1} \\
-1_{n \times 1} \\
1_{(n_E + m) \times 1} \\
0_{(n_E + m) \times 1}
\end{bmatrix},
\]

where \( M_{eq} \) consists of rows of \( M \) corresponding to constraint \( 2 \). Since \( M \) is TU from Proposition 2 upon defining \( M'_{LP} = M \)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
I_{n_E + m}
\end{bmatrix}
\], \( M'_{LP} \) is also TU. This is because, any square submatrix \( M' \) that contains elements from the last \( n_E + m \) rows of \( M'_{LP} \) must have a determinant \( \pm \det M'' \in \{0, \pm 1\} \), where \( M'' \) is the submatrix of \( M' \) after deleting the respective rows and columns in the elements in the last \( n_E + m \) rows of \( M'_{LP} \). As \( M'_{LP} \) is obtained from \( M'_{LP} \) by duplicating its rows (with negative signs), \( M_{LP} \) is certainly TU by definition. The statement in this theorem follows directly from the TU of \( M_{LP} \).

**Proof of Theorem 2** Again, it suffices to show that the constraint matrix of \( \mathcal{P}_2^{\text{LP}} \) is TU. Since \( M \) is TU, this can be done similarly to the proof of Theorem 1. Details are omitted due to their similarities.

**V. Illustrative Example**

Consider system \((A, B)\) with its system digraph \( G(A, B) \) given in Fig. 2. The cost of inputs is \( c = [c_1, \ldots, c_6] = [10, 1, 1, 10, 1, 1] \). This system contains two source-SCCs, with \( X_1 = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\} \) and \( X_2 = \{x_4, x_5, x_6\} \). Hence, \( r = 2, m = 6 \). It is easy to verify that the SSSI constraint is met. The corresponding matrix \( w = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \). Construct LPs \( \mathcal{P}_1^{\text{LP}} \) and \( \mathcal{P}_2^{\text{LP}} \) with decision variables \( (y, t) \), \( y \in \mathbb{R}^{26} \) and \( t \in \mathbb{R}^{5} \).

Using the Matlab LP solver **linprog** to solve the LP \( \mathcal{P}_1^{\text{LP}} \) associated with this system, we obtain \( t_1 = 1 \) for \( i = 2, 3, 5, 6 \) with the optimum \( \sum_{i=1}^{6} c_i t_i = 4 \). This means the optimal solution is \( S^* = \{u_2, u_3, u_5, u_6\} \), and the corresponding minimum cost is 4. Next, we solve the LP \( \mathcal{P}_2^{\text{LP}} \) with \( k = 3 \) to obtain the integral optimal solution. And we obtain \( t_1 = 1 \) for \( i = 2, 4, 5 \) with the optimum \( \sum_{i=1}^{6} c_i t_i = 12 \). This means the optimal solution with a cardinality upper bound 3 is \( S^* = \{u_2, u_4, u_5\} \), and the corresponding cost is 12. Finally, we set \( c = [1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1] \) and then problem \( \mathcal{P}_1 \) reduces to determining the minimum number of inputs to achieve structural controllability. We obtain \( t_1 = 1 \) for \( i = 1, 4 \). Hence, the minimum number of inputs for structural controllability is 2, with the optimal solution \( S^* = \{u_1, u_4\} \). If we consider the original input cost \( c = [10, 1, 1, 10, 1, 1] \), this solution has cost 20, which can also be obtained by setting \( k = 2 \) in problem \( \mathcal{P}_2 \).

The above observations highlight the significance of the cardinality-constrained minimum cost input selection problem \( \mathcal{P}_2 \). Say, with a bigger cardinality upper bound, the cost of the obtained solution tends to be smaller.

\(^2\)When a non-integral optimal solution is found, an integral optimal solution can always be determined from it by computing the involved Hermite normal form; see [13, Corollary 5.3b, Theo 16.2] for details.
VI. CONCLUSIONS

This paper investigates two related constrained input selection problems for structural controllability. Instead of giving approximation algorithms, we provide polynomially solvable conditions for them. We first formulate these problems as equivalent ILPs. We then reveal that under the said SSSI constraint, those ILPs could be solved efficiently by their LP relaxations using the off-the-shelf LP solvers. This is achieved by proving that the corresponding constraint matrices of the ILPs are TU. Our condition contains almost all the existing known nontrivial polynomially solvable ones as special cases. In the future, it is interesting to develop graph-theoretic algorithms for the addressed problems, perhaps with the help of the primal-dual algorithms for the corresponding LPs.
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