On Eulerian orientations of even-degree hypercubes
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Abstract

It is well known that every Eulerian orientation of an Eulerian $2k$-edge connected (undirected) graph is strongly $k$-edge connected. A long-standing goal in the area is to obtain analogous results for other types of connectivity, such as node connectivity. We show that every Eulerian orientation of the hypercube of degree $2k$ is strongly $k$-node connected.
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1. Introduction

The hypercube $Q_k$ is a $k$-regular graph on $2^k$ nodes that can be constructed by labeling the nodes by the $2^k$ subsets of the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ and placing an edge between two nodes whenever the two node labels (i.e., the two subsets) differ in a single element. Hypercubes (and their variants) are useful in computer communication networks, VLSI design, etc., and there is extensive literature in this area, see [3, 5, 8, 12, 15].

An orientation of an (undirected) graph $G = (V, E)$ is a directed graph $D = (V, A)$ such that each edge \(\{v, w\} \in E\) is replaced by exactly one of the arcs $(v, w)$ or $(w, v)$.

Orientations of hypercubes have applications in practical domains such as broadcasting in computer communication networks and the design of parallel computer architectures. The connectivity properties of hypercubes and orientations of hypercubes have been studied, see [3, 8, 15], and orientations of hypercubes that achieve the maximum possible node connectivity are of interest, see [8, Proposition 9].

Our key result states that the optimal node connectivity among orientations of $Q_{2k}$ can be achieved in a trivial way: pick any orientation such that the indegree is equal to the outdegree at every node.

1.1. Smooth orientations and Eulerian orientations

For a node $v$ of a directed graph, we use $d^\text{in}(v)$ to denote the number of arcs with head $v$; similarly, $d^\text{out}(v)$ denotes the number of arcs with tail $v$.
An orientation of an (undirected) graph $G$ is called smooth if the absolute value of the difference between the indegree and the outdegree of every node is at most one, that is, $|d^{\text{in}}(v) - d^{\text{out}}(v)| \leq 1, \forall v \in V(G)$. A smooth orientation of an Eulerian graph $G$ is called an Eulerian orientation; such an orientation satisfies $d^{\text{in}}(v) = d^{\text{out}}(v), \forall v \in V(G)$. Moreover, it can be seen that for every Eulerian orientation, for every subset of the nodes $W$, the number of arcs leaving $W$ is equal to the number of arcs entering $W$, see [4, Ch.6.1]. Therefore, every Eulerian orientation of a $2k$-edge connected Eulerian graph results in a directed graph that is $k$-edge connected. An Eulerian orientation of an Eulerian graph can be found by orienting the edges of each connected component according to an Euler tour.

1.2. Nash-Williams’ results and possible extensions

A well-known result of Nash-Williams says that the edges of a $k$-edge connected graph can be oriented such that the resulting directed graph is $\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor$-edge connected [13], [2, Ch.9]. A long-standing goal in the area is to extend Nash-Williams’ result to obtain analogous results for other types of connectivity, such as node connectivity and element connectivity, see [6, 10, 11, 16, 17].

1.3. Our results

We show that every Eulerian orientation of the hypercube $Q_{2k}$ is strongly $k$-node connected; recall that a directed graph is called strongly $k$-node connected if it has $\geq k + 1$ nodes and the deletion of any set of $\leq (k - 1)$ nodes results in a strongly-connected directed graph.

Let us mention that there are easy inductive constructions that prove that there exists a “good orientation” for a hypercube of even degree; we describe one such construction in Fact 1. For hypercubes of odd degree, the smoothness condition does not guarantee “good orientations;” for example, there exist smooth orientations of $Q_3$ that are not strongly connected.

2. Preliminaries

This section has some definitions and preliminary results. Also, see [4] for standard definitions and notation.

The hypercube $Q_k$ is the Cartesian product of $k$ copies of $K_2$, see [14]. There are other constructions of $Q_k$, and we describe three of them.

(i) Label $2^k$ nodes by $k$-bit binary strings, and place an edge between two nodes whenever their labels differ in exactly one bit (i.e., the Hamming distance between the two strings is one).

(ii) Label $2^k$ nodes by the $2^k$ subsets of a set with $k$ elements, and place an edge between two nodes whenever the two node labels (i.e., the two subsets) differ in a single element.
(iii) Take two disjoint hypercubes $Q_{k-1}$, and place an edge between corresponding pairs of nodes in the two copies of $Q_{k-1}$; thus, the edges between the two copies of $Q_{k-1}$ form a perfect matching.

By a $d$-hypercube we mean a hypercube of degree $d$.

For a node set $S$ of a graph $G$, we use $N_G(S)$ to denote the set of neighbors of $S$, thus, $N_G(S) = \{w \in V(G) - S : \exists v \in S \text{ such that } \{v, w\} \in E(G)\}$.

**Fact 1.** For each integer $k \geq 1$, there exists an Eulerian orientation of $Q_{2k}$ that is strongly $k$-node connected.

**Proof:** Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer. We sketch an inductive construction that gives a strongly $(k + 1)$-node connected Eulerian orientation for the hypercube $Q_{2k+2}$. Observe that any Eulerian orientation of $Q_2$ (the 4-cycle) is strongly 1-connected. Assume (by induction) that $Q_{2k}$ has a strongly $k$-node connected Eulerian orientation. View the $(2k+2)$-hypercube as four $2k$-hypercubes (i.e., four copies of $Q_{2k}$) together with $2^{2k}$ 4-cycles, where each of these 4-cycles $C_i$ contains a distinct node $i$ of the first copy of $Q_{2k}$ as well as the image of $i$ in each of the other three copies of $Q_{2k}$. By the induction hypothesis, there exists a strongly $k$-node connected Eulerian orientation for $Q_{2k}$. Fix such an orientation for each of the four copies of $Q_{2k}$. Moreover, for each of the 4-cycles $C_i$, fix any Eulerian orientation of $C_i$. Let $D$ be the resulting directed graph (i.e., orientation of $Q_{2k+2}$). We claim that $D$ is strongly $(k+1)$-node connected. To see this, consider any set of nodes $Z$ of size $\leq k$. Suppose that one of the four copies of $Q_{2k}$ contains $Z$; then it is clear that each of the other three copies of $Q_{2k}$ is strongly connected in $D - Z$, and hence, (using the $2^{2k}$ oriented 4-cycles of $D$) it can be seen that $D - Z$ is strongly connected. Otherwise, each of the four copies of $Q_{2k}$ has $\leq k - 1$ nodes of $Z$, hence, the removal of $Z$ from any one of the four copies of $Q_{2k}$ results in a strongly connected directed graph; again (using the $2^{2k}$ oriented 4-cycles of $D$), it can be seen that $D - Z$ is strongly connected.

3. Eulerian orientations of $2k$-hypercubes

This section has our results and proofs. In this section, we assume that $k$ is a positive integer.

**Theorem 2.** Let $G$ be a 2$k$-regular 2$k$-node connected graph such that for every set of nodes $S$ with $1 \leq |S| \leq |V(G)|/2$ we have $|N_G(S)| > \min\{k^2 - 1, (k - 1)(|S| + 1)\}$. Then every Eulerian orientation of $G$ is strongly $k$-node connected.

**Proof:** Let $D$ denote an arbitrary Eulerian orientation of $G$. (In what follows, when we refer to the orientation of an edge of $G$ we mean the corresponding directed edge of $D$.) By way of contradiction, suppose that $D$ is not strongly $k$-node connected. Then there is a node set $Z$ of size $\leq k - 1$ whose deletion from $D$ results in a directed graph that has a partition $(S, \bar{S})$ of its node set $V(G) - Z$ such that both $S, \bar{S}$ are nonempty and the edges of $G - Z$ in this cut either are all oriented from $S$ to $\bar{S}$ or are all oriented from
\( \bar{S} \) to \( S \). We fix the notation such that \( |S| \leq |\bar{S}| \). (Now, observe that \( |S| \) satisfies the condition stated in the hypothesis.) Moreover, without loss of generality, we assume that the edges are oriented from \( S \) to \( \bar{S} \) (the arguments are similar for the other case). Observe that \( G - Z \) has \( \geq |N_G(S)| - |Z| \) edges in the cut \((S, \bar{S})\). Thus, \( D \) has \( \geq |N_G(S)| - |Z| \) edges oriented out from \( S \) (and into \( \bar{S} \)). Consider the cut \((S, \bar{S} \cup Z)\) of \( G \), and observe that it has \( \leq \min\{k|Z|, |S||Z|\} \) edges oriented into \( S \) (and out of \( Z \)), because (i) all such edges are incident to nodes of \( Z \) and only \( k \) of the \( 2k \) edges incident to a node \( w \in Z \) are oriented out of \( w \); (ii) each such edge is incident to a node \( s \in S \) and a node \( w \in Z \) (and each pair \( s, w \) contributes at most one such edge). Thus, the cut \((S, \bar{S} \cup Z)\) of \( G \) has \( \geq |N_G(S)| - |Z| \geq |N_G(S)| - (k - 1) \) edges oriented out of \( S \) and \( \leq \min\{k|Z|, |S||Z|\} \leq \min\{k(k - 1), |S|(k - 1)\} \) edges oriented into \( S \); the hypothesis (in the theorem) implies that the former quantity is greater than the latter quantity. This is a contradiction: in an Eulerian orientation of an Eulerian graph, every cut has the same number of outgoing edges and incoming edges. ■

In the next subsection we show that hypercubes of even degree satisfy all the conditions stated in Theorem 2; this gives our main result.

3.1. Bounds for the 2k-hypercube

The main goal of this subsection is to show that the hypercube \( Q_{2k} \) satisfies the inequalities stated in Theorem 2. Our analysis has two parts depending on the size \( m \) of the set \( S \subseteq V(Q_{2k}) \) (in the statement of Theorem 2); the first part (Fact 4) applies for \( 1 \leq m \leq k + 1 \) and it follows easily; the second part (Fact 5) applies for \( k + 2 \leq m \leq 2^{k-1} \) and it follows by exploiting properties of the hypercube. In more detail, in the second part, we show that the minimum of \( |N_{Q_{2k}}(S)| \) over all sets \( S \subseteq V(Q_{2k}) \) of size \( m \) (where \( k + 2 \leq m \leq 2^{k-1} \)) is \( > k^2 - 1 \); our proof avoids elaborate computations by exploiting structural properties of hypercubes; a key point is to focus on a subgraph of the hypercube induced by the set of binary strings of Hamming weight \( i \) and the set of binary strings of Hamming weight \( i - 1 \) (see Claim 6 in the proof of Fact 5).

We follow the notation of [1] and use \( b_v(m, Q_{2k}) \) to denote \( \min\{|N_{Q_{2k}}(S)| : S \subseteq V(Q_{2k}), |S| = m\} \); thus, \( b_v(m, Q_{2k}) \) denotes the minimum over all node sets \( S \subseteq V(Q_{2k}) \) of size \( m \) of the number of neighbors of \( S \). For the sake of exposition, we mention that the node sets \( S \) with \( |N_{Q_{2k}}(S)| = b_v(m, Q_{2k}) \) (i.e., the minimizers of \( b_v(m, Q_{2k}) \)) are Hamming balls (see [1, page 126]), and the formula for \( b_v(m, Q_{2k}) \) (stated in Theorem 3 below) is obtained by computing the minimum number of neighbors of such sets. Harper, see [9] and also see [7], proved the following result:
Theorem 3 (Theorem 4, Ch. 16, [1]). Every integer \( m, 1 \leq m \leq 2^{2k} - 1 \), has a unique representation in the form

\[
m = \sum_{i=r+1}^{2k} \binom{2k}{i} + m', \quad 0 < m' \leq \binom{2k}{r},
\]

\[
m' = \sum_{j=s}^{r} \binom{m_j}{j}, \quad 1 \leq s \leq m_s < m_{s+1} < \cdots < m_r.
\]

Moreover,

\[
b_v(m, Q_{2k}) = \binom{2k}{r} - m' + \sum_{j=s}^{r} \binom{m_j}{j-1}.
\]

Remark: To find the unique representation of \( m \) stated in the above theorem, we start by taking \( r \) to be the largest integer \( x \in \{1, \ldots, 2k\} \) such that \( m \leq \sum_{i=x}^{2k} \binom{2k}{i} \), and then we fix \( m' = m - \sum_{i=x}^{2k} \binom{2k}{i} \); clearly, \( m' \leq \binom{2k}{x} \). Then we write \( m' \) (uniquely) in the form \( \sum_{j=s}^{r} \binom{m_j}{j} \); for this, we take \( m_s \) to be the largest integer \( y \) such that \( \binom{y}{j} \leq m' \); if \( m' = \binom{m}{r} \), then we are done, otherwise, we iterate by replacing \( m' \) and \( r \) by \( m' - \binom{m'}{r} \) and \( r - 1 \), respectively, and then applying the previous step. For example, if \( k = 3 \) and \( m = 17 \), then \( r = 4 \), and \( m = \binom{9}{4} + \binom{5}{2} + m' \), where \( m' = 10 \) and \( m' = \binom{3}{4} + \binom{3}{1} + 5 \).

In what follows, we use the abbreviated notation \( \phi(m) \) for \( b_v(m, Q_{2k}) \). Now, our goal is to show that for \( m = 1, \ldots, 2^{2k-1} \), we have \( \phi(m) > \min\{k^2 - 1, (k-1)(m+1)\} \). This will imply that the hypercube \( Q_{2k} \) satisfies the inequalities stated in Theorem 2.

We first consider the case \( m = 1, \ldots, k+1 \), i.e., \( 1 \leq m \leq k + 1 \). We claim that \( \phi(m) = 1 + (m/2)(4k - m - 1) \). This can be easily verified for \( m = 1 \) (by applying Theorem 3). Now, suppose that \( m = 2, \ldots, k+1 \); then, observe that the unique representation of \( m \) (see Theorem 3) is \( 1 + m' \), where \( m' = m - 1 \) and \( r = 2k - 1 \), and moreover, \( m' = \binom{2k-1}{2k-1} + \binom{2k-2}{2k-2} + \cdots + \binom{2k-m'}{2k-m'} \), hence, \( \phi(m) = (2k) - m' + \binom{2k-1}{2k-1} + \binom{2k-2}{2k-2} + \cdots + \binom{2k-m'}{2k-m'} \).

Fact 4. For each \( m = 1, \ldots, k+1 \), we have

\[
\phi(m) > (k-1)(m+1).
\]

Proof: We have \( \phi(m) = 1 + (m/2)(4k - m - 1) \), for \( m = 1, \ldots, k+1 \). Our goal is to show that

\[
\alpha = 1 + (m/2)(4k - m - 1) - (k-1)(m+1)
\]

is positive. We have \( 2\alpha = m(k - m) + (k + 1)(m - 2) + 6 \). It can be seen that this quantity is \( \geq 4 \) for \( 1 \leq m \leq k + 1 \). (For \( 2 \leq m \leq k \), note that \( m(k - m) \geq 0 \) and \( (k+1)(m-2) \geq 0 \), hence, \( 2\alpha \geq 6 \); moreover, for \( m = 1 \) or \( m = k + 1 \), we have \( 2\alpha \geq 4 \).)
Fact 5. For each \( m = k + 2, \ldots, 2^{2k-1} \), we have

\[
\phi(m) > (k-1)(k+1).
\]

Proof: Let \( \alpha \) denote \( \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \binom{2k}{i} \); observe that \( 2^{2k} = \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \binom{2k}{i} = 2\alpha + \binom{2k}{k} \), hence,

\[
\alpha = \frac{1}{2} 2^{2k} - \frac{1}{2} \binom{2k}{k}.
\]

Suppose that \( m = 2^{2k-1} \). Then \( m = \frac{1}{2} 2^{2k} = \alpha + \frac{1}{2} \binom{2k}{k} \), hence, \( \sum_{i=k+1}^{2k} \binom{2k}{i} < m \leq \sum_{i=k}^{2k} \binom{2k}{i} \). Hence, for each \( m = k + 2, \ldots, 2^{2k-1} \), we have \( k \leq r \leq 2k-1 \) in the unique representation of \( m \) given by Theorem 3, i.e., we have \( m = \sum_{i=r+1}^{2k} \binom{2k}{i} + m' \), where \( 0 < m' \leq \binom{2k}{r} \), and \( k \leq r \leq 2k-1 \); moreover, we have \( m' = \sum_{j=s}^{r} \binom{m_j}{j-1} \), \( 1 \leq s \leq m_s < m_{s+1} < \cdots < m_r \). We will use this notation in the rest of the proof.

To complete the proof, we examine three cases, namely, (1) \( r = k \), (2) \( k+1 \leq r \leq 2k-2 \), and (3) \( r = 2k-1 \).

Case 1: \( r = k \). Since \( m = \alpha + m' \leq 2^{2k-1} \), we have \( 1 \leq m' < 2^{2k-1} - \alpha = \frac{1}{2} \binom{2k}{k} \). Hence, \( \phi(m) = \left( \frac{2k}{k} \right) - m' + \sum_{j=s}^{r} \binom{m_j}{j-1} \geq \left( \frac{2k}{r} \right) - m' \geq \left( \frac{2k}{r} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{2k}{k} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{2k}{k} \right) \). Clearly, for \( k = 3 \), we have \( \frac{1}{2} \binom{2k}{k} > k^2 - 1 \), and for \( k \geq 3 \), we have \( \frac{1}{2} \binom{2k}{k} > \frac{1}{2} \binom{2k}{3} > k^2 - 1 \). Moreover, for \( k = 1 \), Fact 5 holds vacuously, and for \( k = 2 \), by the 4-node connectivity of \( Q_4 \), we have \( \phi(m) \geq 4 > k^2 - 1 = 3 \), \( \forall m \in \{4, \ldots, 8\} \).

Case 2: \( k + 1 \leq r \leq 2k - 2 \). Claim 6, see below, states the key inequality

\[
m' \leq \sum_{j=s}^{r} \binom{m_j}{j-1}.
\]

This immediately implies that \( \phi(m) = \left( \frac{2k}{r} \right) - m' + \sum_{j=s}^{r} \binom{m_j}{j-1} \geq \left( \frac{2k}{r} \right) \geq \left( \frac{2k}{2} \right) = k(2k-1) > k^2 - 1 \) (for \( k \geq 1 \)), as required; observe that the second inequality uses the upper bound on \( r \) (as well as the lower bound \( r \geq k + 1 \geq 2 \)).

Case 3: \( r = 2k - 1 \). Thus, we have \( k + 2 \leq m \leq \sum_{i=2k-1}^{2k} \binom{2k}{i} = 2k+1 \). Then \( m' = m - \sum_{i=2k}^{2k} \binom{2k}{i} = m - 1 \), hence, \( k + 1 \leq m' \leq 2k \). Thus, \( \phi(m) = \left( \frac{2k}{r} \right) - m' + \sum_{j=s}^{r} \binom{m_j}{j-1} \geq \sum_{j=s}^{r} \binom{m_j}{j-1} \).

Claim 6, see below, has the inequality \( \sum_{j=s}^{r} \binom{m_j}{j-1} \geq m'(2k-1)/2 \), assuming that \( r = 2k - 1 \).

Thus, we have \( \phi(m) \geq m'(2k-1)/2 > (k+1)(2k-2)/2 = k^2 - 1 \), as required.

Claim 6. For \( r \geq k + 1 \), we have \( \sum_{j=s}^{r} \binom{m_j}{j-1} > m' \), and moreover, for \( r = 2k - 1 \), we have \( \sum_{j=s}^{r} \binom{m_j}{j-1} \geq m'(2k-1)/2 \).

To prove this claim, it is convenient to view the \( 2^{2k} \) nodes of \( Q_{2k} \) as the \( 2^{2k} \) subsets of the set \( \{1, 2, \ldots, 2k\} \) (recall the second construction in Section 2).
Let \( L_i \subset V(Q_{2k}) \) denote the set of nodes corresponding to \( i \)-element subsets of \( \{1, 2, \ldots, 2k\} \). For \( A \subseteq L_i \), let \( \Gamma(A) \) denote \( N_{Q_{2k}}(A) \cap L_{i−1} = \{v \in L_{i−1} : \exists w \in A \text{ such that } \{v, w\} \in E(Q_{2k})\} \); \( \Gamma(A) \) is called the lower shadow of \( A \). (We mention that the lower shadow of \( A \) is denoted by \( \partial A \) in [1].)

Following [1, Ch.5], let \( \partial^{(r)}(m') \) denote \( \sum_{j=s}^{m'} \binom{m_j}{j−1} \).

Let \( M' \subseteq L_r \) consist of the first \( m' \) nodes (in colex order) of \( L_r \), and let \( S' \subseteq L_{r−1} \) consist of the first \( \partial^{(r)}(m') \) nodes (in colex order) of \( L_{r−1} \).

It is well known that the lower shadow of the first \( m' \) nodes (in colex order) of \( L_r \) consists of precisely the first \( \partial^{(r)}(m') \) nodes (in colex order) of \( L_{r−1} \); see [1, pp. 28–32]. Thus, we have \( \Gamma(M') = S' \).

Our key inequality can be restated as \( m' = |M'| < |S'| \). We will derive it by examining the subgraph \( H \) of \( Q_{2k} \) induced by \( M' \cup S' \). Note that \( H \) is a bipartite graph with the node bipartition \( M', S' \). Observe that for each node of \( M' \) (which corresponds to an \( r \)-element set), there are exactly \( r \) neighbors in \( \Gamma(M') = S' \).

On the other hand, a node in \( S' \) (which corresponds to an \((r−1)\)-element set) has \( \leq 2k−r+1 < r \) neighbors in \( M' \) (the strict inequality follows from \( k+1 \leq r \)). It follows that \( |M'| < |S'| \). This proves the inequality

\[
\sum_{j=s}^{m} \binom{m_j}{j−1} > m' \quad \text{of our claim.}
\]

Now, suppose that \( r = 2k−1 \). Then, the above arguments (on the subgraph \( H \) with the node bipartition \( M', S' \)) imply that each node in \( M' \) has \( 2k−1 \) neighbors in \( S' \), and each node in \( S' \) has \( \leq 2 \) neighbors in \( M' \). Hence, \( \sum_{j=s}^{r} \binom{m_j}{j−1} = |S'| \geq |M'|(2k−1)/2 = m'(2k−1)/2 \). This proves the second part of the claim.

Our main result follows from Theorem 2, Theorem 3, the fact that \( Q_{2k} \) is \( 2k \)-regular and \( 2k \)-connected, and the inequalities stated above (see Facts 4, 5).

**Theorem 7.** Every Eulerian orientation of a hypercube of degree \( 2k \) is strongly \( k \)-node connected.
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