

Rosalind Cameron (Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada) Daniel Horsley (Monash University, Australia)

In this talk:

- decompositions are edge decompositions;
- stars are always simple.

In this talk:

- decompositions are edge decompositions;
- stars are always simple.

Question

When does a multigraph G admit a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?

In this talk:

- decompositions are edge decompositions;
- stars are always simple.

Question

When does a multigraph G admit a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?

This problem is hard.

In this talk:

- decompositions are edge decompositions;
- stars are always simple.

Question

When does a multigraph G admit a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?

This problem is hard. (E.g. it's NP-complete even for $m_1 = \cdots = m_t = 3$.)

In this talk:

- decompositions are edge decompositions;
- stars are always simple.

Question

When does a multigraph G admit a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?

This problem is hard. (E.g. it's NP-complete even for $m_1 = \cdots = m_t = 3$.)

We'll look at two special cases:

In this talk:

- decompositions are edge decompositions;
- stars are always simple.

Question

When does a multigraph G admit a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?

This problem is hard. (E.g. it's NP-complete even for $m_1 = \cdots = m_t = 3$.)

We'll look at two special cases:

Question 1

When does a multigraph *G* admit a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ where each star has a specified centre?

In this talk:

- decompositions are edge decompositions;
- stars are always simple.

Question

When does a multigraph G admit a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?

This problem is hard. (E.g. it's NP-complete even for $m_1 = \cdots = m_t = 3$.)

We'll look at two special cases:

Question 1

When does a multigraph *G* admit a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ where each star has a specified centre?

Question 2

When does a complete multigraph λK_n admit a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?

Question 1: Star decompositions where centres are specified

Question 1

When does a multigraph *G* admit a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ where each star has a specified centre?

Question 1

When does a multigraph *G* admit a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ where each star has a specified centre?



Question 1

When does a multigraph *G* admit a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ where each star has a specified centre?



Question 1

When does a multigraph *G* admit a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ where each star has a specified centre?



Question 1

When does a multigraph *G* admit a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ where each star has a specified centre?



Question 1

When does a multigraph *G* admit a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ where each star has a specified centre?



Question 1

When does a multigraph *G* admit a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ where each star has a specified centre?



Question 1

When does a multigraph *G* admit a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ where each star has a specified centre?



Question 1

When does a multigraph *G* admit a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ where each star has a specified centre?

Example A decomposition of a multigraph into stars of sizes [3, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1] where each star has a specified centre.



Hoffman (1994) answered this question in the case $m_1 = \cdots = m_t$.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

A decomposition of a multigraph *G* into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ where each star has a specified centre exists if and only if $m_1 + \cdots + m_t = |E(G)|$ and no multiset of sizes is *overfull*.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

A decomposition of a multigraph *G* into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ where each star has a specified centre exists if and only if $m_1 + \cdots + m_t = |E(G)|$ and no multiset of sizes is *overfull*.



Theorem Cameron, Horsley

A decomposition of a multigraph *G* into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ where each star has a specified centre exists if and only if $m_1 + \cdots + m_t = |E(G)|$ and no multiset of sizes is *overfull*.

Example



Consider the red star sizes.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

A decomposition of a multigraph *G* into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ where each star has a specified centre exists if and only if $m_1 + \cdots + m_t = |E(G)|$ and no multiset of sizes is *overfull*.



- Consider the red star sizes.
- The corresponding stars must fit inside the blue subgraph.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

A decomposition of a multigraph G into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ where each star has a specified centre exists if and only if $m_1 + \cdots + m_t = |E(G)|$ and no multiset of sizes is *overfull*.



- Consider the red star sizes.
- The corresponding stars must fit inside the blue subgraph.
- ► The red sizes sum to 7.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

A decomposition of a multigraph *G* into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ where each star has a specified centre exists if and only if $m_1 + \cdots + m_t = |E(G)|$ and no multiset of sizes is *overfull*.



- Consider the red star sizes.
- The corresponding stars must fit inside the blue subgraph.
- ▶ The red sizes sum to 7.
- ► The blue graph has only 6 edges.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

A decomposition of a multigraph G into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ where each star has a specified centre exists if and only if $m_1 + \cdots + m_t = |E(G)|$ and no multiset of sizes is *overfull*.



- Consider the red star sizes.
- The corresponding stars must fit inside the blue subgraph.
- ▶ The red sizes sum to 7.
- ► The blue graph has only 6 edges.
- Because 7 > 6 the multiset of red sizes is overfull.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

A decomposition of a multigraph *G* into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ where each star has a specified centre exists if and only if $m_1 + \cdots + m_t = |E(G)|$ and no multiset of sizes is *overfull*.

Example



- Consider the red star sizes.
- The corresponding stars must fit inside the blue subgraph.
- ▶ The red sizes sum to 7.
- ► The blue graph has only 6 edges.
- Because 7 > 6 the multiset of red sizes is overfull.

Hoffman's result is similar but only requires checking every set of vertices.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

A decomposition of a multigraph *G* into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ where each star has a specified centre exists if and only if $m_1 + \cdots + m_t = |E(G)|$ and no multiset of sizes is *overfull*.

Example



- Consider the red star sizes.
- The corresponding stars must fit inside the blue subgraph.
- ► The red sizes sum to 7.
- The blue graph has only 6 edges.
- Because 7 > 6 the multiset of red sizes is overfull.

Hoffman's result is similar but only requires checking every set of vertices.

Both results are proved using max-flow min-cut arguments.

Question 2: Star decompositions of complete multigraphs

Question 2

When is there a decomposition of λK_n into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?

Question 2

When is there a decomposition of λK_n into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?

Example A decomposition of $2K_5$ into stars of sizes [4, 4, 3, 3, 3, 2, 1].

Question 2

When is there a decomposition of λK_n into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?

Example A decomposition of $2K_5$ into stars of sizes [4, 4, 3, 3, 3, 2, 1].



Question 2

When is there a decomposition of λK_n into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?

Example A decomposition of $2K_5$ into stars of sizes [4, 4, 3, 3, 3, 2, 1].


Question 2

When is there a decomposition of λK_n into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?



Question 2

When is there a decomposition of λK_n into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?



Question 2

When is there a decomposition of λK_n into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?



Question 2

When is there a decomposition of λK_n into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?



Question 2

When is there a decomposition of λK_n into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?



Question 2

When is there a decomposition of λK_n into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?



Question 2

When is there a decomposition of λK_n into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?

Example A decomposition of $2K_5$ into stars of sizes [4, 4, 3, 3, 3, 2, 1].



Tarsi (1979) completely answered this question in the case $m_1 = \cdots = m_t$.

Question 2

When is there a decomposition of λK_n into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?

Example A decomposition of $2K_5$ into stars of sizes [4, 4, 3, 3, 3, 2, 1].



Tarsi (1979) completely answered this question in the case $m_1 = \cdots = m_t$. Lin and Shyu (1996) completely answered this question in the case $\lambda = 1$.

Question 2

When is there a decomposition of λK_n into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?

Example A decomposition of $2K_5$ into stars of sizes [4, 4, 3, 3, 3, 2, 1].



Tarsi (1979) completely answered this question in the case $m_1 = \cdots = m_t$.

Lin and Shyu (1996) completely answered this question in the case $\lambda = 1$.

Both results give simple numerical necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a decomposition.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.



Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.



Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.

Proof sketch: Consider trying to decompose $2K_n$ (*n* odd) into stars of sizes $[(n-1)^{n-2}, 4a_1, \ldots, 4a_s]$, where $4a_1 + \cdots + 4a_s = 2(n-1)$.



No two (n − 1)-stars can be centred at the same vertex.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.



- No two (n − 1)-stars can be centred at the same vertex.
- So n − 2 vertices each have one (n − 1)-star centred at them.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.



- No two (n − 1)-stars can be centred at the same vertex.
- So n − 2 vertices each have one (n − 1)-star centred at them.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.



- No two (n − 1)-stars can be centred at the same vertex.
- So n − 2 vertices each have one (n − 1)-star centred at them.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.



- No two (n − 1)-stars can be centred at the same vertex.
- So n − 2 vertices each have one (n − 1)-star centred at them.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.



- No two (n − 1)-stars can be centred at the same vertex.
- So n − 2 vertices each have one (n − 1)-star centred at them.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.



- No two (n − 1)-stars can be centred at the same vertex.
- So n − 2 vertices each have one (n − 1)-star centred at them.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.



- No two (n − 1)-stars can be centred at the same vertex.
- So n − 2 vertices each have one (n − 1)-star centred at them.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.



- No two (n − 1)-stars can be centred at the same vertex.
- So n − 2 vertices each have one (n − 1)-star centred at them.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.



- No two (n − 1)-stars can be centred at the same vertex.
- So n − 2 vertices each have one (n − 1)-star centred at them.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.



- No two (n − 1)-stars can be centred at the same vertex.
- So n − 2 vertices each have one (n − 1)-star centred at them.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.



- No two (n − 1)-stars can be centred at the same vertex.
- So n − 2 vertices each have one (n − 1)-star centred at them.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.



- No two (n − 1)-stars can be centred at the same vertex.
- So n − 2 vertices each have one (n − 1)-star centred at them.
- ► This leaves the graph shown to be decomposed into stars of sizes $[4a_1, \ldots, 4a_t]$.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.



- No two (n − 1)-stars can be centred at the same vertex.
- So n − 2 vertices each have one (n − 1)-star centred at them.
- This leaves the graph shown to be decomposed into stars of sizes $[4a_1, \ldots, 4a_t]$.
- All the remaining stars must be centred on the red vertices.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.



- No two (n − 1)-stars can be centred at the same vertex.
- So n − 2 vertices each have one (n − 1)-star centred at them.
- This leaves the graph shown to be decomposed into stars of sizes $[4a_1, \ldots, 4a_t]$.
- All the remaining stars must be centred on the red vertices.
- ▶ The sizes centred on each red vertex must sum to n-1 (n-2 and n are odd).

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.



- No two (n − 1)-stars can be centred at the same vertex.
- So n − 2 vertices each have one (n − 1)-star centred at them.
- This leaves the graph shown to be decomposed into stars of sizes $[4a_1, \ldots, 4a_t]$.
- All the remaining stars must be centred on the red vertices.
- The sizes centred on each red vertex must sum to n-1 (n-2 and n are odd).
- ► This can be done if and only if [4a₁,...,4a_t] (equivalently, [a₁,...,a_t]) can be partitioned into equal halves.

Theorem Cameron, Horsley

For any $\lambda \ge 2$, the problem of being given *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ and determining whether λK_n has a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ is NP-complete.

Proof sketch: Consider trying to decompose $2K_n$ (*n* odd) into stars of sizes $[(n-1)^{n-2}, 4a_1, \ldots, 4a_s]$, where $4a_1 + \cdots + 4a_s = 2(n-1)$.



- No two (n − 1)-stars can be centred at the same vertex.
- So n − 2 vertices each have one (n − 1)-star centred at them.
- ► This leaves the graph shown to be decomposed into stars of sizes [4a₁,...,4a_t].
- All the remaining stars must be centred on the red vertices.
- The sizes centred on each red vertex must sum to n-1 (n-2 and n are odd).
- ► This can be done if and only if [4a₁,...,4a_t] (equivalently, [a₁,...,a_t]) can be partitioned into equal halves.

This allows us to reduce PARTITION to our problem.

What about if we limit the maximum star size?

What about if we limit the maximum star size?

$(\lambda, lpha) ext{-star decomp}$

Instance: Positive integers *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$ such that $\max(m_1, \ldots, m_t) \leq \alpha(n-1)$ and $m_1 + \cdots + m_t = \lambda \binom{n}{2}$.

Question: Does λK_n have a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_t]$?

What about if we limit the maximum star size?

$(\lambda, lpha) ext{-star decomp}$

Instance: Positive integers *n* and $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$ such that $\max(m_1, \ldots, m_l) \leq \alpha(n-1)$ and $m_1 + \cdots + m_t = \lambda {n \choose 2}$. Question: Does λK_n have a decomposition into stars of sizes $[m_1, \ldots, m_l]$?

Theorem wannabe Cameron, Horsley

Let $\lambda \ge 2$ be an integer. Then (λ, α) -star decomp is NP-complete if and only if $\alpha > \alpha'$, where

$$\alpha' = \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda}{\lambda+1}, & \text{if } \lambda \text{ is odd;} \\ 1 - 4(\sqrt{\lambda(\lambda+2)} + 2)^{-2}, & \text{if } \lambda \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, if $\alpha \leq \alpha'$ then, for all sufficiently large *n*, the answer to (λ, α) -STAR DECOMP is affirmative.

Threshold configuration for λ odd
Take a list $[m^{(\lambda+1)n/2-2}, \text{ small stuff}]$, where $m = (\alpha' + \epsilon)(n-1)$.

Take a list $[m^{(\lambda+1)n/2-2}, \text{small stuff}]$, where $m = (\alpha' + \epsilon)(n-1)$.

We can show the ms must be arranged as follows (otherwise the set of ms will be overfull):



Take a list $[m^{(\lambda+1)n/2-2}, \text{small stuff}]$, where $m = (\alpha' + \epsilon)(n-1)$.

We can show the mes must be arranged as follows (otherwise the set of mes will be overfull):



Take a list $[m^{(\lambda+1)n/2-2}, \text{small stuff}]$, where $m = (\alpha' + \epsilon)(n-1)$.

We can show the mes must be arranged as follows (otherwise the set of mes will be overfull):



Take a list $[m^{(\lambda+1)n/2-2}, \text{small stuff}]$, where $m = (\alpha' + \epsilon)(n-1)$.

We can show the ms must be arranged as follows (otherwise the set of ms will be overfull):



Each marked vertex must have almost half the small stuff on it (otherwise the set star sizes on vertices other than it will be overfull).

Take a list $[m^{(\lambda+1)n/2-2}, \text{small stuff}]$, where $m = (\alpha' + \epsilon)(n-1)$.

We can show the ms must be arranged as follows (otherwise the set of ms will be overfull):



Each marked vertex must have almost half the small stuff on it (otherwise the set star sizes on vertices other than it will be overfull).

So we can set up a similar NP-completeness argument to before.

Take a list $[m^{\lambda(n-s)/2-2}, c^{(\lambda+2)s/2+2}, \text{small stuff}]$, where m, c and s are carefully selected so that

- $m = (\alpha' + \epsilon)(n-1)$
- c obeys $\frac{\lambda}{\lambda+2}m < c < m$
- s is very roughly equal to $\frac{2}{\lambda+4}n$.

Take a list $[m^{\lambda(n-s)/2-2}, c^{(\lambda+2)s/2+2}]$, small stuff], where m, c and s are carefully selected so that

- $m = (\alpha' + \epsilon)(n-1)$
- c obeys $\frac{\lambda}{\lambda+2}m < c < m$
- s is very roughly equal to $\frac{2}{\lambda+4}n$.

We can show the **m**s and **c**s must be arranged as follows (otherwise some set of star sizes will be overfull):





Take a list $[m^{\lambda(n-s)/2-2}, c^{(\lambda+2)s/2+2}]$, small stuff], where m, c and s are carefully selected so that

- $m = (\alpha' + \epsilon)(n-1)$
- c obeys $\frac{\lambda}{\lambda+2}m < c < m$
- s is very roughly equal to $\frac{2}{\lambda+4}n$.

We can show the **m**s and **c**s must be arranged as follows (otherwise some set of star sizes will be overfull):



s

Take a list $[m^{\lambda(n-s)/2-2}, c^{(\lambda+2)s/2+2}]$, small stuff], where m, c and s are carefully selected so that

- $m = (\alpha' + \epsilon)(n-1)$
- c obeys $\frac{\lambda}{\lambda+2}m < c < m$
- s is very roughly equal to $\frac{2}{\lambda+4}n$.

We can show the **m**s and **c**s must be arranged as follows (otherwise some set of star sizes will be overfull):



s

Take a list $[m^{\lambda(n-s)/2-2}, c^{(\lambda+2)s/2+2}, \text{small stuff}]$, where m, c and s are carefully selected so that

- $m = (\alpha' + \epsilon)(n-1)$
- c obeys $\frac{\lambda}{\lambda+2}m < c < m$
- *s* is very roughly equal to $\frac{2}{\lambda+4}n$.

We can show the mes and cs must be arranged as follows (otherwise some set of star sizes will be overfull):



Each marked vertex must have almost half the small stuff on it (otherwise the set star sizes on vertices other than it will be overfull).

So we can set up a similar NP-completeness argument to before.

The end.

