Lecture 19: More Flow Applications
Some general ideas for using MaxFlow/MinCut

- If no source/sink, add them with appropriate capacity depending on application
- Sometimes can have edges with no capacity limits
  - Infinite capacity (or, equivalently, very large integer capacity)
- Convert undirected graphs to directed ones
- Can remove unnecessary flow cycles in answers
- Another idea:
  - To use them for vertex capacities $c_v$
  - Make two copies of each vertex $v$ named $v_{in}, v_{out}$
Kinds of applications

• So far we mostly have focused on flow-like problems

• Applications that involve cut problems are also important...
Image Segmentation
Image Segmentation

Image segmentation:

**Given:** an Image
- a grid of pixels with RGB values

**Divide** image into coherent regions.

**Example:** Three people standing in front of complex background scene. Identify each person as a coherent object.
Image Segmentation

Foreground / background segmentation:


- $a_i \geq 0$ is likelihood pixel $i$ is foreground.
- $b_i \geq 0$ is likelihood pixel $i$ is background.
- For $(i, j) \in E$, $p_{ij} \geq 0$ is separation penalty for labeling one of $i$ and $j$ as foreground, and the other as background.

Label each pixel in image as belonging to foreground (in $A$) or background (in $B$)

Goals: Maximize

Accuracy: if $a_i > b_i$ in isolation, prefer to label $i$ in foreground.

Smoothness: if many neighbors of $i$ are labeled foreground, we should be inclined not to label $i$ as background.

Find partition $(A, B)$ that maximizes $\sum_{i \in A} a_i + \sum_{i \in B} b_i - \sum_{(i, j) \in E, |A \cap \{i, j\}|=1} p_{ij}$
Image Segmentation

Issues with formulating as min cut problem:

- Maximization.
- No source or sink.
- Undirected graph.

But maximizing
\[ \sum_{i \in A} a_i + \sum_{i \in B} b_i - \sum_{|A \cap \{i,j\}|=1'} p_{ij} \]

is equivalent to maximizing
\[ \sum_{i \in V} a_i - \sum_{i \in B} a_i + \sum_{i \in V} b_i - \sum_{i \in a} b_i - \sum_{|A \cap \{i,j\}|=1'} p_{ij} \]

or, alternatively, minimizing
\[ \sum_{i \in A} b_i + \sum_{i \in B} a_i + \sum_{|A \cap \{i,j\}|=1'} p_{ij} \]
Image Segmentation

Formulate as min cut problem.

- Add source $s$ to correspond to foreground, edges $(s, i)$ with capacity $a_i$; add sink $t$ to correspond to background, edges $(j, t)$ with capacity $b_j$. 
Image Segmentation

Formulate as min cut problem.

- Add source $s$ to correspond to foreground, edges $(s, i)$ with capacity $a_i$; add sink $t$ to correspond to background, edges $(j, t)$ with capacity $b_j$.
- Use two anti-parallel edges instead of undirected edge, capacity $p_{ij}$. 

![Graph representation of Image Segmentation](image)
Image Segmentation

Formulate as min cut problem.

- Add source $s$ to correspond to foreground, edges $(s, i)$ with capacity $a_i$; add sink $t$ to correspond to background, edges $(j, t)$ with capacity $b_j$.
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Image Segmentation

Formulate as min cut problem.

- Add source $s$ to correspond to foreground, edges $(s, i)$ with capacity $a_i$; add sink $t$ to correspond to background, edges $(j, t)$ with capacity $b_j$.
- Use two anti-parallel edges instead of undirected edge, capacity $p_{ij}$.
- $G' = (V', E')$.

Edges cut: from $s$ leaving $A$ from $A$ to $t$ one direction for $p_{ij}$

Min cut is exactly the quantity we want to minimize!
Project Selection
Project Selection

Project Selection:

Input: Set $P$ of possible projects; each project $v \in P$ has an associated revenue $p_v$ which can be negative.
- Some projects generate money so $p_v > 0$; e.g., create interactive e-commerce interface, redesign web page
- Others cost money so $p_v < 0$; e.g., upgrade computers, get site license

Set $E$ of “prerequisites”: If $(v, w) \in E$, can't do project $v$ and unless also do project $w$.

Defn: A subset of projects is feasible iff the prerequisite of every project in $A$ also belongs to $A$.

Find: A feasible subset of projects $A \subseteq P$ that maximizes total revenue.

Note: “prerequisites” may have nothing to do with time. $E$ may include cycles.
Project Selection: Prerequisite Graph

Prerequisite graph:

• Include an edge from \( v \) to \( w \) if can't do \( v \) without also doing \( w \).
• \( \{v, w, x\} \) is feasible subset of projects.
• \( \{v, x\} \) is infeasible subset of projects.
Min cut formulation:

- Assign capacity $\infty$ to all prerequisite edge.
- Add edge $(s, v)$ with capacity $p_v$ if $p_v > 0$.
- Add edge $(v, t)$ with capacity $|p_v| = -p_v$ if $p_v < 0$.
- For notational convenience, define $p_s = p_t = 0$. 
Project Selection: Min Cut Formulation

Claim: \((A, B)\) is min cut iff \(A - \{s\}\) is optimal set of projects.

- Infinite capacity edges ensure \(A - \{s\}\) is feasible. (No original edges leave \(A\).)
- Max revenue because:

\[
c(A, B) = \sum_{v \in B} p_v + \sum_{v \in A} (-p(v))
\]

\(
= \sum_{v \in B} p_v \quad \sum_{v \in A} p(v) - \sum_{v \in \hat{A}} p(v)
\)

The sum in red is constant so minimizing \(c(A, B)\) is the same as maximizing \(\sum_{v \in \hat{A}} p(v)\).
Also known as Strip Mining problem

Open-pit mining. (studied since early 1960s)

- Blocks of earth are extracted from surface to retrieve ore.
- Each block $v$ has net value $p_v = \text{value of ore} - \text{processing cost}$.
- Can't remove block $v$ before $w$ or $x$. 

\[
\text{Diagram: Open-pit mining scenario with blocks } v, w, \text{and } x.\]
"See that thing in the paper last week about Einstein? . . .
Some reporter asked him to figure out the mathematics of the
pennant race. You know, one team wins so many of their
remaining games, the other teams win this number or that
number. What are the myriad possibilities? Who's got the
edge?"
"The hell does he know?"
"Apparently not much. He picked the Dodgers
to eliminate the Giants last Friday."

- Don DeLillo, Underworld
Baseball Elimination

• Though you probably don’t care at all about baseball or sports in general, the way that the solution works is interesting.
  • This particular problem is a bit old style since baseball scheduling doesn’t work this way any more:

• Near the end of a season
  • sportswriters use simple notions to tell which teams can be eliminated from getting a top place finish:
    • “magic number”, “elimination number”, etc.

• These are not accurate
  • We can do better with network flow
## Baseball Elimination: Scenario

### Team vs. Against

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Wins $w_i$</th>
<th>Losses $l_i$</th>
<th>To play $r_i$</th>
<th>Against = $r_{ij}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Which teams have a chance of finishing the season with most wins?
  - Oakland eliminated since it can finish with at most 80 wins, but Texas already has 83.
  - If $w_i + r_i < w_j$ ⇒ team $i$ eliminated.
  - Only reason sports broadcasters appear to be aware of.
  - Sufficient, but not necessary!
Baseball Elimination: Scenario

- Which teams have a chance of finishing the season with most wins?
  - Houston can win 83 games, but is still eliminated . . .
  - If Texas doesn’t get to 84 wins then Seattle will get 6 more wins and finish with 84 wins.

- The answer depends on more than current wins and # of remaining games
  - It also depends on all the games that are being played.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
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<td></td>
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<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>77</td>
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<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baseball Elimination

Baseball elimination problem:
• Set of teams $S$.
• Distinguished team $z \in S$.
• Team $x$ has won $w_x$ games already.
• Teams $x$ and $y$ play each other $r_{xy}$ additional times.
• Is there any outcome of the remaining games in which team $s$ finishes with the most (or tied for the most) wins?
Can team 3 finish with most wins?

- Assume team 3 wins all remaining games $\Rightarrow w_3 + r_3$ wins.
- Divide up remaining games so that all teams have $\leq w_3 + r_3$ wins.
Baseball Elimination: Max Flow Formulation

**Theorem:** Team 3 is not eliminated iff max flow equals capacity leaving source.
- Integrality theorem implies that each remaining $x$-$y$ game counts as a win for $x$ or $y$.
- Capacity on $(x, t)$ edge ensures no team wins too many games.
Baseball Elimination: Explanation for Sports Writers

Which teams have a chance of finishing the season with most wins?

- Detroit could finish season with \(49 + 27 = 76\) wins.

Certificate of elimination. \(R = \{NY, Bal, Bos, Tor\}\)

- Have already won \(w(R) = 278\) games.
- Must win at least \(r(R) = 27\) more.
- Average team in \(R\) wins at least \(305/4 > 76\) games.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Wins</th>
<th>Losses</th>
<th>To play</th>
<th>Against = (r_{ij})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(w_i)</td>
<td>(l_i)</td>
<td>(r_i)</td>
<td>NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AL East: August 30, 1996
Baseball Elimination: Explanation for Sports Writers

**Defn:** Given a set $T$ of teams define

- $w(T) = \sum_{x \in T} w_x$  total number of wins for teams in $T$
- $r(T) = \sum_{\{x,y\} \subseteq T} r_{xy}$ total remaining games between teams in $T$

We say that $T$ eliminates team $z$ iff $\frac{w(T)+r(T)}{|T|} > w_z + r_z$ since an average team in $T$ will win more than $w_z + r_z$ games.

**Theorem [Hoffman-Rivlin 1967]:** Team $z$ is eliminated $\iff$ there is some set $T$ of teams that eliminates $z$ (as defined above).

**Proof:** $\iff$ Shown above

$\Rightarrow$ Choose $T$ to be the set of teams on the source side of the min cut...
Proof of ⇒: Assume that $z$ is eliminated

Let $T = \text{team nodes in } A$ for minimum cut $(A, B)$ with capacity $< \sum_{xy} r_{xy}$.

Claim: $x - y \in A \iff \text{both } x \in A \text{ and } y \in A$ (equivalently $x \in T$ and $y \in T$).

- infinite capacity edges ensure that if $x - y \in A$ then $x \in A$ and $y \in A$
- if $x \in A$ and $y \in A$ but $x - y \notin A$, then adding $x - y$ to $A$ decreases cut capacity by $r_{xy}$.
Baseball Elimination: Explanation for Sports Writers

Proof of $\Rightarrow$: Assume that $z$ is eliminated.

Let $T =$ team nodes in $A$ for minimum cut $(A, B)$ with capacity $< \sum_{xy} r_{xy}$.

Claim: $x - y \in A \iff$ both $x \in A$ and $y \in A$ (equivalently $x \in T$ and $y \in T$).

Then $c(A, B) = \sum_{xy} r_{xy} - r(T) + |T|(w_z + r_z) - w(T)$
Baseball Elimination: Explanation for Sports Writers

Proof of $\Rightarrow$: Assume that $z$ is eliminated.

Let $T = \text{team nodes in } A \text{ for minimum cut } (A, B) \text{ with capacity } < \sum_{xy} r_{xy}$.

Claim: $x-y \in A \iff \text{both } x \in A \text{ and } y \in A$ (equivalently $x \in T \text{ and } y \in T$).

Then $c(A, B) = \sum_{xy} r_{xy} - r(T) + |T|(w_z + r_z) - w(T)$

Now $c(A, B) < \sum_{xy} r_{xy}$ implies that $r(T) - |T|(w_z + r_z) + w(T) > 0$.

Rearranging, we have $r(T) + w(T) > |T|(w_z + r_z)$ so $\frac{w(T) + r(T)}{|T|} > w_z + r_z$ which means that $T$ eliminates $z$. 