NOTE ON A THEOREM OF DILWORTH

by

D. R. Fulkerson

P-681

11 April 1955

Approved for OTS release

COPY 1 OF 2
HARD COPY $1.00
MICROFICHE $0.50

The RAND Corporation
1700 MAIN ST. • SANTA MONICA • CALIFORNIA
A theorem due to Dilworth on chain decompositions of partially ordered sets is shown to be a consequence of Menger's theorem in the theory of linear graphs.
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Let $P$ be a finite partially ordered set with elements $1, 2, \ldots, n$ and order relation denoted by "$>$". A chain in $P$ is a set of one or more elements $i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k$ with $i_1 > i_2 > \ldots > i_k$. A decomposition of $P$ is a partition of $P$ into chains; a decomposition with the smallest number of chains is minimal. Two members $i, j$ of $P$ are unrelated if neither $i > j$ nor $j > i$. Dilworth [3] has proved that the number of chains in a minimal decomposition of $P$ is equal to the maximal number of mutually unrelated elements of $P$.

Recently Dantzig and Hoffman [1] have formulated the problem of finding a minimal decomposition of $P$ as a transportation-type linear programming problem, and have shown that Dilworth's theorem follows from the duality theorem of linear inequality theory. Our aim here is to show that Dilworth's theorem can be deduced from Menger's theorem [3, p. 244] concerning linear graphs. That the two theorems are related is not surprising, since Menger's theorem may also be viewed as a consequence of the duality theorem applied to a programming problem of transportation type [2].
We need Menger's theorem in only the following rather special form. Let \( L \) be a linear graph with node set \( N \) and suppose \( N \) is partitioned into fixed subsets \( N_1, N_2 \). An \( N_1, N_2 \) cut \( C \) of \( L \) is a subset of \( N \) having the property that every arc joining a node of \( N_1 \) to a node of \( N_2 \) has some node of \( C \) as endpoint, and no proper subset of \( C \) has this property. An \( N_1, N_2 \) join \( J \) of \( L \) is a set of arcs of \( L \), each of which joins a node of \( N_1 \) to a node of \( N_2 \), and no two of which have a node in common. Menger's theorem, applied to \( L \) and the given \( N_1, N_2 \) partition, states that \( \max J = \min C \) (where \( |S| \) denotes the number of elements in set \( S \)), the maximum being taken over all \( N_1, N_2 \) joins \( J \), the minimum over all \( N_1, N_2 \) cuts \( C \). A proof of this particular version of Menger's theorem has also been given by Egerváry [4].

We proceed to a deduction of Dilworth's theorem. Given the partially ordered set \( P = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \), let \( L \) be the linear graph consisting of \( 2n \) nodes, labeled \( a_1, \ldots, a_n, b_1, \ldots, b_n \), and arcs defined from \( P \) by the rule: If \( i > j \), then \( a_i b_j \) is an arc of \( L \); these are all the arcs of \( L \). Let \( N_1 = \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\} \), \( N_2 = \{b_1, \ldots, b_n\} \). Henceforth all joins and cuts are relative to \( N_1, N_2 \).

**Lemma 1.** Corresponding to any join \( J \) of \( L \), there is a decomposition \( D \) of \( P \) with \( |J| + |D| = n \).

**Lemma 2.** Corresponding to any cut \( C \) of \( L \), there is a set \( U \) of mutually unrelated elements of \( P \) with \( |C| + |U| = n \).
Note that Dilworth's theorem follows from the lemmas and Menger's theorem. For let \( \hat{J} \) be a maximal join in \( L \), \( \hat{C} \) a minimal cut, and let \( \hat{D}, \hat{U} \) be their respective correspondents in \( P \). By Menger's theorem, \( |\hat{J}| = |\hat{C}| \); hence, by the lemmas, \( |\hat{D}| = |\hat{U}| \).

But \( |U| \leq |D| \) for any \( U \) and \( D \), since two unrelated elements can not belong to the same chain. Hence \( \max|U| = \min|D| \).

Proof of Lemma 1. Let \( J = \{a_1 b_{i_2}, a_{i_3} b_4, \ldots, a_{i_{2k-1}} b_{i_{2k}}\} \).

Thus

\[
i_1 > i_2, i_3 > i_4, \ldots, i_{2k-1} > i_{2k}
\]
in \( P \), and we may put these together to form chains in the obvious way. These chains will be disjunct, since \( J \) is a join in \( L \).

By adding to these, as one-element chains, all indices from \( 1,2,\ldots,n \) which do not already occur, a decomposition \( D \) of \( P \) is obtained. If the length of the \( i \)th chain in \( D \) is \( l_i \), then

\[
n = \sum l_i = \sum (l_i - 1) + |D| = |J| + |D|.
\]

Proof of Lemma 2. Let \( C = \{a_{i_1}, \ldots, a_{i_k}, b_{j_1}, \ldots, b_{j_m}\} \). The elements of the set \( I \) of indices \( i_1, \ldots, i_k, j_1, \ldots, j_m \) are all distinct, for suppose \( i_1 = j_1 \), say. Since \( C \) is a cut, there is an \( a_{p} \in C \) with \( a_{p} b_{j_1} \) an arc of \( L \); similarly there is a \( b_{q} \in C \) with \( a_{i_1} b_{q} \) an arc of \( L \). Then, by the transitivity of the ordering and the assumption that
$i_1 = j_1$, it follows that $a_r b_s$ is an arc of $L$. This contradicts the fact that $C$ is a cut, and thus implies that the elements of $I$ are all distinct. Now let $U$ be the complement of the set $I$ in $1, 2, \ldots, n$. Since $C$ is a cut, the elements of $U$ are mutually unrelated in $P$, and $n = |U| + |C|$. 
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