

(a) Let M be any Olympic matching, and let T be any Olympic transversal. Since T contains by definition an element (colour) of every flag, it must contain an element $c^{(f)} \in f$ for each $f \in M$. Since the flags $f \in M$ are pairwise disjoint, the colours $c^{(f)}$ must be pairwise distinct. Thus we have shown that T must contain at least as many colours as there are flags in M , that is, $|T| \geq |M|$. Since this reasoning was valid for arbitrary M and T , it implies $\tau(F) \geq \mu(F)$.

(b) The linear program (LP-T) is feasible, because $\mathbf{1}_n$ is a feasible point. Furthermore its objective function is bounded from below, because for all feasible x we have $\mathbf{1}_n^T x = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \geq 0$. From these two facts it follows that there is a (finite) optimum.

Now let T be an Olympic transversal of minimum size, $|T| = \tau(F)$. Then the (characteristic) vector $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with

$$x_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } c_i \notin T \\ 1 & \text{if } c_i \in T \end{cases}$$

is feasible with objective value $\mathbf{1}_n^T x = |T|$. The optimum of the linear program can only be smaller; hence $\tau^*(F) \leq \tau(F)$.

(c) Let $n = 3$ and $F = \{\{c_1, c_2\}, \{c_2, c_3\}, \{c_1, c_3\}\}$ (a triangle graph). Here every Olympic transversal must contain at least two colours, and $T = \{c_1, c_2\}$ is an Olympic transversal; so we have $\tau(F) = 2$. On the other hand, $x = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ is feasible, so we have $\tau^*(F) \leq \frac{3}{2}$.

(d) Consider the dual linear program,

$$\text{maximize } \mathbf{1}_m^T y \text{ subject to } y \geq 0, A^T y \leq \mathbf{1}_n. \quad (\text{LP-M})$$

Since (LP-T) has an optimal solution, so also (LP-M) has an optimum $\mu^*(F)$.

Let M be an Olympic matching of maximum size, $|M| = \mu(F)$, and let $y \in \{0, 1\}^m$ denote its characteristic vector, that is,

$$y_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } f_i \notin M \\ 1 & \text{if } f_i \in M. \end{cases}$$

Then y is a feasible solution for (LP-M) with objective value $|M|$, thus $|M| \leq \mu^*(F)$. Since M was an arbitrary Olympic matching, this proves $\mu(F) \leq \mu^*(F)$. By weak duality we have $\mu^*(F) \leq \tau^*(F)$, and the statement follows.

(e) Let $T = \{c_1, \dots, c_s\}$, and let N denote the number of flags not intersected by T . We have

$$\mathbf{E}[N] = \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^m [\mathbf{f}_i \cap T = \emptyset] \right] = \sum_{i=1}^m \Pr[\mathbf{f}_i \cap T = \emptyset]$$

and for all i we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\mathbf{f}_i \cap T = \emptyset] &= \Pr[c_1 \notin \mathbf{f}_i \text{ and } \dots \text{ and } c_s \notin \mathbf{f}_i] \\ &= \prod_{k=1}^s \Pr[c_k \notin \mathbf{f}_i] \quad (\text{the draws are independent}) \\ &= \prod_{k=1}^s (1 - \Pr[c_k \in \mathbf{f}_i]) \\ &= \prod_{k=1}^s \left(1 - \sum_{c \in \mathbf{f}_i} p(c) \right) \\ &= \prod_{k=1}^s \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{c_j \in \mathbf{f}_i} x_j^*}{\sum_{j=1}^n x_j^*} \right) \\ &\leq \prod_{k=1}^s \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^n x_j^*} \right) \quad (\text{because } x^* \text{ is feasible for (LP-T)}) \\ &= \prod_{k=1}^s \left(1 - \frac{1}{\tau^*} \right) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\tau^*} \right)^s \leq e^{-s/\tau^*}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\mathbf{E}[N] \leq m e^{-s/\tau^*}$. If we choose $s := \lceil \tau^* \ln m \rceil + 1$ (note that we must choose an integer number here) then we have $s > \tau^* \ln m$ and we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}[N] < m e^{-(\tau^* \ln m)/\tau^*} = \frac{m}{m} = 1.$$

It follows that the random set T is an Olympic transversal with positive probability (because otherwise we would have $\Pr[N \geq 1] = 1$ and hence $\mathbf{E}[N] = \sum_{k \geq 1} \Pr[N \geq k] \geq 1$). This means, concretely, that there is a fixed choice of colours c_1, \dots, c_s such that T is an Olympic transversal. Since $|T| \leq s$ this proves $\tau(F) \leq s \leq \tau^* \ln m + 1$.

- (f) (i) Assume w.l.o.g that the colours are numbered in such a way that the first, say, d colours are dark and the remaining colours are light. The assumption in the question means, in terms of the incidence matrix A , that every row has exactly two entries equal to 1, namely one entry within the first d columns and another entry within the remaining $n - d$ columns. All other entries are zero. It follows that the sum of the first d columns of A equals $\mathbf{1}_m$, and the sum of the remaining columns is also $\mathbf{1}_m$. This is a linear dependence among the columns of A , which for clarity we can also write as

$$A \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1}_d \\ -\mathbf{1}_{n-d} \end{pmatrix} = 0.$$

- (ii) We prove by induction on $k \geq 1$ that for every $k \times k$ -submatrix B of A we have $\det(B) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$.

Induction base case, $k = 1$: Clear because the entries of A are all $\in \{0, 1\}$.

Induction step: Let $k \geq 2$ and assume that the statement holds for all smaller square submatrices. Let B be a $k \times k$ -submatrix of A . If every row of B contains two non-zero entries, then we can prove in the same way as in (i) that the columns of B are linearly dependent, from which it follows that $\det(B) = 0$.

Now assume the opposite, that there is a row i of B that has at most one non-zero entry. If all entries in this row are zero, then we again have $\det(B) = 0$. So now assume that row i contains exactly one non-zero entry, say in column j . Then $B_{ij} = 1$. Let C denote the matrix that arises from B by deleting the i th row and the j th column. From the Laplace expansion for the determinant (or directly from the formula for the determinant, if you're patient enough to go through this) it follows that $\det(B) = \pm B_{ij} \det(C) = \pm \det(C)$. Since C is also a submatrix of A , but of dimension smaller than k , we can apply the induction hypothesis and obtain $\det(C) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$. The statement follows.

- (iii) Let x be a basic feasible solution of (LP-T). By definition, x satisfies n linearly independent constraints with equality. If we write the constraints of the linear program in the form

$$Bx \geq b$$

where

$$B := \begin{pmatrix} I_n \\ A \end{pmatrix}, \quad b := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_n \\ \mathbf{1}_m \end{pmatrix},$$

then the n linearly independent constraints correspond to n linearly independent rows of the matrix B . Let \tilde{B} be the submatrix that consists of these rows, and let \tilde{b} be the vector that contains the corresponding entries of the right-hand side b , so that

$$\tilde{B}x = \tilde{b}.$$

Since the proof in (ii) applies verbatim to the matrix B instead of A , we have $\det(\tilde{B}) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$. By linear independence, however, we have $\det(\tilde{B}) \neq 0$. By Cramer's rule (cf. the proof of theorem 6.2 where the same trick was used), for all j ,

$$x_j = \frac{\det(\tilde{B}_j)}{\det(\tilde{B})} = \pm \det(\tilde{B}_j),$$

where \tilde{B}_j is obtained from \tilde{B} by replacing the j th column with \tilde{b} . All entries of \tilde{B}_j are integers, hence $\det(\tilde{B}_j)$ is an integer. Thus we have shown that all entries of x are integers.

- (iv) We assume, as we told you by mail you may, too, that (LP-T) has an optimal solution x^* which is at the same time a basic feasible solution. It follows from (iii) that x^* is integral. Furthermore we can observe that every optimal solution satisfies $x^* \leq \mathbf{1}_n$ (if there is some coordinate i with $x_i^* > 1$, then we can replace x_i^* by 1

and the resulting vector is still feasible, but its objective value is strictly smaller, contradicting optimality of χ^*). We also have $\chi^* \geq \mathbf{0}_n$ from the constraints.

Thus χ^* must be a 0-1-vector, and the set $T := \{c_j : \chi_j^* = 1\}$ is an Olympic transversal of minimum size (*by construction of (LP-T); no need to detail this once again for just 2 points*). It follows that $\tau^*(F) = |T| = \tau(F)$.

- (v) Consider the dual program (LP-M) again. We can write the constraints in the same way as we did for (LP-T) in (iii), i.e.,

$$\begin{pmatrix} -I_m \\ A^T \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{y} \leq \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_m \\ \mathbf{1}_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let C be any square submatrix of $\begin{pmatrix} -I_m \\ A^T \end{pmatrix}$. Then, by Laplace expansion, $\det(C) = \pm \det \tilde{C}$ where \tilde{C} is some submatrix of A^T (and also of C). The transposed matrix \tilde{C}^T is a submatrix of A , so we can apply (ii):

$$\det(C) = \pm \det(\tilde{C}) = \pm \det(\tilde{C}^T) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}.$$

This was true for an arbitrary square submatrix C . Hence the reasoning in (iii) can also be applied to the dual program (LP-M), and every basic feasible solution of (LP-M) is integral.

Let \mathbf{y} be any feasible solution of (LP-M). We claim that $\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{1}_m$. Indeed, every column of A^T contains at least one entry (actually, two of them) equal to 1, so that every y_i appears in some constraint of the form $y_{i_1} + \dots + y_{i_k} \leq 1$. Since we also have $\mathbf{y} \geq 0$, this implies $y_i \leq 1$.

We have shown that every basic feasible solution of (LP-M) is a 0-1-vector. Similarly to (iv) it follows that, given an optimal solution \mathbf{y}^* , the set $M := \{f_i : y_i^* = 1\}$ is a maximum Olympic matching, and $\mu^*(F) = |M| = \mu(F)$. We conclude with strong duality:

$$\tau(F) = \tau^*(F) = \mu^*(F) = \mu(F).$$