Sexuelevoorlichting1991full

DOWNLOAD: https://tinurli.com/2il4b1

Download

; @Gai1990; @Kolodrubetz2002; @Rogers2002; @Zhu2010]. A single vertex can be removed from the graph, however, which yields a larger graph which still has the same number of vertex-disjoint paths and is easier to compute an optimal packing of (for a proof, see [@Zhu2010 Lemma 2]). It is hence important to note that the maximum number of disjoint paths is not the same as the maximum number of vertex-disjoint paths. One of the first examples showing that the maximum number of vertex-disjoint paths in a graph is not necessarily equal to the maximum number of disjoint paths was given by Kelly [@Kelly1963], who showed that any graph with more than $n+2$ vertices has at least $2n+4$ disjoint paths. For a more recent example, see [@Zhu2010], where the authors show that for any $n\geq 5$, there exists a graph with $n+2$ vertices and exactly $2n+4$ disjoint paths. To obtain the desired upper bound we will use the following useful lemma by Zhu [@Zhu2010]. \[lem:Zhu\] Let G be a graph with n vertices and F be a subset of G with k vertices such that the maximum number of disjoint paths from F is N. Then, there exists a subgraph H of G such that H contains F and $|V(H)|=N+k-1$ and at most one vertex of F is adjacent to a vertex of $H-F$. Let C_1, C_2,..., C_k be the paths in $\mathcal{P}$. Recall that the set $V(C_i)$ is the set of vertices of the path C_i, i.e. $V(C_i)=\{v_i: 1\leq i\leq k\}$ for some $v_i\in V(C_i)$. \[lem:main\] Let $C_1, C_2,..., C_k$ be a partition of the set F of $n+2$ vertices 82157476af