

## Traffic Grooming on the Path

Jean-Claude Bermond, Laurent Braud, David Coudert

► **To cite this version:**

Jean-Claude Bermond, Laurent Braud, David Coudert. Traffic Grooming on the Path. Theoretical Computer Science, Elsevier, 2007, Structural Information and Communication Complexity (SIROCCO 2005), 384 (2-3), pp.139-151. <10.1016/j.tcs.2007.04.028>. <inria-00308716>

**HAL Id: inria-00308716**

**<https://hal.inria.fr/inria-00308716>**

Submitted on 31 Jul 2008

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Traffic Grooming on the Path\*

Jean-Claude Bermond<sup>a</sup>, Laurent Braud<sup>b†</sup>, David Coudert<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Mascotte Project, CNRS/I3S/INRIA, Sophia-Antipolis, France

`{bermond,dcoudert}@sophia.inria.fr`

<sup>b</sup> ENS-Lyon, Lyon, France

`laurent.braud@ens-lyon.fr`

## Abstract

In a WDM network, routing a request consists in assigning it a route in the physical network and a wavelength. If each request uses at most  $1/C$  of the bandwidth of the wavelength, we will say that the grooming factor is  $C$ . That means that on a given edge of the network we can groom (group) at most  $C$  requests on the same wavelength. With this constraint the objective can be either to minimize the number of wavelengths (related to the transmission cost) or minimize the number of Add Drop Multiplexers (shortly ADM) used in the network (related to the cost of the nodes). We consider here the case where the network is a path on  $N$  nodes,  $P_N$ . Thus the routing is unique. For a given grooming factor  $C$  minimizing the number of wavelengths is an easy problem, well known and related to the load problem. But minimizing the number of ADM's is NP-complete for a general set of requests and no results are known. Here we show how to model the problem as a graph partition problem and using tools of design theory we completely solve the case where  $C = 2$  and where we have a static uniform all-to-all traffic (one request for each pair of vertices).

**Keywords:** Traffic grooming, graph, design theory, WDM

## 1 Introduction

Traffic grooming is the generic term for packing low rate signals into higher speed streams (see the surveys [14, 24, 26]). By using traffic grooming, one can bypass the electronics in the nodes for which there is no traffic sourced or destined to it. Typically, in a WDM network, instead of having one SONET Add Drop Multiplexer (shortly ADM) on every wavelength at every node, it may be possible to have ADMs only for the wavelength used at that node, the other wavelengths being optically routed without electronic switching. For example in Figure 1 node 1 has an ADM only for wavelength  $w_3$ , the other wavelengths ( $w_1$  and  $w_2$ ) being optically routed.

In the past many papers on WDM networks had for objective to minimize the transmission cost and in particular the number of wavelengths to be used [1, 12, 10]; recent research has focused on reducing the total number of ADMs used in the network, trying to minimize it.

Here, we consider the particular case of paths (the routing is unique) with static uniform all-to-all traffic (one request for each pair of vertices).

---

\*This work has been partially funded by the European project IST FET AEOLUS, and has been done in the context of the CRC CORSO with France Telecom and the European action COST 293.

†Part of this work has been done during the internship of Laurent Braud in the Mascotte project, june-july 2004.




Figure 1: Placement of ADMs in the network: one ADM for each wavelength used in a node.

To each request  $\{i, j\}$  routed on the path from  $i$  to  $j$ , we want to assign a wavelength in such a way that at most  $C$  requests use the same wavelength on a given edge of the path. Equivalently, each request uses  $1/C$  of the bandwidth of the wavelength.  $C$  is called the *grooming ratio* (or *grooming factor*). For example, if the request from  $i$  to  $j$  is one OC-12 and a wavelength can carry an OC-48, the grooming factor is 4. Given the grooming ratio  $C$  and the path  $P_N$  with  $N$  vertices, the objective is to minimize the total number of (SONET) ADMs used, denoted  $A(P_N, C)$ , and so reducing the network cost by eliminating as many ADMs as possible from the “no grooming case”.

Figure 2 shows how to groom requests for a grooming factor  $C = 2$  and a path  $P_N$  with  $N = 3, 7, 9$  vertices. In the figure each level represents a wavelength (1 for  $N = 3$ , 6 for  $N = 7$  and 10 for  $N = 9$ ), on each wavelength the  $\bullet$  indicate the vertices where an ADM is put for this wavelength and the lines represented requests routed on this wavelength. For example for  $N = 7$  we have 5 ADM's on wavelength  $w_1$  in nodes 0,1,2,3,6 and we groom requests  $\{0, 1\}$ ,  $\{1, 2\}$ ,  $\{0, 2\}$ ,  $\{2, 3\}$ ,  $\{3, 6\}$ ,  $\{2, 6\}$  on this wavelength. Note that, for  $C = 2$ , we group mainly the requests by groups of 3 ( $\{a, b\}$ ,  $\{b, c\}$  and  $\{a, c\}$ ), some groups sharing a common extremity.

For  $N = 3$  we have 3 requests. So, if we give a priori one wavelength to each request (no grooming), we will need 2 ADMs per request and altogether 6 ADMs. However, in the case  $C = 1$  we can use the same wavelength for the two requests  $\{0, 1\}$  and  $\{1, 2\}$ , thus using 3 ADMs for this wavelength (saving 1) and another wavelength for  $\{0, 2\}$  with 2 ADMs, so altogether 5 ADMs. Furthermore, when  $C = 2$  we can use the same wavelength for the 3 requests and so need only 3 ADMs (one in each vertex).

For  $N = 7$  we have 21 requests. So, a priori, if we give one wavelength to each request we need 42 ADMs. Using the same wavelength for disjoint requests (case  $C = 1$ ), we will see after that 33 ADMs suffice. Indeed two requests may share an ADM if they have a common extremity. For  $C = 2$  we will see that the construction given in Figure 2 is optimal and uses 6 wavelengths and 20 ADMs (note that 4 requests share the same ADM in vertex 2).

To the best of our knowledge, the problem for paths has only been studied in [22], where it has been proved NP-complete for a general set of requests (and for given  $C \geq 2$ ) and no other results are known. Other topologies have also been considered and in particular unidirectional rings primarily in the context of variable traffic requirements [8, 13, 18, 27, 29]; but the case of fixed traffic requirements has also been widely studied [3, 4, 6, 7, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 24, 28, 30].

In this paper we model the grooming problem on the path as a graph partition problem. We show how a greedy algorithm gives a solution for  $C = 1$  and any set of requests. Then, using tools




Figure 2: Constructions for  $N = 3, 7$  and  $9$ .

of design theory, we determine exactly the number of ADMs in the case  $C = 2$  for the all-to-all set of requests.

A preliminary version of this paper has been presented at SIROCCO'05 [2].

## 2 Modeling

Here we are given a physical graph and a set of requests  $\mathcal{I}$ . The physical graph will be the path  $P_N$  with vertex set  $V = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, N - 1\}$  and where the edges are the pairs  $\{i, i + 1\}$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq N - 2$ .

The set of requests  $\mathcal{I}$  is a set of pairs  $\{u, v\}$  that we model by a graph  $I$  where each edge  $e = \{u, v\}$  is associated to the request  $\{u, v\}$ . Each request is routed along the unique subpath in  $P_N$  from  $u$  to  $v$  and we associate to it a wavelength  $w$ .

For a subgraph  $B$  of requests of  $I$ , we define the load of an edge  $e = \{i, i + 1\}$  of  $P_N$ ,  $L(B, e)$ , as the number of requests which are routed through  $e$ , that is the number of edges  $\{u, v\}$  of  $B$  such that  $u \leq i < v$ .

Now let  $B_w = (V_w, E_w)$  be the subgraph of  $I$  containing all requests carried by wavelength  $w$ . The fact that the grooming ratio is  $C$  can be expressed as  $L(B_w, e) \leq C$  for each edge  $e$  of  $P_N$ . The number of ADMs used for the wavelength  $w$  is nothing else than  $|V_w|$ .

So the problem corresponds to partition the edges of  $I$  (set of requests) into subgraphs  $B_w$  (set of requests with wavelength  $w$ ) such that  $L(B_w, e) \leq C$ .

It is straightforward to see that minimizing the number  $W$  of wavelengths needed to route all requests is equivalent to minimizing the number of subgraphs in the partition. Furthermore this is an easy problem since the load  $L(G, e)$  is easy to compute. For example if  $I$  is the complete graph  $K_N$ ,  $L(K_N, \{i, i + 1\}) = (i + 1)(N - i - 1)$ . If  $L_{\max}(G)$  is the maximum load over all the edges,

$L_{\max}(G) = \max_{e \in P_N} L(G, e)$ , then we need at least  $\frac{L_{\max}(G)}{C}$  wavelengths and we can assign them in a greedy way. For the complete graph, the number of wavelengths is therefore:

**Proposition 2.1** *For the all-to-all set of requests on the path  $P_N$  and grooming ratio  $C$ , the minimum number of wavelengths needed is  $\left\lceil \frac{N^2 - \varepsilon}{4C} \right\rceil$ , where  $\varepsilon = 1$  when  $N$  is odd and 0 otherwise.*

**Proof:** We have  $L_{\max}(K_N) = \max_{e \in P_N} L(K_N, e) = \max_{\{i, i+1\} = e \in P_N} (i+1)(N-i-1) = \left\lceil \frac{N^2 - \varepsilon}{4} \right\rceil$ , where  $\varepsilon = 1$  when  $N$  is odd and 0 otherwise.  $\square$

Here our objective is to minimize the number of ADMs, that is the sum of the number of vertices in the  $B_w$ . Thus the problem can be formalized as follows:

**Problem 2.2 (Grooming problem on the path)**

- Inputs : a path  $P_N$ , a grooming ratio  $C$  and a set of requests  $\mathcal{I}$  modeled by the graph  $I$ .
- Output : a partition of the edges of  $I$  into subgraphs  $B_w = (V_w, E_w)$ ,  $w = 1, \dots, W$ , such that  $\text{load}(B_w, e) \leq C$  for each edge  $e$  of  $P_N$ .
- Objective : minimize  $\sum_{1 \leq w \leq W} |V_w|$ .

We will denote the minimum of  $\sum_{1 \leq w \leq W} |V_w|$  by  $A(P_N, I, C)$ . As we will mainly consider in this paper  $I = K_N$ , following [6], we will shortly denote  $A(P_N, K_N, C)$  by  $A(P_N, C)$ , that is the optimal number of ADMs for a grooming ratio  $C$  and the all-to-all set of requests on the path.

We have formalized the problem in its undirected version, but for paths it is the same for directed or symmetric directed versions. Indeed, if we consider a dipath  $\overrightarrow{P_N}$  where the arcs are from  $i$  to  $i+1$ , and if the requests are the couples  $(u, v)$ , with  $u < v$ , the problem is exactly the same. If we consider a symmetric dipath  $P_N^*$  with arcs  $(i, i+1)$  and  $(i+1, i)$  and the requests are the couples  $(u, v)$ , we can split the problem into 2 disjoint subproblems, one with the dipath  $\overrightarrow{P_N}$  oriented from 0 to  $N-1$  with all requests  $(u, v)$  with  $u < v$ , and the second on the dipath  $\overleftarrow{P_N}$  oriented from  $N-1$  to 0 with requests  $(u, v)$  with  $v < u$ .

To the best of our knowledge, this problem has only been studied in [22] where it has been proved NP-complete, and no other results are known. However, the grooming problem for rings has been extensively studied. For example in [6] we have shown that the grooming problem on the unidirectional ring can be formalized as follows:

**Problem 2.3 (Grooming problem on the cycle)**

- Inputs : a cycle  $C_N$  and a grooming ratio  $C$ .
- Output : a partition of the edges of  $K_N$  into subgraphs  $B_w = (V_w, E_w)$ ,  $w = 1, \dots, W$ , such that  $|E_w| \leq C$ .
- Objective : minimize  $\sum_{1 \leq w \leq W} |V_w|$ .

Note that in Problem 2.3, for the ring, it is supposed that the two requests  $(u, v)$  and  $(v, u)$  are assigned to the same wavelength (using thus  $1/C$  of the capacity of the wavelength). Clearly, a bound on the number of ADMs for unidirectional ring gives a bound for our problem, but there might be very different (for example for  $C = 2$  and for the cycle  $C_3$  we need 5 ADMS, but  $A(P_3, 2) = 3$ ) due to capacity constraints.

In fact, the problem for unidirectional rings corresponds to the problem of path “without erasure” [22]. In this model a request  $(u, v)$  uses  $1/C$  of the bandwidth on the whole path and not

only on the subpath between  $u$  and  $v$ . The “load condition” becomes: there are at most  $C$  requests in any subgraph  $B_w$  which is exactly the constraint of Problem 2.3.

We will show in the next section that the grooming problem on the path with erasure for  $C = 1$  and general instances can be solved polynomially, which is not the case on the ring (in the erasure model) [25, 27, 15].

### 3 Grooming ratio $C = 1$

When the grooming ratio is equal to 1, the grooming problem on the path can be solved optimally for any set of requests in polynomial time. We prove this in Proposition 3.1 and give the exact number of ADMs in the all-to-all case in Corollary 3.2. Let  $d_I^-(i)$  (resp.  $d_I^+(i)$ ) denote the indegree (resp. outdegree) of node  $i$  in  $I$ , that is the number of requests  $\{u, i\}$  with  $u < i$  (resp.  $\{i, u\}$  with  $i < u$ ).

**Proposition 3.1**  $A(P_N, I, 1) = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \max \{d_I^-(i), d_I^+(i)\}$ .

**Proof:** The lower bound is simple since in each node  $i$  of the path  $P_N$  we can not do better than sharing an ADM between a request ending in this node, that is a request  $\{u, i\}$  with  $u < i$ , and a request starting from it, that is  $\{i, v\}$  with  $i < v$ . Thus  $A(P_N, I, 1) \geq \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \max \{d_I^-(i), d_I^+(i)\}$ .

Now, note that it is always possible to put a request ending in node  $i$  and a request starting from  $i$  in a same subgraph. Thus we can form the subgraphs using a greedy process: scan the nodes of the path from 0 to  $N - 2$  and add to each subgraph containing a request ending in  $i$  a request starting from  $i$  (if any left), and then create a new subgraph for each remaining request that start from  $i$  (if any). Therefore, in each node  $i$ , we will use  $\max \{d_I^-(i), d_I^+(i)\}$  ADMs and so the lower bound is attained.

Finally, one may remark that this process will create more subgraphs than necessary, but we can merge two subgraphs if they contain disjoint requests. Doing so we will use the optimal number of subgraphs. □

**Corollary 3.2**  $A(P_N, 1) = \frac{3N^2 - 2N - \varepsilon}{4}$ , where  $\varepsilon = 1$  when  $N$  is odd and 0 otherwise .

The corollary follows from the fact that  $d_I^-(i) = i$  and  $d_I^+(i) = N - 1 - i$ . Another simple construction is the following. We have  $A(P_2, 1) = 2$  and  $A(P_3, 1) = 5$ . Now let the vertices of  $P_N$  be  $0, 1, \dots, N - 1$ ; arrange them in this order, and suppose that  $A(P_N, 1) = (3N^2 - 2N - \varepsilon)/4$ , where  $\varepsilon = 1$  when  $N$  is odd and 0 otherwise. Let now the vertices of  $P_{N+2}$  be  $x, 0, 1, \dots, N - 1, y$  and arrange them in this order. The subgraphs of the partition of  $K_{N+2}$  will be: the  $N$  subgraphs  $B_j$ ,  $0 \leq j \leq N - 1$ , each of them containing the edges  $\{x, j\}$  and  $\{j, y\}$ , and so  $|V(B_j)| = 3$ ; the subgraph  $B_N$  which contains only the edge  $\{x, y\}$ , and so  $|V(B_N)| = 2$ ; and the subgraphs of the partition of  $K_N$ . So altogether the partition of  $K_{N+2}$  contains  $2 + 3N + (3N^2 - 2N - \varepsilon)/4 = (3(N + 2)^2 - 2(N + 2) - \varepsilon) / 4$ , where  $\varepsilon = 1$  when  $N$  is odd and 0 otherwise.

When the grooming ratio is  $C \geq 2$ , the problem is NP-complete and difficult to approximate for general instance. In particular, when the grooming ratio is equal to  $C = 2$ , this problem is similar to partition the edges of  $I$  into the maximum number of  $K_3$ s (see [11, 19]), although such partition only provides an upper bound of the total number of ADMs (two  $K_3$  may share an ADM). However, for  $I = K_N$  we will give in the next sections the exact number of ADMs for  $C = 2$ .

## 4 Lower bounds

Consider a valid construction for the Problem 2.2 and let  $a_p$  denote the number of subgraphs of the partition with exactly  $p$  nodes,  $A$  the number of ADMs, and  $W$  the number of subgraphs of the partition. We have the following equalities:

$$A = \sum_{p=2}^N p a_p \quad (1)$$

$$\sum_{p=2}^N a_p = W \quad (2)$$

$$\sum_{w=1}^W |E_w| = |E| \quad (3)$$

To obtain accurate lower bounds we need to bound the value of  $|E_w|$  for a graph with  $|V_w| = p$  vertices, satisfying the load constraint. Let  $\gamma(C, p)$  be this maximum number of edges. The determination of  $\gamma(C, p)$  is a challenging problem. In a first version of this paper we conjectured that we have to take the edges of smallest length (distance on the path); that corresponds to the intuition that, in order to satisfy the maximum number of requests, one has to choose the smallest ones. This conjecture is true for  $C = 1$ , as  $\gamma(1, p) = p - 1$ . We will see that it is true also for  $C = 2$ , where  $\gamma(2, p) = \left\lfloor \frac{3p-3}{2} \right\rfloor$ . It is also true for  $C = 3$ , where  $\gamma(3, p) = p - 1 + p - 2 = 2p - 3$  obtained by taking all the edges of length 1 and 2. However, this conjecture is not true in general and has been disproved in [5], where is given a closed formula for  $\gamma(C, p)$ . For example when  $C = \frac{s(s+1)}{2}$  and  $p > s(s-1)$  then  $\gamma(C, p) = sp - C$ .

In the particular case where  $I = K_N$ , we know by Proposition 2.1 that  $W \geq \left\lceil \frac{N^2 - \varepsilon}{4C} \right\rceil$ , where  $\varepsilon = 1$  when  $N$  is odd and 0 otherwise, and we have  $|E| = \frac{N(N-1)}{2}$ . Therefore Equations 2 and 3 become

$$\sum_{p=2}^N a_p \geq \left\lceil \frac{N^2 - \varepsilon}{4C} \right\rceil \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_{p=2}^N a_p \gamma(C, p) \geq \frac{N(N-1)}{2} \quad (5)$$

For example when  $C = 3$  and using the value  $\gamma(3, p) = 2p - 3$  we obtain

$$\sum_{p=2}^N (2p - 3) a_p \geq \frac{N(N-1)}{2} \quad (6)$$

that is

$$2A(P_N, 3) \geq \frac{N(N-1)}{2} + 3 \left\lceil \frac{N^2 - \varepsilon}{12} \right\rceil \quad (7)$$

In what follows we will restrict ourselves to the case  $C = 2$ , which is already non immediate and for which we have been able to obtain exact values. To obtain the right lower bounds when

$N$  is even, we need to determine  $\gamma(2, p, 2h)$  which is the maximum number of edges of a graph  $B$  with  $p$  vertices with at least  $2h$  vertices of odd degree and such that  $L(B, e) \leq 2$  for each edge of  $P_N$ . Note that  $\gamma(2, p) = \gamma(2, p, 0)$ .

**Lemma 4.1**  $\gamma(2, p, 2h) = \left\lfloor \frac{3p-3-h}{2} \right\rfloor$

**Proof:** We prove the lemma by induction. It is true for  $p = 2$  as a graph with two vertices has at most one edge. In that case  $h = 1$  and we have equality. For  $p = 3$  the maximum number of edges is 3, obtained with a  $K_3$ , and there is equality for  $h = 0$ . With  $h = 1$ , the graph has at most 2 edges and the equality is attained with a  $P_3$ . Similarly for  $p = 4$ , the graph has at most 4 edges. Let the vertices be  $\{a, b, c, d\}$  with  $a < b < c < d$ . For  $h = 0$  the equality is attained for example with the graph  $C_4$  consisting of the 4 edges  $\{a, b\}$ ,  $\{b, c\}$ ,  $\{c, d\}$  and  $\{a, d\}$ ; for  $h = 1$  equality is attained with the graph consisting of an edge joined by a vertex to a  $K_3$  more precisely the 4 edges  $\{a, b\}$ ,  $\{b, c\}$ ,  $\{c, d\}$  and  $\{b, d\}$ ; and for  $h = 2$  equality is attained with a 3-star  $K_{1,3}$   $\{a, b\}$ ,  $\{b, c\}$  and  $\{b, d\}$ .

Now consider a graph  $B$  with  $p$  vertices and  $2h$  vertices of odd degree. Let  $m(B)$  be the number of edges of  $B$ , and let  $u_0$  be the first vertex of  $B$  (in the order of the path).

1. If  $u_0$  has degree 1,  $B - \{u_0\}$  has at least  $2h - 2$  vertices of degree 1 and therefore  $m(B) \leq \gamma(2, p - 1, 2h - 2) + 1 = \left\lfloor \frac{3p-3-h}{2} \right\rfloor$
2. If  $u_0$  is of degree 2, let  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  be the 2 neighbors of  $u_0$ , with  $u_0 < u_1 < u_2$ . As  $L(B, \{u_1 - 1, u_1\}) \leq 2$  there is no edge  $\{u, u_1\}$  with  $u < u_1$ , and as  $L(B, \{u_1, u_1 + 1\}) \leq 2$  there is at most one edge  $\{u_1, v\}$  with  $v > u_1$ .
  - (a) If there is no edge  $\{u_1, v\}$ , the graph obtained from  $B$  by deleting  $u_0$  and  $u_1$  has at least  $2h - 2$  vertices of odd degree and so  $m(B) \leq \gamma(2, p - 2, 2h - 2) + 2 = \left\lfloor \frac{3p-4-h}{2} \right\rfloor$ .
  - (b) If there is an edge  $\{u_1, v_1\}$  3 subcases can appear.
    - i. either  $v_1 = u_2$  and the graph obtained from  $B$  by deleting  $u_0$  and  $u_1$  (and therefore the  $K_3$   $\{u_0, u_1, v_1\}$ ) has the same number of vertices of odd degree as  $B$  and so  $m(B) \leq \gamma(2, p - 2, 2h) + 3 = \left\lfloor \frac{3p-3-h}{2} \right\rfloor$ .
    - ii. or  $v_1 < u_2$ . Due to the load constraint there is no edge  $\{u, v_1\}$  with  $u < v_1$  and at most one edge  $\{v_1, v\}$  with  $v_1 < v$ . The graph obtained from  $B$  by deleting  $u_0, u_1, v_1$  has at least  $2h - 2$  vertices of odd degree and 3 or 4 edges less than  $B$ . So  $m(B) \leq \gamma(2, p - 3, 2h - 2) + 4 = \left\lfloor \frac{3p-3-h}{2} \right\rfloor$ .
    - iii. or  $v_1 > u_2$  we do the same reasoning by deleting from  $B$  the vertices  $u_0, u_1, u_2$  and we obtain  $m(B) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{3p-3-h}{2} \right\rfloor$ .

So in all cases the bound is proved. □

**Remark:** a careful analysis indicates when the bound is attained. An optimal  $(p, 2h)$  graph can be obtained either by adding an edge joined to a vertex of even degree of a  $(p - 1, 2h - 2)$  optimal graph (case 1); or by adding two edges  $\{a, b\}$  and  $\{a, c\}$  with  $a < b < c$ ,  $c$  being a vertex of even degree of an optimal  $(p - 2, 2h - 2)$  graph with  $p + h$  even (case 2.a); or by adding a  $K_3$



joined to a vertex of an optimal  $(p-2, 2h)$  graph (case 2.b.i); or by adding a  $C_4$  joined to a vertex of an optimal  $(p-3, 2h)$  graph (careful analysis of case 2.b.iii).

In particular when  $p$  is odd and  $h = 0$ , the optimal graph is unique and consists of a sequence of  $\frac{3p-3}{6}$   $K_3$ 's sharing two by two a vertex ( $K_3 + K_3 + \dots + K_3$ ) where  $G + H$  denote the graph obtained by merging the right most node of  $G$  with the left most node of  $H$ .

For any  $h$ , equality is attained with the graph consisting of  $\frac{3p-3-3h}{6}$   $K_3$ s and  $h$  edges merged in the following way  $e + K_3 + e + K_3 + \dots + K_3 + e + K_3 + K_3 + \dots + K_3$  (with  $p \geq h$ , and  $p$  odd when  $h$  even and  $p$  even when  $h$  odd).

#### Theorem 4.2

- $A(P_N, 2) \geq \left\lceil \frac{11N^2-8N-3}{24} \right\rceil$  when  $N$  is odd
- $A(P_N, 2) \geq \left\lceil \frac{N(N-1)}{3} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{N^2}{8} \right\rceil + \frac{N}{6}$  when  $N$  is even.

**Proof:** By Lemma 4.1 we know that  $|E_w| \leq \gamma(2, p_w, 2h_w) \leq \frac{3p_w-3-h_w}{2}$  for a  $B_w$  with  $p_w$  vertices and  $2h_w$  vertices with odd degree. So

$$\sum_{w=1}^W |E_w| \leq \sum_{p=2}^N \frac{3p-3}{2} a_p - \sum_{w=1}^W \frac{h_w}{2} \quad (8)$$

If  $N$  is odd,  $\sum_{w=1}^W h_w$  can be equal to 0, but when  $N$  is even all vertices of  $K_N$  being of odd degree,  $\sum_{w=1}^W 2h_w \geq N$ . So Equation 1 and Inequalities 4 and 5 become Equation 9 and Inequalities 10 and 11, where  $\varepsilon = 1$  if  $N$  is odd and  $\varepsilon = 0$  otherwise.

$$A = \sum_{p=2}^N p a_p \quad (9)$$

$$\sum_{p=2}^N a_p \geq \left\lceil \frac{N^2 - \varepsilon}{8} \right\rceil \quad (10)$$

$$\sum_{p=2}^N \frac{3p-3}{2} a_p - (1-\varepsilon) \frac{N}{4} \geq \frac{N(N-1)}{2} \quad (11)$$

Thus Inequality 11 becomes

$$\sum_{p=2}^N 3p a_p \geq N(N-1) + 3 \sum_{p=2}^N a_p + (1-\varepsilon) \frac{N}{2} \quad (12)$$

and so

$$A(P_N, 2) \geq \frac{N(N-1)}{3} + \left\lceil \frac{N^2 - \varepsilon}{8} \right\rceil + (1-\varepsilon) \frac{N}{6} \quad (13)$$

When  $N$  is odd, we have  $\varepsilon = 1$  and so  $A(P_N, 2) \geq \frac{11N^2-8N-3}{24}$ , and when  $N$  is even, we have  $\varepsilon = 0$  and so  $A(P_N, 2) \geq \frac{N(N-1)}{3} + \left\lceil \frac{N^2}{8} \right\rceil + \frac{N}{6}$ .

□

## 5 Constructions for $C = 2$

### 5.1 3-GDD

Let  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_l$  be non negative integers; the *complete multipartite graph with group sizes*  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_l$  is defined to be the graph with vertex set  $V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \dots \cup V_l$  where  $|V_i| = v_i$ , and two vertices  $u \in V_i$  and  $v \in V_j$  are adjacent if  $i \neq j$ . Using terminology of Design Theory, the graph of type  $p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \dots p_l^{\alpha_l}$  will be the complete multipartite graph with  $\alpha_i$  groups of size  $p_i$ . The existence of a partition of this multipartite graph into  $K_k$  is equivalent to the existence of a *k-GDD* (*Group Divisible Design*) of type  $p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \dots p_l^{\alpha_l}$ .

Here we are interested in the existence of 3-GDD's, that is partitions into  $K_3$ 's.

**Theorem 5.1 (Existence of a 3-GDD (see [9]))** *There exists a 3-GDD of type  $p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \dots p_l^{\alpha_l}$  if and only if (i) each node of the complete multipartite graph has even degree, and (ii) the number of edges is a multiple of 3.*

Various constructions are explained in [23]. One can find in [9] a collection of multipartite graphs for which there exists a 3-GDD. For example when the total number of nodes is 22, there exists 3-GDDs of type  $6^1 4^4$ ,  $6^3 4^1$ ,  $8^1 6^1 4^1 2^2$  and  $10^1 2^6$ . Some other values are given in Theorem 5.2.

### 5.2 Constructions for small values of $N$

We have reported in Table 1 the number  $A(P_N, 2)$  of ADMs and the number  $W$  of subgraphs of optimal constructions for some small cases. Direct constructions for the value that cannot be obtained in the following constructions are given in Appendix A.

$N$	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	16	17	20
$A(P_N, 2)$	2	3	7	10	16	20	28	34	45	52	64	73	115	127	180
$W$	1	1	2	3	5	6	8	10	13	15	18	21	32	36	50

Table 1: Number of ADMs and number of subgraphs in small cases

### 5.3 Constructions for odd values

In this section we show that the lower bound is always attained for odd  $N$ . To prove that, we use the 3-GDD described in Theorem 5.2 from which we deduce a generic construction in Corollary 5.3. Finally, we show in Theorem 5.4 that the bound is reached for all odd values.

**Theorem 5.2 (1.26 page 190 of [9])** *Let  $u$  and  $v$  be positive integer with  $v \leq u$ . Then a 3-GDD of type  $u^1 v^1 1^u$  exists if and only if  $(u, v) \equiv (1, 1), (3, 1), (3, 3), (3, 5), (5, 1) \pmod{(6, 6)}$ .*

**Corollary 5.3** *Given  $u$  and  $v$  satisfying the condition of Theorem 5.2 and an optimal construction for both  $u$  and  $v$ , we can build an optimal construction for  $N = 2u + v$ .*

**Proof:** Let the nodes of  $K_N$  be numbered from left to right  $0, 1, \dots, u-1, u, \dots, u+v-1, \dots, 2u+v-1 = N$  and let  $A = \{0, 1, \dots, u-1\}$ ,  $B = \{u, u+1, \dots, u+v-1\}$  and  $C = \{u+v, u+v+1, \dots, 2u+v-1\}$ .

The examples of Figure 2 for  $N = 7$  (resp.  $N = 9$ ) are obtained with this construction using  $u = 3$  and  $v = 1$  (resp.  $v = 3$ ).

The 3-GDD of type  $u^1v^11^u$  has  $\frac{3u^2-u+4uv}{6} K_3$ , and we say that the  $K_3$ s are of type  $ABC$  or  $ACC$  or  $CCC$  depending of their number of nodes in  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $C$ . There are  $uv$   $K_3$  of type  $ABC$ ,  $\frac{u(u-v)}{2} K_3$  of type  $ACC$  and  $\frac{u(v-1)}{6} K_3$  of type  $CCC$ .

Each node of  $A$  is the left most node of  $v + \frac{u-v}{2} = \frac{u+v}{2} K_3$  of type  $ABC$  or  $ACC$ . Since each node of  $A$  is the right most node of at most  $\frac{u-1}{2}$  subgraphs of the decomposition of  $K_u$ , we can merge each of the  $\frac{u^2-1}{8}$  subgraphs with one  $K_3$  and so we save  $\frac{u^2-1}{8}$  ADMs.

Each node of  $C$  is the right most node of  $v K_3$  of type  $ABC$ . It is also involved in  $u-v$   $K_3$  of type  $ACC$  and in  $\frac{u-1-(u-v)}{2} = \frac{v-1}{2} K_3$  of type  $CCC$ . Thus we can merge each  $K_3$  of type  $CCC$  with a  $K_3$  of type  $ABC$  and so we save  $\frac{u(v-1)}{6}$  more ADMs.

Note that since each node of  $B$  is the middle node of a  $K_3$  of type  $ABC$ , we can not merge the subgraphs of the partition of  $K_v$ .

Thus, the number of ADMs used in this construction is

$$\frac{3u^2 - u + 4uv}{2} + A(P_u, 2) - \frac{u^2 - 1}{8} - \frac{u(v-1)}{6} + A(P_v, 2) \quad (14)$$

Since for  $w = u$  or  $v$ , we have  $A(P_w, 2) = \frac{11w^2-8w-3}{24} + \varepsilon_w$ , where  $\varepsilon_w = \frac{1}{3}$  for  $w \equiv 5 \pmod{6}$  and 0 otherwise, Equation 14 become

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{3u^2 - u + 4uv}{2} + \frac{11u^2 - 8u - 3}{24} + \varepsilon_u \\ & - \frac{u^2 - 1}{8} - \frac{u(v-1)}{6} + \frac{11v^2 - 8v - 3}{24} + \varepsilon_v \\ & = \frac{11(2u+v)^2 - 8(2u+v) - 3}{24} + (\varepsilon_u + \varepsilon_v) \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Finally, if  $(u, v) \equiv (1, 1), (3, 1), (3, 3) \pmod{(6, 6)}$ , then we have  $\varepsilon_u = \varepsilon_v = 0$  and we obtain the lower bound, and if  $(u, v) \equiv (3, 5)$  or  $(5, 1) \pmod{(6, 6)}$ , then  $2u + v \equiv 5 \pmod{6}$  but  $\varepsilon_u + \varepsilon_v = \frac{1}{3}$  and we get again the lowerbound.

Note that, as expected, the number of subgraphs in the partition is

$$\frac{3u^2 - u + 4uv}{6} - \frac{u(v-1)}{6} + \frac{v^2 - 1}{8} = \frac{(2u+v)^2 - 1}{8} \quad (16)$$

□

We can now prove that the bound is attained for all odd values.

**Theorem 5.4** *When  $N$  is odd,  $A(P_N, 2) = \left\lceil \frac{11N^2-8N-3}{24} \right\rceil$ . Furthermore, the construction contains  $\frac{N^2-1}{8}$  subgraphs.*

**Proof:** For  $N = 3, 5, 13, 17$  we give direct constructions in Lemmas A.1, A.3, A.6 and A.8. For other values we will use Corollary 5.3 using induction on  $u$ .

- When  $N = 12t + 1$ ,  $t \geq 2$ , let  $u = 6t - 3$  and  $v = 7$ . Since  $(6t - 3, 7) \equiv (3, 1) \pmod{(6, 6)}$ , we can use Corollary 5.3.
- When  $N = 12t + 3$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , we can use Corollary 5.3 with  $u = 6t + 1$  and  $v = 1$

- When  $N = 12t + 5$ ,  $t \geq 3$ , we can use Corollary 5.3 with  $u = 6t - 3$  and  $v = 11$ , and for  $t = 2$ , that is  $N = 29$  we can use Corollary 5.3 with  $u = 11$  and  $v = 7$
- When  $N = 12t + 7$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , we can use Corollary 5.3 with  $u = 6t + 3$  and  $v = 1$
- When  $N = 12t + 9$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , we can use Corollary 5.3 with  $u = 6t + 3$  and  $v = 3$ .
- When  $N = 12t + 11$ ,  $t \geq 1$ , we can use Corollary 5.3 with  $u = 6t + 3$  and  $v = 5$ . Finally, we can also use Corollary 5.3 for  $N = 11$  with  $u = 5$  and  $v = 1$

□

#### 5.4 Construction for even values

In view of the lower bound, an optimal partition will have exactly  $\left\lceil \frac{N^2}{8} \right\rceil$  subgraphs and each vertex will appear once with odd degree and otherwise the value  $\frac{3p-3}{2}$  is attained. So we will have mainly  $K_3$ 's, plus  $\frac{N}{2}$  graphs  $K_3 + e$  (except for some congruence classes where one edge is isolated) some of these  $K_3$ 's or  $K_3 + e$  being merged together.

**Lemma 5.5** *There exists a 3-GDD of type  $(2u)^1(2v)^12^u$  when  $u \geq v \geq 1$  and  $u(v-1) \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ .*

**Proof:** To deduce the lemma from Theorem 5.1, one has to check that all nodes have even degree (which is true) and that the total number of edges  $4u^2 + 4uv + 4uv + 4\frac{u(u-1)}{2} = 6u^2 + 6uv + 2u(v-1)$  is a multiple of 3 which follows from  $u(v-1) \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ . □

**Theorem 5.6** *When  $N$  is even,  $A(P_N, 2) = \left\lceil \frac{N(N-1)}{3} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{N^2}{8} \right\rceil + \frac{N}{6} = \frac{11N^2 - 4N}{24} + \varepsilon_N$ , where  $\varepsilon_N = \frac{1}{2}$  when  $N \equiv 2$  or  $6 \pmod{12}$ ,  $\varepsilon_N = \frac{1}{3}$  when  $N \equiv 4 \pmod{12}$ ,  $\varepsilon_N = \frac{5}{6}$  when  $N \equiv 10 \pmod{12}$ , and 0 when  $N \equiv 0$  or  $8 \pmod{12}$ . Furthermore, the construction contains  $\left\lceil \frac{N^2}{8} \right\rceil$  subgraphs.*

**Proof:** First of all, the theorem is true for  $N = 2, 4, 8, 12, 16, 20$  by Lemmas A.1, A.2, A.4, A.5, A.7 and A.9 (see Appendix A).

Now suppose that the result is true for  $2u$  and  $2v$ , that is for  $w = u$  or  $v$ ,

$$A(P_{2w}, 2) = \left\lceil \frac{2w(2w-1)}{3} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{4w^2}{8} \right\rceil + \frac{2w}{6} = \frac{44w^2 - 8w}{24} + \varepsilon_w \quad (17)$$

where  $\varepsilon_w = \frac{1}{2}$  when  $2w \equiv 2$  or  $6 \pmod{12}$ ,  $\varepsilon_w = \frac{1}{3}$  when  $2w \equiv 4 \pmod{12}$ ,  $\varepsilon_w = \frac{5}{6}$  when  $2w \equiv 10 \pmod{12}$ , and 0 otherwise. Furthermore, the number of subgraph is  $\left\lceil \frac{4w^2}{8} \right\rceil$ .

Let now  $N = 4u + 2v$ , where  $u$  and  $v$  are such that there exists a 3-GDD of type  $(2u)^1(2v)^12^u$ . Let also the nodes be  $A \cup B \cup C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \dots \cup C_u$  with  $|A| = 2u$ ,  $|B| = 2v$  and  $|C_i| = 2$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq u$ , and let  $C = \cup_{i=1}^u C_i$ .

To simplify the notation, we say that an edge is of type  $CC$  if it has one node in  $C_i$  and another in  $C_j$  with  $i \neq j$ .

The 3-GDD of type  $(2u)^1(2v)^12^u$  has  $\frac{6u^2 - 2u + 8uv}{3}$   $K_3$ :  $4uv$  of type  $ABC$ ,  $\frac{2u(2u-2v)}{2} = 2u(u-v)$  of type  $ACC$  and  $\frac{2u(v-1)}{3}$  of type  $CCC$ .

We observe that each node of  $C$  is the right most node of  $2v$   $K_3$  of type  $ABC$  and is involved in  $2u - 2v$   $K_3$  of type  $ACC$  and  $v - 1$   $K_3$  of type  $CCC$ . Thus, we can merge each  $K_3$  of type  $CCC$

with a  $K_3$  of type  $ABC$  and so save  $\frac{2u(v-1)}{3}$  ADMs. Furthermore, we can merge each edge  $\{c_i^1, c_i^2\}$  such that  $c_i^1, c_i^2 \in C_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq u$ , with a  $K_3$  of type  $ABC$  or  $ACC$  and so save  $u$  more ADMs.

Each node of  $A$  is the left most node of  $2v + u - v = u + v$   $K_3$  of type  $ABC$  or  $ACC$  and is the right most node of at most  $\frac{2u-2}{2} + 1 = u$  subgraphs of the optimal construction for  $2u$ . Thus we can merge each subgraph and save  $\left\lceil \frac{4u^2}{8} \right\rceil$  more ADMs.

By hypothesis we have

$$A(P_{2u}, 2) - \left\lceil \frac{4u^2}{8} \right\rceil = \left\lceil \frac{2u(2u-1)}{3} + \frac{2u}{6} \right\rceil = \left\lceil \frac{u(4u-1)}{3} \right\rceil = \frac{u(4u-1)}{3} + \alpha_u \quad (18)$$

where  $\alpha_u = \frac{1}{3}$  when  $u \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  and 0 otherwise.

Altogether the construction has the following number of ADMs.

$$\begin{aligned} A(P_N, 2) &\leq A(P_{2u}, 2) - \left\lceil \frac{4u^2}{8} \right\rceil + A(P_{2v}, 2) + (6u^2 - 2u + 8uv) - \frac{2u(v-1)}{3} \\ &\quad + 2u - u \\ &\leq \frac{u(4u-1)}{3} + \alpha_u + \frac{44v^2 - 8v}{24} + \varepsilon_v + \frac{18u^2 - u + 22uv}{3} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

$$\leq \frac{11(4u+2v)^2 - 4(4u+2v)}{24} + \alpha_u + \varepsilon_v \quad (20)$$

Now we have to check that  $\alpha_u + \varepsilon_v = \varepsilon_N$  in all cases. For that, observe that the conditions of Lemma 5.5 are satisfied when  $v = 1$  and when  $v = 4$ , assuming that  $u \geq v \geq 1$ . So we have reported in the following table all cases that satisfies the above construction.

$N$	condition	$u$	$v$	$\alpha_u$	$\varepsilon_v$	$\varepsilon_N$
$12t + 2$	$t \geq 1$	$3t$	1	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
$12t + 4$	$t \geq 2$	$3t - 1$	4	$\frac{1}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$
$12t + 6$	$t \geq 0$	$3t + 1$	1	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
$12t + 8$	$t \geq 2$	$3t$	4	0	0	0
$12t + 10$	$t \geq 0$	$3t + 2$	1	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{5}{6}$
$12t + 12$	$t \geq 1$	$3t + 1$	4	0	0	0

Furthermore, the number of subgraphs in our construction for  $N = 4u + 2v$  is equal to the number of  $K_3$  of type  $ABC$ , plus the number of  $K_3$  of type  $ACC$ , plus the number of subgraphs in the construction for  $2v$ , that is  $4uv + 2u(u-v) + \left\lceil \frac{4v^2}{8} \right\rceil = \left\lceil \frac{(4u+2v)^2}{8} \right\rceil$ .

In conclusion, Theorem 5.6 is true for all even  $N$ . □

## Acknowledgments

Many thanks to C.J. Colbourn for his help in solving the case  $N = 17$  and for two anonymous referees for helpful remarks.

## References

- [1] B. Beauquier, J-C. Bermond, L. Gargano, P. Hell, S. Pérennes, and U. Vaccaro. Graph problems arising from wavelength-routing in all-optical networks. In *IEEE Workshop on Optics and Computer Science*, Geneva, Switzerland, April 1997.
- [2] J-C. Bermond, L. Braud, and D. Coudert. Traffic grooming on the path. In *12th International Colloquium on Structural Information and Communication Complexity – SIROCCO*, pages 34–48, Le Mont Saint-Michel, France, May 24-26 2005. LNCS 3499.
- [3] J-C. Bermond and S. Ceroi. Minimizing SONET ADMs in unidirectional WDM ring with grooming ratio 3. *Networks*, 41(2):73–82, February 2003.
- [4] J-C. Bermond, C.J. Colbourn, A. Ling, and M.-L. Yu. Grooming in unidirectional rings :  $K_4 - e$  designs. *Discrete Mathematics, Lindner's Volume*, 284(1-3):57–62, 2004.
- [5] J-C. Bermond, M. Cosnard, D. Coudert, and S. Perennes. Optimal solution of the maximum all request path grooming problem. In *Advanced International Conference on Telecommunications (AICT)*. IEEE, 2006.
- [6] J-C. Bermond and D. Coudert. Traffic grooming in unidirectional WDM ring networks using design theory. In *IEEE ICC*, volume 2, pages 1402–1406, Anchorage, USA, May 2003.
- [7] J-C. Bermond, D. Coudert, and X. Muñoz. Traffic grooming in unidirectional WDM ring networks: the all-to-all unitary case. In *IFIP ONDM*, pages 1135–1153, February 2003.
- [8] A. L. Chiu and E. H. Modiano. Traffic grooming algorithms for reducing electronic multiplexing costs in WDM ring networks. *IEEE/OSA Journal of Lightwave Technology*, 18(1):2–12, 2000.
- [9] C.J. Colbourn and J.H. Dinitz, editors. *The CRC handbook of Combinatorial designs*. CRC Press, 1996. (2nd edition in print with a chapter on grooming).
- [10] D. Coudert and H. Rivano. Lightpath assignment for multifibers WDM optical networks with wavelength translators. In *IEEE Globecom*, volume 3, pages 2686–2690, Taipei, Taiwan, November 2002.
- [11] D Dor and M. Tarse. Graph decomposition is NP-complete: a complete proof of Holyer's conjecture. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 26(4):1166–1187, 1997.
- [12] R. Dutta and G. N. Rouskas. A survey of virtual topology design algorithms for wavelength routed optical networks. *Optical Networks Magazine*, 1(1):73–89, 2000.
- [13] R. Dutta and G. N. Rouskas. On optimal traffic grooming in WDM rings. *IEEE Journal of Selected Areas in Communications*, 20(1):1–12, 2002.
- [14] R. Dutta and G. N. Rouskas. Traffic grooming in WDM networks: Past and future. *IEEE Network*, 16(6):46–56, 2002.
- [15] L. Epstein and A. Levin. Better bounds for minimizing SONET ADMs. In *WAOA*, LNCS 3351, pages 281–292, Budapest, Hungary, September 2004.
- [16] O. Gerstel, P. Lin, and G. Sasaki. Wavelength assignment in a WDM ring to minimize cost of embedded SONET rings. In *IEEE Infocom*, pages 94–101, San Francisco, USA, 1998.

- [17] O. Gerstel, R. Ramaswani, and G. Sasaki. Cost-effective traffic grooming in WDM rings. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 8(5):618–630, 2000.
- [18] O. Goldschmidt, D. Hochbaum, A. Levin, and E. Olinick. The SONET edge-partition problem. *Networks*, 41(1):13–23, 2003.
- [19] I. Holyer. The NP-completeness of some edge-partition problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 10(4):713–717, 1981.
- [20] J.Q. Hu. Optimal traffic grooming for wavelength-division-multiplexing rings with all-to-all uniform traffic. *OSA Journal of Optical Networks*, 1(1):32–42, 2002.
- [21] J.Q. Hu. Traffic grooming in WDM ring networks: A linear programming solution. *OSA Journal of Optical Networks*, 1(11):397–408, 2002.
- [22] S. Huang, R. Dutta, and G. N. Rouskas. Traffic grooming in path, star, and tree networks: Complexity, bounds, and algorithms. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 24(4):66–82, April 2006.
- [23] C.C. Lindner and C.A. Rodger. *Design Theory*. CRC Press, 1997.
- [24] E. Modiano and P. Lin. Traffic grooming in WDM networks. *IEEE Communications Magazine*, 39(7):124–129, 2001.
- [25] M. Shalom and S. Zaks. A  $10/7 + \epsilon$  approximation for minimizing the number of ADMs in SONET rings. In *IEEE BroadNets*, pages 254–262, San José, USA, October 2004.
- [26] A. Somani. Survivable traffic grooming in WDM networks. In D.K. Gautam, editor, *Broad band optical fiber communications technology – BBOFCT*, pages 17–45, Jalgaon, India, December 2001.
- [27] P.-J. Wan, G. Calinescu, L. Liu, and O. Frieder. Grooming of arbitrary traffic in SONET/WDM BLSRs. *IEEE Journal of Selected Areas in Communications*, 18(10):1995–2003, 2000.
- [28] J. Wang, W. Cho, V. Vemuri, and B. Mukherjee. Improved approaches for cost-effective traffic grooming in WDM ring networks: ILP formulations and single-hop and multihop connections. *IEEE/OSA Journal of Lightwave Technology*, 19(11):1645–1653, 2001.
- [29] X. Yuan and A. Fulay. Wavelength assignment to minimize the number of SONET ADMs in WDM rings. *Journal of Photonic Network Communications*, 5(1):59–68, January 2003.
- [30] X. Zhang and C. Qiao. An effective and comprehensive approach for traffic grooming and wavelength assignment in SONET/WDM rings. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 8(5):608–617, 2000.

## A Appendix: small cases

Remark that all the subgraphs that we consider in the constructions satisfy  $L(B_w, e) \leq 2$ . It is clear for a  $K_3 \{u, v, w\}$ , where we suppose  $u < v < w$ . For a graph  $e + K_3$ , where the edge  $\{t, u\}$  is glued with the  $K_3 \{u, v, w\}$ , we suppose that  $t < u < v < w$ . For a graph  $K_3 + e$ , where the  $K_3 \{u, v, w\}$  is glued with the edge  $\{w, x\}$ , we suppose that  $u < v < w < x$ .

**Lemma A.1**  $A(P_2, 2) = 2$  and  $A(P_3, 2) = 3$ .

**Lemma A.2**  $A(P_4, 2) = 7$ .

**Proof:** The first subgraph is the  $e + K_3 \{0, 1\} + \{1, 2, 3\}$ , and the second subgraph contains the two edges  $\{0, 2\}$  and  $\{0, 3\}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma A.3**  $A(P_5, 2) = 10$ .

**Proof:** The subgraphs of the decomposition are the two  $K_3 \{0, 2, 4\}$  and  $\{0, 1, 3\}$ , plus the subgraph  $B_3$  containing the 4 edges  $\{1, 2\}$ ,  $\{2, 3\}$ ,  $\{3, 4\}$  and  $\{1, 4\}$ . This construction uses 10 ADMs, which fits the lower bound.  $\square$

**Lemma A.4**  $A(P_8, 2) = 28$

**Proof:** Let the nodes be  $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2, d_1, d_2$  arranged in this order. We have 4 groups of 2 consecutive nodes and we use a 3-GDD of type  $2^4$ . The decomposition contains the 4  $K_3 \{a_2, b_2, c_2\}$ ,  $\{b_1, c_2, d_1\}$ ,  $\{a_1, c_2, d_2\}$  and  $\{a_1, b_2, d_1\}$  plus the two  $e + K_3 \{a_1, a_2\} + \{a_2, b_1, d_2\}$  and  $\{b_1, b_2\} + \{b_2, c_1, d_2\}$ , and the two  $K_3 + e \{a_1, b_1, c_1\} + \{c_1, c_2\}$  and  $\{a_2, c_1, d_1\} + \{d_1, d_2\}$ . This construction has 28 ADMs.  $\square$

**Lemma A.5**  $A(P_{12}, 2) = 64$

**Proof:** Let the nodes of  $P_{12}$  be  $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2, d_1, d_2, e_1, e_2, f_1, f_2$  and arrange them in this order.

The decomposition contains the two subgraphs  $K_3 + K_3 \{a_1, b_1, c_2\} + \{c_2, e_2, f_1\}$  and  $\{a_2, c_2, d_2\} + \{d_2, e_1, f_2\}$ , plus the 3  $e + K_3 \{a_1, a_2\} + \{a_2, b_2, f_1\}$ ,  $\{b_1, b_2\} + \{b_2, c_1, d_2\}$  and  $\{c_1, c_2\} + \{c_2, d_1, e_1\}$ , and the 3  $K_3 + e \{a_2, c_1, d_1\} + \{d_1, d_2\}$ ,  $\{a_2, b_1, e_1\} + \{e_1, e_2\}$  and  $\{a_1, d_2, f_1\} + \{f_1, f_2\}$ , and plus the 10  $K_3 \{b_1, d_1, f_1\}$ ,  $\{b_2, d_1, e_2\}$ ,  $\{a_1, c_1, e_2\}$ ,  $\{b_1, c_1, f_2\}$ ,  $\{a_1, d_1, f_2\}$ ,  $\{b_2, c_2, f_2\}$ ,  $\{a_1, b_2, e_1\}$ ,  $\{b_1, d_2, e_2\}$ ,  $\{c_1, e_1, f_1\}$  and  $\{a_2, e_2, f_2\}$ . Altogether, it has  $2 \times 5 + 6 \times 4 + 10 \times 3 = 64$  ADMs.  $\square$

**Lemma A.6**  $A(P_{13}, 2) = 73$

**Proof:** Let the vertices of  $P_{13}$  be  $\mathbb{Z}_{13}$  and remark that  $K_{13}$  can be partitioned into the 26  $K_3 \{i, i+1, i+4\}$  and  $\{i, i+5, i+7\}$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{13}$ . Our decomposition contains the subgraph  $K_3 + K_3 + K_3 \{0, 1, 4\} + \{4, 5, 8\} + \{8, 9, 12\}$ , plus the 3 subgraphs  $K_3 + K_3 \{i, i+1, i+4\} + \{i+4, i+5, i+8\}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , plus the 4  $K_3 \{j, j+1, j+4\}$ ,  $j = 9, 10, 11, 12$ , and plus the 13  $K_3 \{k, k+5, k+7\}$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{13}$ . Altogether the construction has  $7 + 3 \times 5 + 17 \times 3 = 73$  ADMs.  $\square$



**Lemma A.7**  $A(P_{16}, 2) = 115$

**Proof:** Let the vertices of  $P_{16}$  be  $A \cup B \cup C$ , where  $A = \{a_0, a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5\}$ ,  $B = \{b_0, b_1, b_2, b_3\}$  and  $C = \{c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, c_5\}$ . Our construction is based on the existence of a 3-GDD of type  $6^1 4^1 2^3$ , which consist on 24  $K_3$  of type  $ABC$ , 6  $K_3$  of type  $ACC$  and 2  $K_3$  of type  $CCC$ , and by merging the 5 subgraphs of the decomposition of  $K_6$  with  $K_3$ s of type  $ABC$ , the 2  $K_3$  of type  $CCC$  and the 3 edges  $\{c_i, c_{i+1}\}$ ,  $i = 0, 1, 2$ , with  $K_3$ s of type  $ABC$ . Altogether this construction uses 115 ADMs and the subgraphs of the decomposition are:

- The 4 subgraphs  $K_3 + K_3 \{a_0, b_0, c_0\} + \{c_0, c_2, c_4\}$ ,  $\{a_1, b_1, c_1\} + \{c_1, c_3, c_5\}$ ,  $\{a_0, a_2, a_5\} + \{a_5, b_1, c_0\}$  and  $\{a_1, a_3, a_5\} + \{a_5, b_3, c_3\}$ , so 20 ADMs.
- The 3  $K_3 + e \{a_2, b_2, c_0\} + \{c_0, c_1\}$ ,  $\{a_3, b_3, c_2\} + \{c_2, c_3\}$  and  $\{a_4, b_2, c_4\} + \{c_4, c_5\}$ , and the  $e + K_3 \{a_2, a_3\} + \{a_3, b_1, c_3\}$ , so 16 ADMs.
- The 2 subgraphs on 6 vertices, the  $K_3 + e + K_3 \{a_0, a_3, a_4\} + \{a_4, a_5\} + \{a_5, b_0, c_2\}$  and the  $e + K_3 + K_3 \{a_0, a_1\} + \{a_1, a_2, a_4\} + \{a_4, b_0, c_1\}$ , so 12 ADMs.
- The 21  $K_3 \{a_0, b_1, c_5\}$ ,  $\{a_0, b_2, c_3\}$ ,  $\{a_0, b_3, c_4\}$ ,  $\{a_0, c_1, c_2\}$ ,  $\{a_1, b_0, c_5\}$ ,  $\{a_1, b_2, c_2\}$ ,  $\{a_1, b_3, c_0\}$ ,  $\{a_1, c_3, c_4\}$ ,  $\{a_2, b_0, c_3\}$ ,  $\{a_2, b_1, c_4\}$ ,  $\{a_2, b_3, c_1\}$ ,  $\{a_2, c_2, c_5\}$ ,  $\{a_3, b_0, c_4\}$ ,  $\{a_3, b_2, c_1\}$ ,  $\{a_3, c_0, c_5\}$ ,  $\{a_4, b_1, c_2\}$ ,  $\{a_4, b_3, c_5\}$ ,  $\{a_4, c_0, c_3\}$ ,  $\{a_5, b_2, c_5\}$ ,  $\{a_5, c_1, c_4\}$  and  $\{b_0, b_2, b_3\}$ , so 63 ADMs.
- The star  $\{b_0, b_1\} + \{b_1, b_2\} + \{b_1, b_3\}$ , 4 ADMs.

□

**Lemma A.8**  $A(P_{17}, 2) = 127$

**Proof:** The decomposition is based on the existence of a 3-GDD of type  $3^2 5^1 3^2$  (which was kindly given to us by C.J. Colbourn) and the subgraphs are:

- The 9 subgraphs  $K_3 + K_3 \{0, 1, 2\} + \{2, 3, 11\}$ ,  $\{3, 4, 5\} + \{5, 13, 15\}$ ,  $\{1, 4, 11\} + \{11, 12, 13\}$ ,  $\{2, 4, 14\} + \{14, 15, 16\}$ ,  $\{0, 5, 6\} + \{6, 11, 14\}$ ,  $\{2, 5, 7\} + \{7, 11, 16\}$ ,  $\{0, 4, 8\} + \{8, 11, 15\}$ ,  $\{1, 5, 9\} + \{9, 13, 14\}$  and  $\{0, 3, 10\} + \{10, 12, 14\}$ , so altogether 45 ADMs.
- The 24  $K_3$ s  $\{4, 6, 12\}$ ,  $\{1, 6, 13\}$ ,  $\{2, 6, 15\}$ ,  $\{3, 6, 16\}$   $\{1, 7, 12\}$ ,  $\{4, 7, 13\}$ ,  $\{3, 7, 15\}$ ,  $\{0, 7, 14\}$   $\{2, 8, 12\}$ ,  $\{3, 8, 13\}$ ,  $\{1, 8, 16\}$ ,  $\{5, 8, 14\}$   $\{3, 9, 12\}$ ,  $\{4, 9, 15\}$ ,  $\{2, 9, 16\}$ ,  $\{0, 9, 11\}$   $\{2, 10, 13\}$ ,  $\{1, 10, 15\}$ ,  $\{4, 10, 16\}$ ,  $\{5, 10, 11\}$   $\{1, 3, 14\}$ ,  $\{0, 12, 15\}$ ,  $\{0, 13, 16\}$  and  $\{5, 12, 16\}$ , so 72 ADMs.
- The 3 graphs of the decomposition of the  $K_5$  on 6, 7, 8, 9, 10: the 2  $K_3 \{6, 8, 10\}$  and  $\{6, 7, 9\}$  and the  $C_4 \{7, 8, 9, 10\}$ , so 10 more ADMs.

In summary our construction has 127 ADMs.

□

**Lemma A.9**  $A(P_{20}, 2) = 180$

**Proof:** The decomposition is based on a 3-GDD of type  $2^3 8^1 2^3$  in which the vertices are labeled  $a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1, c_0, c_1, 0, 1, \dots, 7, d_0, d_1, e_0, e_1, f_0, f_1$  and ranked in this order. The subgraphs are:

- The 2 subgraphs  $K_3 + K_3 \{a_1, c_0, 0\} + \{0, 3, 6\}$  and  $\{0, 5, 7\} + \{7, d_0, f_1\}$ , and the 3 subgraphs  $e + K_3 + e \{a_0, a_1\} + \{a_1, 4, d_0\} + \{d_0, d_1\}$ ,  $\{b_0, b_1\} + \{b_1, 4, e_0\} + \{e_0, e_1\}$  and  $\{c_0, c_1\} + \{c_1, 4, f_0\} + \{f_0, f_1\}$ , so 25 ADMs.

- The 4 subgraphs on 6 vertices: the two  $K_3 + e + K_3$   $\{a_0, b_1, 0\} + \{0, 1\} + \{1, 2, 7\}$  and  $\{2, 5, 6\} + \{6, 7\} + \{7, e_1, f_0\}$ , the  $K_3 + K_3 + e$   $\{b_0, c_1, 0\} + \{0, 2, 4\} + \{4, 5\}$  and the  $e + K_3 + K_3$   $\{2, 3\} + \{3, 4, 7\} + \{7, d_1, e_0\}$  so 24 ADMs.
- The 2 subgraphs  $K_3 + K_3 + K_3$   $\{a_0, b_0, c_0\} + \{c_0, 2, d_0\} + \{d_0, e_0, f_0\}$  and  $\{a_1, b_1, c_1\} + \{c_1, 2, d_1\} + \{d_1, e_1, f_1\}$ , so 14 ADMs.
- The 39  $K_3$   $\{1, 4, 6\}, \{1, 3, 5\}, \{0, d_0, e_1\}, \{0, e_0, f_1\}, \{0, d_1, f_0\}, \{a_0, c_1, 7\}, \{a_1, b_0, 7\}, \{b_1, c_0, 7\}, \{a_0, 1, d_0\}, \{b_0, 1, e_0\}, \{c_0, 1, f_0\}, \{a_1, 1, d_1\}, \{b_1, 1, e_1\}, \{c_1, 1, f_1\}, \{a_0, 2, e_0\}, \{b_0, 2, f_0\}, \{a_1, 2, e_1\}, \{b_1, 2, f_1\}, \{a_0, 3, f_0\}, \{b_0, 3, d_0\}, \{c_0, 3, e_0\}, \{a_1, 3, f_1\}, \{b_1, 3, d_1\}, \{c_1, 3, e_1\}, \{a_0, 4, d_1\}, \{b_0, 4, e_1\}, \{c_0, 4, f_1\}, \{a_0, 5, e_1\}, \{b_0, 5, f_1\}, \{c_0, 5, d_1\}, \{a_1, 5, e_0\}, \{b_1, 5, f_0\}, \{c_1, 5, d_0\}, \{a_0, 6, f_1\}, \{b_0, 6, d_1\}, \{c_0, 6, e_1\}, \{a_1, 6, f_0\}, \{b_1, 6, d_0\}$  and  $\{c_1, 6, e_0\}$ , so 117 more ADMs

Altogether this construction has 180 ADMs. □