

Identifying faulty edges in resistive electrical networks

Barbara Fiedorowicz¹ and Amitabh Basu¹

¹Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics, Johns Hopkins University,
{bfiedor1,basu.amitabh}@jhu.edu

Abstract

Given a resistive electrical network, we would like to determine whether all the resistances (edges) in the network are working, and if not, identify which edge (or edges) are faulty. To make this determination, we are allowed to measure the effective resistance between certain pairs of nodes (which can be done by measuring the amount of current when one unit of voltage difference is applied at the chosen pair of nodes). The goal is to determine which edge, if any, is not working in the network using the smallest number of measurements. We prove rigorous upper and lower bounds on this optimal number of measurements for different classes of graphs. These bounds are tight for several of these classes showing that our measurement strategies are optimal.

Keywords: Electrical networks, Spectral graph theory, Information theory, Fault detection, Combinatorial optimization

1 Background and Motivation

Diagnosing faults in electrical circuits and wiring is an important problem with applications in power systems, very large scale integration (VLSI), chip design, circuit board systems, to name a few. The literature is vast; the reader is referred to the survey [13], a sample of more recent work [11, 21] and the references therein. There are a variety of approaches that are adopted in practice and new methods are regularly being invented even to the present. In this paper, we consider a particular formalization of this problem which, to the best of our knowledge, has not been studied rigorously in prior work. Nevertheless, we believe the model we study is natural, of practical relevance, and worth studying from a mathematical perspective. It is related to, and inspired by, work in detecting faults and structures in continuous conducting media; see the textbooks [8, 14] and [1] for a more recent survey. Our problem can be seen as a discrete analogue of this problem from the literature on continuous media and related inverse problems. The resulting optimization problem is rich in its scope, spanning topics from combinatorial and spectral graph theory, integer and combinatorial optimization, information theory, and electrical network theory. Let us formally introduce the problem.

Definition 1.1. A *(resistive) electrical network* is given by a graph $G = (V, E)$ with nonnegative weights $w_e \in \mathbb{R}_+$ for each edge $e \in E$. The graph is allowed to have multiple edges between any pair of vertices, but no self loops are allowed. Each vertex $v \in V$ represents a *terminal* in the network and each edge $e = uv$ in E represents a *resistor connection* between the terminals u and v . The weight $w_e \in \mathbb{R}_+$ represents the conductance value, i.e., the reciprocal of the resistance value of that edge. We

use $\mathbf{w} := (w_e)_{e \in E}$ to denote the vector of weights and the notation (V, E, \mathbf{w}) to denote an electrical network.

Given two vertices $r, s \in V$, which are called the source and the sink terminals, the effective resistance R_{rs} of the network between r, s is defined as the reciprocal of the net current that would flow through the network if a unit voltage difference was applied to the source-sink pair.

The problem we wish to study is to detect whether all the resistance connections in the network are working as expected, or whether one of them has been damaged. To do this, we are allowed to probe the network by making current value measurements (or equivalently, effective resistance values) across pairs of terminals (vertices) and use these values to determine if any edge is faulty and if so, which one.

Definition 1.2. [Faulty edge detection problem] Let (V, E, \mathbf{w}) be a given electrical network and let $T \subseteq V \times V$ be a fixed subset of (unordered) pairs of vertices. An adversary (nature) selects an edge $e^* \in E$ and alters the weight from w_{e^*} to 0 (that resistor has been completely removed from the network). One has to select a subset of measurements $S \subseteq T$ and one observes the effective resistance values for each of the pairs in S (equivalently, one observes the net current flowing through the network when a unit voltage difference is applied to this pair). From these measurements and observed values, one has to figure out which edge was altered by the adversary. The goal is to select the smallest size set S of measurements to achieve this.

A different version of the problem is obtained when the adversary changes the weight of e^* to $+\infty$ (that edge has been shorted, which is equivalent to contracting the edge).

One could allow for the possibility that no edge has been altered. Then, one has to detect if any edge has been altered and if so, identify which one. We give a short argument below that the number of measurements in this version of the problem is at most one more than the version in Definition 1.2 where a single, unknown edge has been altered. Consequently, we will focus on the version in Definition 1.2 for the remainder of the paper.

Let $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{|T| \times |E|}$ be the matrix where each row corresponds to a measurement $t \in T$ and each column corresponds to an edge $e \in E$ that has been altered. Each entry in \mathcal{A} contains the effective resistance value for a given pair of source and sink terminals and a given altered edge. Consider the submatrix $\mathcal{A}_S \in \mathbb{R}^{|S| \times |E|}$ of values corresponding to measurements $S \subseteq T$ and all edges E . If all columns in \mathcal{A}_S are different from one another, then the provided measurements S satisfy the version of our problem given in Definition 1.2. On the other hand, if there are at least two columns that are the same, then the set S of measurements will not distinguish between these two edges. Hence, an equivalent formulation of the problem is to find the smallest set $S \subseteq T$ of measurements such that \mathcal{A}_S has distinct columns.

Suppose now we include a new column c in $\overline{\mathcal{A}} = [\mathcal{A}|c]$ which contains the effective resistance values when no edge in G has been altered. Consider any set S of measurements such that \mathcal{A}_S has distinct columns (i.e., S is a set of measurements that can identify a faulty edge assuming one exists). If all columns of the updated submatrix $\overline{\mathcal{A}}_S$ are different from one another, then the measurements S solve the problem including the possibility that no edge has been altered. Otherwise, there is one column in $\overline{\mathcal{A}}_S$ that is the same as column c restricted to $\overline{\mathcal{A}}_S$ (there can be at most one such column since \mathcal{A}_S has distinct columns). Let $e^* \in E$ be the edge corresponding to this column. If there is no measurement in T such that the column corresponding to e^* has a different entry compared to column c in $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$, then the problem cannot be solved using measurements in T . In other words, no measurement

is able to distinguish between the possibility that e^* has been altered and the possibility that no edge has been altered. Thus, we may assume there exists a measurement $s^* \in T$ such that the corresponding entry of column of c will be different from that associated with e^* . As a result, $S^* = S \cup \{s^*\}$ is a set of measurements that will solve the problem with the additional possibility that no edge has been altered. Since $|S^*| = |S| + 1$, at most one additional measurement is required if the possibility of no edge being altered is included in the problem.

1.1 Our contributions

We provide tight upper and lower bounds on the smallest number of measurements for the fault detection problem in various families of electrical networks. In particular, we are able to fully resolve the problem for complete graphs and complete k -partite graphs for $k \geq 2$. The formal statements are in Section 2 and their proofs are provided in Section 3. The proof techniques draw upon combinatorial and spectral graph theory, electrical network theory, and ideas from information theory. We note briefly that each effective resistance measurement provides a real number; thus, a single measurement potentially provides infinitely many bits of information. For this reason, classical information theoretic lower bound arguments based on bits of information do not immediately apply. While our final results are mathematically precise and rigorous, our search for the best measurement strategy in each of these cases involved modeling the problem as a set covering/integer programming problem and using computational experiments to guide us towards the optimal strategy for measurements. Thus, the problem involves a nice interplay between rigorous mathematical analysis and computer-aided search using discrete optimization techniques. More broadly, we believe that the fault detection problem we set up in Definition 1.2 is a new, challenging combinatorial optimization problem that is rich in its mathematical structure and is motivated by a fundamental problem in fault diagnosis in electrical networks, which has diverse applications. We close the paper in Section 4 with some future directions, including some concrete open questions and conjectures, that we hope can spawn new and interesting research avenues for the combinatorial and discrete optimization community.

1.2 Related literature

As mentioned before, the formalization of fault detection given in Definition 1.2 does not seem to have received a great deal of attention in terms of obtaining provable bounds on the smallest number of measurements. Nevertheless, there are several very related strands of work on fault detection in electrical networks that we review next, which place our work in the broader context of fault diagnosis in electrical systems.

A very closely related line of work originates in the literature on inverse problems, especially in the so-called Calderón problem. The discrete version of the Calderón problem is to recover the values of *all* resistors in a resistive network given a possible set of measurements that one can make. While there is no adversary altering the resistances as in Definition 1.2, obviously if one can determine all the resistance values, then one can simply check if any one of them differs from the original value. Thus, the discrete Calderón problem requires one to deduce much more information from the measurements, compared to the faulty edge detection problem in Definition 1.2 (and therefore may require a much larger number of measurements). A good introduction to the discrete Calderón problem is the book [10], which also surveys relevant prior work. [16] is a recent paper that surveys work in the past couple of decades and provides some new mathematical foundations for the problem. The original

Calderón problem is defined for a continuous conducting medium as opposed to a discrete electrical network modeled by a graph. One is allowed to make current and voltage measurements on the boundary of a connected domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and from this one has to infer the electrical properties in the interior of Ω . The problem forms the mathematical foundation for Electrical Impedance Tomography (EIT) [1, 7, 14], which has numerous applications ranging from computational medicine, geophysics, to testing for structural defects in solids. Much of the literature uses the terms EIT and Calderón problem interchangeably. The tools and techniques are quite different from the discrete setting (and especially the techniques we use in this paper), drawing upon methods from PDEs and classical inverse problems. A continuous version of the problem we study in this paper (Definition 1.2) has been studied, arising out of the work on the continuous Calderón problem. Here, one considers a fracture or a crack in the conducting medium, modeled by a curve that is perfectly insulating. The goal is to, again, use boundary measurements to determine the location/shape of the curve. The problem was introduced in a seminal paper by Friedman and Vogelius [12], with several follow up works; see [3–6, 17] for a sample and the textbook [8] for more details.

In [18, 19], the authors consider the problem of detecting faults in wiring networks, building on prior work which can be traced back to a seminal paper by Kautz [15]. Here, the vertices of a graph model different logical units (often called nets) in a circuit board and each edge denotes a possible site of a “fault”. One is allowed to probe the logical units and use the responses to detect these faults, if any. The mathematical formalization is the following: given a (simple) graph $G = (V, E)$, one can query a subset $U \subseteq V$ and the response is a subset $Q(U)$ which is the set of all vertices that can be reached by a path from a vertex in U . The goal is to find the smallest set of queries to identify all the connected components of G (the vertices in the connected components of size two or more correspond to the logical units that are connected by faulty edges). A group testing [2] approach to this problem was considered in [9] and is discussed in the papers [18, 19] cited above, along with other relevant work on this problem.

2 Statement of results

We consider the fault detection problem in Definition 1.2 where all the unaltered weights are 1, i.e., the network is made of unit resistance (conductance) edges; we use $\mathbf{1}$ to denote the vector of all ones. Moreover, we allow all possible measurements, i.e., $T = V \times V$ (see Definition 1.2). We present upper and lower bounds when the electrical network’s underlying graph is a complete graph or a complete k -partite graph.

Complete graphs. The following theorem gives the number of measurements needed for complete graphs (i.e., graphs that have an edge between every pair of vertices).

Theorem 2.1. *The smallest number of measurements needed to solve the faulty edge detection problem in a complete graph on $n \geq 6$ vertices is exactly $\lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil$.*

Complete k -partite graphs. A complete k -partite graph is one where the set of vertices can be partitioned into k independent sets and there is an edge between every pair of vertices in different partitions. We first state exact bounds for the bipartite ($k = 2$) and tripartite ($k = 3$) cases, and then state a generalization for arbitrary $k \geq 2$.

Theorem 2.2. Let $(V, E, \mathbf{1})$ be an electrical network such that the underlying graph $G = (V, E)$ is a complete bipartite graph with $|V| = n$ and partitions p_β, p_γ with $|p_\beta| \leq |p_\gamma|$.

When $|p_\beta| < |p_\gamma|$, the smallest number of measurements needed to solve the faulty edge detection problem is $\lfloor \frac{2}{3}|p_\gamma| + \frac{1}{3}|p_\beta| \rfloor - 1$ when $|p_\gamma| - |p_\beta| \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$, and equal to $\lfloor \frac{2}{3}|p_\gamma| + \frac{1}{3}|p_\beta| \rfloor$ when $|p_\gamma| - |p_\beta| \equiv 1$ or $2 \pmod{3}$.

When $|p_\beta| = |p_\gamma|$, the smallest number of measurements needed to solve the faulty edge detection problem is $\lfloor \frac{2n}{3} \rfloor - 1$ when $|p_\beta| \equiv 0$ or $1 \pmod{3}$, and equal to $\lfloor \frac{2n}{3} \rfloor$ when $|p_\beta| \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$.

Theorem 2.3. Let $(V, E, \mathbf{1})$ be an electrical network such that the underlying graph $G = (V, E)$ is a tripartite graph with $|V| = n$ and partitions $p_\alpha, p_\beta, p_\gamma$ with $|p_\alpha| \leq |p_\beta| \leq |p_\gamma|$. The smallest number of measurements needed to solve the faulty edge detection problem is given in Table 1.

Partition Sizes	Upper Bound	Lower Bound
$ p_\alpha < p_\beta < p_\gamma $	$\lfloor \frac{n-3}{2} \rfloor$	$\lfloor \frac{n-3}{2} \rfloor$
$ p_\alpha = p_\beta < p_\gamma $	$\max \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{2}{3}n - \frac{2}{3}p_\alpha - \frac{4}{3} \right\rfloor, \left\lfloor \frac{2}{3}n - \frac{1}{3}p_\gamma - \frac{5}{3} \right\rfloor \right\}$	$\min \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{2}{3}n - \frac{2}{3}p_\alpha - \frac{4}{3} \right\rfloor, \left\lfloor \frac{2}{3}n - \frac{1}{3}p_\gamma - \frac{5}{3} \right\rfloor \right\}$
$ p_\alpha < p_\beta = p_\gamma $	$\lfloor \frac{2}{3}n - \frac{1}{3}p_\alpha - \frac{5}{3} \rfloor$	$\lfloor \frac{2}{3}n - \frac{1}{3}p_\alpha - \frac{5}{3} \rfloor$
$ p_\alpha = p_\beta = p_\gamma $	$\lfloor \frac{2}{3}n - 2 \rfloor$	$\lfloor \frac{2}{3}n - 2 \rfloor$

Table 1: Number of measurements required for tripartite graphs.

We now state our result for k -partite graphs for arbitrary $k \geq 2$.

Definition 2.4. An ordered list of numbers is a finite sequence a_1, \dots, a_k of real numbers such that $a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_k$, with $k \geq 1$. Given an ordered list L of k numbers and any subset $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}$, we define $L \setminus S$ to be the new ordered list where elements a_i , $i \in S$ are removed from L . Also, given any ordered list L , we define

$$\text{val}(L) := \sum_{i \in [k]: i \pmod{3} \equiv 0} (2|p_i| - 2).$$

Theorem 2.5. Let $k \geq 2$ be a natural number. Consider an electrical network $(V, E, \mathbf{1})$ such that the underlying graph $G = (V, E)$ is a complete k -partite graph with $|V| = n$, with partitions labeled p_1, \dots, p_k , such that the partition sizes satisfy $2 \leq |p_1| \leq |p_2| \leq \dots \leq |p_k|$. Then one needs at least $\lfloor \frac{n-k}{2} \rfloor$ measurements to solve the faulty edge detection problem. Let L be the ordered list of these partition sizes. An upper bound on the number of measurements is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{val}(L) \quad \text{if } k \equiv 0 \pmod{3}, \\ & \min_{i \in \{1, \dots, k\}} \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{2(|p_i|)}{3} \right\rfloor + \text{val}(L \setminus \{i\}) \right\} \quad \text{if } k \equiv 1 \pmod{3}, \\ & \min_{i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}, i \neq j} \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{2(|p_i| + |p_j| - 1)}{3} \right\rfloor + \text{val}(L \setminus \{i, j\}) \right\} \quad \text{if } k \equiv 2 \pmod{3}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.6. The upper and lower bounds in Theorem 2.5 cannot be improved. Observe that for bipartite graphs with $|p_\gamma| = |p_\beta| + 1$, the bound in Theorem 2.2 reduces to $\lfloor \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + \frac{2}{3} \rfloor = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. This shows that the general lower bound in Theorem 2.5 cannot be improved since it is equal to $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1 = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. Similarly, the bound in Theorem 2.2 with $|p_\beta| = |p_\gamma|$ is $\lfloor \frac{2n}{3} \rfloor$ (for graphs with $|p_\beta| \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$) which is the same as what one would obtain from the upper bound in Theorem 2.5. Thus, the general upper bound in Theorem 2.5 cannot be improved.

3 Proofs of results

In this section, we give complete proofs of Theorems 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.5. First, we provide the proofs for the complete graphs, complete bipartite graphs, and complete tripartite graphs, which illustrate the general proof techniques for establishing upper and lower bounds on the smallest number of measurements needed for the faulty edge detection problem. The most technically involved proof is Theorem 2.5 that analyzes k -partite graphs for arbitrary $k \geq 2$. Its proof is a much more intricate implementation of the general proof ideas illustrated in this section for the complete graph, complete bipartite, and complete tripartite cases. The high level idea in the proofs for the upper and lower bounds is to precisely quantify the amount of information one gains with any given measurement. Given any proposed measurement in an electrical network, two edges can be considered *information theoretically equivalent* if the effective resistance values are the same when they are altered. In other words, this measurement will not be able to distinguish two equivalent edges. Therefore, one seeks to find the smallest set of measurements such that for every pair of edges, there exists a measurement that puts them in different equivalence classes. Consequently, it becomes important to understand the equivalence classes of the edges of the graph for any measurement. This is done for complete graphs in Appendix B and for complete k -partite graphs in Appendix C.

A conceptual tool that we use for our lower bound proofs is the idea of a *measurement graph*.

Definition 3.1. Let $(V, E, \mathbf{1})$ be an electrical network and let \mathcal{M} be some set of effective resistance measurements, i.e., \mathcal{M} is a set of unordered pairs of vertices. The graph $G' = (V, \mathcal{M})$ is the measurement graph corresponding to \mathcal{M} .

Note that the edges in the measurement graph $G' = (V, \mathcal{M})$ are not necessarily edges in the underlying graph $G = (V, E)$ for the electrical network.

Many of our measurement strategies are based on the following type of measurement.

Definition 3.2. Let $(V, E, \mathbf{1})$ be an electrical network. A butterfly wing measurement involving vertices $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in V$ is comprised of two measurements (v_1, v_2) and (v_2, v_3) . We refer to v_2 as the *center node* (involved in both measurements) and v_1, v_3 as the *wing nodes*.

We now describe four types of butterfly wing measurements used in the strategies for k -partite graphs.

Definition 3.3. Given partitions $p_\alpha, p_\beta, p_\gamma$ in a k -partite graph with $|p_\alpha| \leq |p_\beta| \leq |p_\gamma|$, a tripartite butterfly wing is formed using vertices $v_1 \in p_\alpha, v_3 \in p_\gamma, v_2 \in p_\beta$ such that v_3 is the center node.

Definition 3.4. Given partitions p_β, p_γ in a k -partite graph with $|p_\beta| \leq |p_\gamma|$, a zig-zagging butterfly wing scheme is formed by utilizing vertices $v_1, v_3, v_5 \in p_\gamma$ and $v_2, v_4, v_6 \in p_\beta$. This scheme involves two distinct butterfly wings. The first butterfly wing involves v_1, v_2, v_3 with $v_2 \in p_\beta$ as the center node. The second involves v_4, v_5, v_6 with $v_5 \in p_\gamma$ as the center node.

Definition 3.5. Given partitions p_β, p_γ in a k -partite graph with $|p_\beta| \leq |p_\gamma|$, we form a hairpin butterfly wing by utilizing vertices v_1, v, v_2 with v as the center node, satisfying the following: either $v \in p_\beta$ and $v_1, v_2 \in p_\gamma$, or else $v \in p_\gamma$, and $v_1, v_2 \in p_\beta$.

Definition 3.6. Given a partition p_γ in a k -partite graph, a partition butterfly wing is formed by utilizing vertices $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in p_\gamma$, with any of these three vertices as the center node.

3.1 Complete Graphs

The characterization of the edge equivalence classes for any measurement given in Lemma B.1 from Appendix B will be an important tool below. In particular, the altered resistance values in Table 3 will be referred to many times.

3.1.1 Upper Bound in Theorem 2.1

Let the vertices of the complete graph be labeled as v_1, \dots, v_n . We first prove that $\lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil$ measurements suffice and then establish a matching lower bound.

Strategy. Partition the vertices into groups of three: v_1, v_2, v_3 and v_4, v_5, v_6 and so forth, and depending on the value of n , we will have zero, one or two vertices left over that cannot be grouped. We use butterfly wing measurements (Definition 3.2) on all the groups of size three (with v_2, v_5, v_8, \dots as the center nodes). If we have one or two vertices left over that were not grouped, then we add measurements with source equal to v_2 (the center node in the first group of three) and sink equal to the left over vertices. We claim that these measurements suffice.

Measurement Counts. The number of measurements is either $\frac{2n}{3}$ if $n \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$, $\frac{2(n-1)}{3} + 1 = \frac{2n}{3} + \frac{1}{3}$ if $n \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, or $\frac{2(n-2)}{3} + 2 = \frac{2n}{3} + \frac{2}{3}$ if $n \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$. We observe that these numbers are equal to $\lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil$ (in the respective cases).

Correctness. Consider two edges $e, e' \in E$. We have to show there exists a measurement which gives different effective resistance values when these two edges are altered. First, observe that at least one of the edges, say e without loss of generality, must have an endpoint in some group of size three. This is because we have at most two vertices in the graph that are not included in some group of size three. We now do some case analysis.

Case 1: e has both endpoints in the same group of size three. If e' does not have an endpoint in this group of size three, then any measurement in the butterfly wing will distinguish these two edges by Lemma B.1. If e' has both endpoints in this group of size three, then there must be a measurement in the butterfly wing in this group of size three whose the endpoints coincide with either e or e' , but not both. This measurement will distinguish these two edges by Lemma B.1. Finally, consider the possibility that e' has exactly one endpoint in this group of size three. If the other endpoint of e' is in a different group of size three, then the measurement from the butterfly wing on this other group that shares an endpoint with e' will distinguish e, e' by Lemma B.1. Else, the other endpoint u of e' is one of the left over vertices that were not grouped into groups of size three. If the butterfly wing in the group containing e has a measurement that coincides with e , then that measurement will distinguish e, e' by Lemma B.1. So now suppose the butterfly wing in the group containing e is such that the wing nodes are the endpoints of e . If e' also has one of these wing nodes as its endpoint, then the measurement with the other wing node will distinguish e, e' by Lemma B.1. Otherwise, we are in the case where e' has the center node v of this butterfly wing as one of its endpoints. In this case, Lemma B.1 implies that the measurement using u and v_2 will distinguish e, e' . This holds in the case when $v = v_2$, i.e., v is the center node of the first butterfly, and also when v is the center node of a different butterfly.

Case 2: The two endpoints of e are in different groups of size three. If e' has both endpoints in the same group of size three, then this is symmetrical to Case 1. Thus, we assume e' does not have endpoints in the same group of size three. Suppose e and e' do not share an endpoint. Consider any one of the groups containing an endpoint of e . At least one of the measurements in this butterfly wing will share an endpoint with e but not e' , or vice versa. This measurement will distinguish e, e' by Lemma B.1. Suppose now that e and e' do share an endpoint. Consider the group of three containing the other endpoint of e . There must be a measurement in the butterfly wing in this group that shares an endpoint with e or e' but not both. This measurement will distinguish e, e' by Lemma B.1.

Case 3: One endpoint of e is in a group of size three and the other one is not. We may assume that one endpoint of e' is in a group of size three and the other one is not. Otherwise, we are in symmetrical cases to Case 1 and Case 2. Thus, both e and e' have endpoints u and u' that were not grouped into the groups of size three. Suppose $u \neq u'$. If v_2 is the endpoint of either e or e' , we can use the measurement corresponding to that edge which will distinguish it from the other edge, by Lemma B.1. Otherwise, v_2 is not the other endpoint of e or e' ; then the measurement with source v_2 and sink u will distinguish the edges, by Lemma B.1. Suppose now $u = u'$. If the other endpoints of e and e' are in different groups of size three, then any measurement from the butterfly wing in the group containing an endpoint of e will distinguish e, e' by Lemma B.1. Finally, consider the case when the other endpoints of e and e' are in the same group of size three. Then one of the measurements in the butterfly wing on this group of size three shares an endpoint with e or e' but not both, which will distinguish e, e' by Lemma B.1.

Case 4: Neither endpoint of e is in a group of size three. This means both endpoints u_1 and u_2 of e are left over vertices from the grouping into size three groups. One of these vertices, say u_1 without loss of generality, is not an endpoint of e' . If v_2 is not an endpoint of e' then the measurement with source v_2 and sink u_1 will distinguish e, e' by Lemma B.1. Thus, assume v_2 is an endpoint of e' . Then, the measurement with source v_1 and sink v_2 (i.e., a measurement from the first group of size three) will distinguish e, e' by Lemma B.1.

3.1.2 Lower Bound in Theorem 2.1

Let \mathcal{M} be any set of measurements that solves the faulty edge detection problem for the complete graph on n vertices and consider the measurement graph $G' = (V, \mathcal{M})$ from Definition 3.1. We first observe that there can be no connected component of size two in G' . If we had a component of size two $C_1 = \{r, s\}$, then for any vertex $d \in V \setminus \{r, s\}$ (which exists since $n \geq 6$), we will not be able to distinguish edge (r, d) from (s, d) by Lemma B.1. We now consider two cases:

Case 1: G' has an isolated vertex. First, there can be at most one isolated vertex in G' . Indeed, suppose u and w are both isolated vertices in G' , then for any vertex $v \in V \setminus \{u, w\}$, no measurement will distinguish the edges (u, v) and (w, v) by Lemma B.1. Moreover, since we have no size two components in G' by the observation before, all other connected components are of size three or more. We now claim that all size three connected components of G' must be triangles, i.e., all the edges must be measurements in \mathcal{M} . Otherwise, suppose we have a size three component with vertices a, b, c and edges (a, b) and (a, c) . Let the isolated vertex in G' be v . Then no measurement can distinguish the edges (v, a) and (b, c) by Lemma B.1. Let q be the number of size three components in G' . Every component of size $s \geq 4$ must have at least $s - 1 \geq 3s/4$ edges. Thus, the number of measurements in

\mathcal{M} is at least

$$3q + \frac{3(n - 3q - 1)}{4} = \frac{3n}{4} + \frac{3q}{4} - \frac{3}{4} \geq \frac{3n}{4} - \frac{3}{4}.$$

Since the number of measurements is an integer, we have a lower bound of $\lceil \frac{3n}{4} - \frac{3}{4} \rceil$ which is at least $\lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil$ for all $n \geq 6$.

Case 2: G' has no isolated vertices. In this case, each component of G' has at least three vertices, and any such component of size $s \geq 3$ must have at least $s - 1 \geq \frac{2s}{3}$ edges. Thus, overall, G' must have at least $\frac{2n}{3}$ edges and we have our lower bound of $\lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil$ since the number of measurements must be an integer.

3.2 Bipartite Graphs

The characterization of the edge equivalence classes for any measurement in a complete k -partite graph, for $k \geq 2$, given in Lemma C.1 from Appendix C will be an important tool below. In particular, the altered resistance values in Tables 4 and 5 will be referred to many times. In these two tables, we use the convention that for any measurement (r, s) , we use p_r and p_s to denote the partitions containing r and s , respectively.

3.2.1 Upper Bound in Theorem 2.2

Let B be a bipartite graph comprised of partitions p_β, p_γ such that $|p_\beta| \leq |p_\gamma|$. We first prove that $\lfloor \frac{2}{3}|p_\gamma| + \frac{1}{3}|p_\beta| \rfloor$ measurements suffice when $|p_\beta| < |p_\gamma|$ and $\lfloor \frac{2n}{3} \rfloor$ measurements suffice when $|p_\beta| = |p_\gamma|$.

Strategy. We have two variants of the strategy to deal with the cases when the partitions are different sizes and when they have the same size.

Definition 3.7 (Bipartite Graph Strategy with Different Sized Partitions). *Given bipartite graphs B comprised of partitions p_β, p_γ such that $|p_\beta| < |p_\gamma|$. Maintain two designated nodes $i_\beta \in p_\beta$ and $i_\gamma \in p_\gamma$. First, place as many disjoint measurements (u, v) such that $u \in p_\beta \setminus \{i_\beta\}$ and $v \in p_\gamma \setminus \{i_\gamma\}$. If there are nodes left in $p_\gamma \setminus \{i_\gamma\}$ that are not designated or used in a measurement, group them into groups of size three and place butterfly wing measurements on these groups. If one node v_γ remains in $p_\gamma \setminus \{i_\gamma\}$ that has not been utilized in any measurement so far, make measurement (v_γ, w_γ) where w_γ is any node in $p_\gamma \setminus \{v_\gamma, i_\gamma\}$. If two nodes u_γ, v_γ remain that have not been utilized in any measurement, place a butterfly wing measurement involving $u_\gamma, v_\gamma, i_\gamma$.*

Definition 3.8 (Bipartite Graph Strategy with Same Sized Partitions). *Given bipartite graphs B comprised of partitions p_β, p_γ such that $|p_\beta| = |p_\gamma|$. Maintain two designated nodes $i_\beta \in p_\beta$ and $i_\gamma \in p_\gamma$. Place as many disjoint zig-zagging bipartite wing measurements (Definition 3.4) as possible. If one node $v \in p_\beta \setminus \{i_\beta\}$ remains that is unable to be placed in a zig-zagging bipartite wing measurement scheme, we place a hairpin butterfly wing measurement (Definition 3.5) disjoint from all measurements so far, with v as the center node and i_γ as one of the wing nodes. If two nodes $u, v \in p_\beta \setminus \{i_\beta\}$ remain that are unable to be placed in a zig-zagging bipartite wing measurement scheme, we place a disjoint hairpin butterfly wing measurement with $w \in p_\gamma \setminus \{i_\gamma\}$ as its center node, such that w has not been used in a previously described measurement. There should be one*

remaining node $t \in p_\gamma \setminus \{i_\gamma\}$ that is not involved in any measurement so far. We place one additional measurement from t to w .

Measurement Counts. It can be verified that the strategies in Definitions 3.7 and 3.8 give the stated measurement counts in Theorem 2.2.

Correctness. The following is the proof of correctness for the strategy outlined in Definition 3.7 for bipartite graphs with different sizes. The proof of the correctness of the strategy outlined in Definition 3.8 is provided in Case 9 of the proof of correctness for k -partite graphs (Section 3.4.2).

Recall we label the partitions p_β and p_γ with $|p_\beta| < |p_\gamma|$. Consider two edges (a, b) and (a', b') with $a, a' \in p_\beta$ and $b, b' \in p_\gamma$. Since $e \neq e'$, either $a \neq a'$ or $b \neq b'$. Recall that p_β and p_γ each contain at most one designated node not involved in any measurement. Further, we recognize that measurements that are within butterfly wing measurements are contained within p_γ . Now we consider two cases.

Case 1: $a \neq a'$. Since $a \neq a'$, there must exist a measurement (r, s) in the strategy from Definition 3.7 that involves exactly one of a or a' ; without loss of generality, let a be this vertex with $a = r$. Suppose first that $b = b'$. If $b = s$, when e is altered, the effective resistance value comes from column **I** in Table 4, and for e' , the value comes from column **III** as $a' \in p_r, a' \neq r$ and $b' = s$. If $b \neq s$, then the effective resistance value comes from column **II** when e is altered and, since $a' \in p_r, a' \neq r$ and $b' \in p_s, b' \neq s$, for e' , the effective resistance value comes from column **IV**. Next, suppose $b \neq b'$. If $b = s$, when e is altered, the effective resistance value comes from column **I** in Table 4, and for e' , the value comes from column **IV** as $a' \in p_r, a' \neq r$ and $b' \neq s$. If $b' = s$, then the effective resistance value when e is altered comes from column **II** in Table 4 since $a = r$ and $b \in p_s, b \neq s$, and when e' is altered, the value comes from column **III** since $a' \in p_r, a' \neq r$ and $b' = s$. Note that $|p_r| \neq |p_s|$ because the bipartite graph has partitions of different sizes. Thus, the value in column **II** is different from the value in column **III**. Finally, if s is not equal to b or b' , then the effective resistance value when e is altered comes from **II** and, since $a' \in p_r, a' \neq r$ and $b' \in p_s, b' \neq s$, for e' , the effective resistance value comes from column **IV**.

Case 2: $a' = a$. This implies $b \neq b'$. Observe that there must exist a measurement (r, s) in the strategy from Definition 3.7 that involves b or b' but not both; without loss of generality, let b be this vertex with $b = s$. If the measurement endpoints are in different partitions, i.e., $s \notin p_r$, when e is altered, the effective resistance value comes from column **I** in Table 4 if $a = r$ and $b = s$, and for e' , the value comes from column **II** as $a' = r$ and $b' \in p_s, b' \neq s$. Another possibility is that $a \in p_r, a \neq r$ and $b = s$, meaning that when e is altered the effective resistance value comes from **III**, and for e' , the value comes from **IV** as $a' \in p_r, a' \neq r$ and $b' \in p_s, b' \neq s$. Now, suppose the measurement endpoints are in the same partition, i.e. $s \in p_r$. When e is altered, the effective resistance value comes from column **X** in Table 5 as $a \notin p_r$ and $b = s$ and, since $a' \notin p_r$ and $b' \in p_s, b' \neq s$, for e' the value comes from column **XI** (the endpoint labels on edges (a, b) and (a', b') should be switched to match with the convention in Table 5).

3.2.2 Lower Bound in Theorem 2.2

Let \mathcal{M} be any set of measurements that solves the faulty edge detection problem for the bipartite graph and consider the measurement graph $G' = (V, \mathcal{M})$ from Definition 3.1.

We first discuss the lower bound achieved when $|p_\beta| < |p_\gamma|$. We observe that we can have at most one isolated vertex in each partition in G' . Otherwise, let a, a' be two isolated vertices in the same partition p_a and $b \in p_b$ be any vertex in G with $p_a \neq p_b$. Since a, a' are in the same partition and they are not the endpoint of any measurement, for both edges (a, b) and (a', b) , the effective resistance value will come from the same column in Tables 4 and 5 when they are altered. Similarly, a component of size two in G' cannot be formed using two vertices in the same partition since two edges with these as endpoints and any other vertex in the other partition as the other endpoint cannot be distinguished by any measurement. Let q_2 be the number of size two components in \mathcal{M} . Since there can only be components of size two with endpoints in different partitions, the number of components of size two components is at most $|p_\beta|$. The remaining components of size $s \geq 3$ must have at least $2s/3$ edges. Therefore, the number of measurements in \mathcal{M} is at least

$$\begin{aligned} q_2 + \frac{2(n-2-2q_2)}{3} &= \frac{2n}{3} - \frac{q_2}{3} - \frac{4}{3} \\ &\geq \frac{2n}{3} - \frac{|p_\beta|}{3} - \frac{4}{3} \\ &= \frac{2|p_\gamma|}{3} + \frac{|p_\beta|}{3} - \frac{4}{3} \end{aligned}$$

Since the number of measurements is an integer, this gives at least $\left\lfloor \frac{2|p_\gamma|}{3} + \frac{|p_\beta|}{3} \right\rfloor - 1$ measurements. This argument can be sharpened when $|p_\gamma| - |p_\beta| \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ or $|p_\gamma| - |p_\beta| \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$. Note that in this case, if we have an isolated vertex in both partitions, then $q_2 \leq |p_\beta| - 1$. If $q_2 \leq |p_\beta| - 2$, then the right hand side of the second inequality above becomes $\frac{2n}{3} - \frac{|p_\beta|-2}{3} - \frac{4}{3} = \frac{2}{3}(|p_\gamma| - |p_\beta|) + |p_\beta| - \frac{2}{3}$. Since $|p_\gamma| - |p_\beta| \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ or $|p_\gamma| - |p_\beta| \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$, $\frac{2}{3}(|p_\gamma| - |p_\beta|) + |p_\beta| - \frac{2}{3} \geq \left\lfloor \frac{2|p_\gamma|}{3} + \frac{|p_\beta|}{3} \right\rfloor$. If $q_2 = |p_\beta| - 1$, then observe that we have components of size at least three on the remaining $|p_\gamma| - |p_\beta|$ vertices in the p_γ component. In other words, we have at least $\left\lceil \frac{2(|p_\gamma| - |p_\beta|)}{3} \right\rceil$ edges, and therefore, in total, $\left\lceil \frac{2(|p_\gamma| - |p_\beta|)}{3} \right\rceil + |p_\beta| - 1$ edges. Since $|p_\gamma| - |p_\beta| \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$, $\left\lceil \frac{2(|p_\gamma| - |p_\beta|)}{3} \right\rceil + |p_\beta| - 1 \geq \left\lfloor \frac{2|p_\gamma|}{3} + \frac{|p_\beta|}{3} \right\rfloor$.

We now consider the case where $|p_\beta| = |p_\gamma|$. As before, we can have at most 2 isolated vertices in G' , and components of size two must have endpoints in both partitions. Moreover, we can have at most one component of size two. Indeed, if r, s and r', s' are two such measurements with r, r' in the same partition, then no measurement can distinguish the edges (r, s') and (r', s) since the sizes of the partitions are the same. Moreover, if one has 2 isolated vertices in G' , then one cannot have a component of size two in G' : Let u, u' be the isolated vertices and let (v, v') be the single edge, with u, v in the same partition and u', v' in the same partition. Then no measurement in G' can distinguish between the edges (u, v') and (u', v) . Indeed, when looking at (v, v') as a measurement, the effective resistance values of the edges (u, v') and (u', v) will be the same as they come from columns **II** and **III** in Table 4 with $|p_r| = |p_s|$. When looking at any other measurement in G' , the values will come from column **IV** in Table 4 when the measurement endpoints are in different partitions and from columns **XI** in Table 5 when the measurement endpoints are in the same partition. Therefore, the number of measurements is at least $\min \left\{ \frac{2(n-2)}{3}, 1 + \frac{2(n-3)}{3} \right\} \geq \frac{2n}{3} - \frac{4}{3}$. Since the number of measurements must be an integer, this means we must have at least $\left\lceil \frac{2n}{3} - \frac{4}{3} \right\rceil$ measurements. We now observe that when $p_\beta \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ or $p_\beta \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, i.e., $n \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ or $n \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$, $\left\lceil \frac{2n}{3} - \frac{4}{3} \right\rceil \geq \left\lfloor \frac{2n}{3} \right\rfloor - 1$, and when $p_\beta \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$, i.e., $n \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, $\left\lceil \frac{2n}{3} - \frac{4}{3} \right\rceil = \left\lceil \left\lfloor \frac{2n}{3} \right\rfloor + \frac{2}{3} - \frac{4}{3} \right\rceil = \left\lfloor \frac{2n}{3} \right\rfloor + \left\lceil \frac{2}{3} - \frac{4}{3} \right\rceil = \left\lfloor \frac{2n}{3} \right\rfloor$.

3.3 Complete tripartite graphs

Using the same notational conventions and similar techniques used in the proof of Theorem 2.2 in Section 3.2, we present the proof for complete tripartite graphs.

3.3.1 Upper Bound in Theorem 2.3

Strategy. For the case that $|p_\alpha| = |p_\beta| = |p_\gamma|$, the strategy is to maintain three designated vertices, one in each partition, and to place tripartite butterfly wing measurements (Definition 3.3) on the remaining vertices.

For the case that $|p_\alpha| < |p_\beta| < |p_\gamma|$, the strategy is to maintain three designated vertices, one in each partition. If n is odd, there exists a perfect matching on the remaining $n - 3$ vertices and we use the measurements that coincide with this matching. If n is even, place a tripartite butterfly wing measurement (Definition 3.3) and the remaining vertices will have a proper matching that will dictate which measurements should be selected.

For the case that $|p_\alpha| = |p_\beta| < |p_\gamma|$, the strategy is again to maintain three designated vertices $v_\alpha, v_\beta, v_\gamma$, one in each partition, and then place as many matching measurements as possible from vertices in $p_\alpha/\{v_\alpha\}$ to vertices in $p_\gamma/\{v_\gamma\}$, and then as many as possible from vertices in $p_\beta/\{v_\beta\}$ to vertices in $p_\gamma/\{v_\gamma\}$. If any vertices remain in $p_\beta/\{v_\beta\}$ or $p_\gamma/\{v_\gamma\}$ (note that we cannot have vertices left over in both $p_\beta/\{v_\beta\}$ and $p_\gamma/\{v_\gamma\}$), place as many disjoint partition butterfly wing measurements (Definition 3.6) as possible, on the vertices that are left over. If there is one vertex v left over, which is not the designated vertex in this partition, and it is not involved in any measurement so far, place a measurement from v to any previously used vertex in that partition. If there are two vertices left over, place a partition butterfly measurement involving these two and the designated vertex in this partition.

For the case that $|p_\alpha| < |p_\beta| = |p_\gamma|$, the strategy is again to maintain three designated vertices $v_\alpha, v_\beta, v_\gamma$, one in each partition, and then place as many matching measurements as possible from $p_\alpha/\{v_\alpha\}$ to $p_\beta/\{v_\beta\}$. Next, we place as many disjoint partition butterfly wing measurements (Definition 3.6) as possible, on the vertices that are left over in $p_\beta/\{v_\beta\}$ and $p_\gamma/\{v_\gamma\}$. Now, for both partitions p_β and p_γ , we do the following. If there is one vertex left over, which is not the designated vertex in that partition, and it is not involved in any measurement so far, place a measurement from that vertex to any previously used vertex in that partition. If there are two vertices left over, place a partition butterfly measurement involving these two and the designated vertex in that partition.

Measurement Counts. We provide the bounds for the four cases in Table 1 under the column titled “Upper Bound”.

Correctness. We leave the proofs of correctness to the reader. However, the proofs follow a similar argument to that provided in Case 2 of the proof of correctness for k -partite graphs.

3.3.2 Lower Bound in Theorem 2.3

Claim 3.9. *Given a complete tripartite graph G with partitions of the different sizes $|p_\alpha| < |p_\beta| < |p_\gamma|$, the lower bound on the number of measurements needed is $\lceil \frac{n-3}{2} \rceil$.*

The proof of this lower bound is similar to that of the lower bound proof of Theorem 2.5 in Section 3.4.1. Let \mathcal{M} be any set of measurements that solves the faulty edge detection problem for

the tripartite graph and consider the measurement graph $G' = (V, \mathcal{M})$ from Definition 3.1. As in Section 3.4.1, we recognize that there can be at most one isolated vertex in each partition in G' . Otherwise, let a, a' be two isolated vertices in the same partition and let b be any vertex in a different partition of G' . Consider a measurement (r, s) . Because a and a' are in the same partition and they are not an endpoint of any measurements, when (a, b) or (a', b) are altered, they will have the same effective resistance value coming from columns **III, IV, VI, VII** or **VIII** in Table 4 if $s \notin p_r$, and from columns **X, XI** or **XII** in Table 5 if $s \in p_r$. Thus, there are at least $n - 3$ vertices with degree at least 1 in G' , meaning the sum of the degrees in G' is at least $n - 3$. By the Handshaking Lemma, there must be at least $\frac{n-3}{2}$ edges in G' and since the number of edges must be an integer, there are at least $\lceil \frac{n-3}{2} \rceil$ edges in G' .

Claim 3.10. *Given complete tripartite graph G with partitions of the same size $|p|$, the lower bound on the number of measurements needed is $2|p| - 2$.*

Proof. We first make the following observations about the measurement graph G' (Definition 3.1). First, there can be no more than one isolated node in G' within any given partition. This follows from the same argument described in the previous claim. Second, a pair of partitions can have at most one component of size two between them. Otherwise, let vertices $a \in p_a$ and $b \in p_b$ form one component and $a' \in p_a$ and $b' \in p_b$ form the other, meaning (a, b) and (a', b') are two measurements. Since there are no other measurement edges in G' incident on a, b, a', b' , the edges (a, b') and (a', b) will give the same effective resistance value when altered. Indeed, when looking at (a, b) or (a', b') as a measurement, the effective resistance values of these edges come from columns **II** and **III** in Table 4, which are equal as $|p_r| = |p_s|$. When looking at any other measurement, their values will be the same and come from columns **IV, VI**, or **VIII** in Table 4 when the measurement endpoints are in different partitions, and from columns **XI** or **XII** in Table 5 when the measurement endpoints are in the same partition. Third, it is not possible for two partitions to each have isolated vertices in G' and also contain the endpoints of a size two component in G' . Otherwise, suppose $(a, b) \in E(G')$ and i_a, i_b are two isolated nodes such that $a, i_a \in p_a$ and $b, i_b \in p_b$. There are no other measurement edges in G' incident on a, b, i_a, i_b , which implies that edges (a, i_b) and (i_a, b) will be indistinguishable. Indeed, when looking at (a, b) as a measurement, the effective resistance values of the edges will be the same as they come from columns **II** and **III** in Table 4 with $|p_r| = |p_s|$. When looking at any other measurement in G' , the values will come from columns **IV, VI**, and **VIII** in Table 4 when the measurement endpoints are in different partitions and from columns **XI** and **XII** in Table 5 when the measurement endpoints are in the same partition.

We now analyze three different cases. The first case is that there is one isolated node in G' . Let q_2 be the number of size two components in \mathcal{M} . Due to the second restriction, $q_2 \leq 3$. The remaining components will therefore be of size $s \geq 3$ and they must have at least $s - 1 \geq 2s/3$ edges. Therefore, the number of measurements in \mathcal{M} is at least

$$\begin{aligned} q_2 + \frac{2(n-1-2q_2)}{3} &= \frac{2n}{3} - \frac{q_2}{3} - \frac{2}{3} \\ &\geq \frac{2n}{3} - \frac{3}{3} - \frac{2}{3} \\ &= \frac{2(3|p|)}{3} - \frac{5}{3} \\ &\geq 2|p| - 2 \end{aligned}$$

The second case is that there are two isolated nodes in G' . The second and third restrictions imply that $q_2 \leq 2$. The remaining components of size $s \geq 3$ must have at least $2s/3$ edges. Therefore, the

number of measurement in \mathcal{M} is at least

$$\begin{aligned}
q_2 + \frac{2(n-2-2q_2)}{3} &= \frac{2n}{3} - \frac{q_2}{3} - \frac{4}{3} \\
&\geq \frac{2n}{3} - \frac{2}{3} - \frac{4}{3} \\
&= \frac{2(3|p|)}{3} - 2 \\
&\geq 2|p| - 2
\end{aligned}$$

The third and final case is that there are three isolated nodes in G' . Given the second and third restrictions, we recognize that there cannot be a component of size two in \mathcal{M} . Therefore, the remaining components in \mathcal{M} must be of size $s \geq 3$ containing at least $2s/3$ edges. Therefore, the number of measurements in \mathcal{M} is at least

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{2(n-3)}{3} &= \frac{2n}{3} - 2 \\
&= \frac{2(3|p|)}{3} - 2 \\
&\geq 2|p| - 2
\end{aligned}$$

In all three cases, we end up with a lower bound of $2|p| - 2$ as claimed. \square

The two provided claims give the lower bounds in the first and last rows of Table 1. The cases where two of the partitions are the same size and the third one is different (smaller or larger) can be handled in the same way, yielding the lower bounds in the second and third rows of Table 1.

3.4 Complete k -partite Graphs

We prove Theorem 2.5 in this section. Lemma C.1 in Appendix C will provide the edge equivalence classes for a given measurement. The proof will utilize altered resistance values listed in Tables 4 and 5. As mentioned above in Section 3.2, we use the convention in these two tables that for any measurement (r, s) , we use p_r and p_s to denote the partitions containing r and s , respectively. We prove the stated lower bound below, and then establish the stated upper bound.

3.4.1 Lower Bound in Theorem 2.5

Let \mathcal{M} be any set of measurements that solves the faulty edge detection problem for the complete k -partite graph with $k \geq 2$ and consider the measurement graph $G' = (V, \mathcal{M})$ from Definition 3.1. We first observe that we can have at most one isolated vertex in each partition in G' . Otherwise, let a, a' be two isolated vertices in the same partition p_a and let $b \in p_b$ be any vertex in G with $p_a \neq p_b$. Consider any measurement (r, s) . Since a, a' are in the same partition and they are not the endpoint of any measurement, for both edges (a, b) and (a', b) , the effective resistance value will come from the same column (one of **III**, **IV**, **VI**, **VII**, **VIII**, or **IX** from Table 4 if r, s are in different partitions, or columns **X**, **XI**, **XII** from Table 5 if r, s are in the same partition) when they are altered.

Thus, we have at least $n - k$ vertices with degree at least 1 in G' and so the sum of the degrees is at least $n - k$. By the Handshaking lemma, we must have at least $\frac{n-k}{2}$ edges, and since the number of edges is an integer, it must be at least $\lceil \frac{n-k}{2} \rceil$.

3.4.2 Upper Bound in Theorem 2.5

The measurement strategy. We describe a measurement strategy for any tripartite graph. This will form the building block for the general k -partite case. Below, we employ notation like $u \in p_u$ because

we feel this is intuitive; however, the symbol/variable u is being used to denote both a vertex and a natural number, i.e., the index of the partition. We believe the intuitive clarity justifies this slight abuse of notation.

Definition 3.11. [Tripartite Graph Strategy] Let T be a tripartite graph with partitions $p_\alpha, p_\beta, p_\gamma$ such that $|p_\alpha| \leq |p_\beta| \leq |p_\gamma|$. Maintain one designated node in each partition, i.e., $v_\alpha \in p_\alpha, v_\beta \in p_\beta, v_\gamma \in p_\gamma$. Next, place as many disjoint tripartite wing measurements (Definition 3.3) as possible that do not involve any of the designated nodes. If there are nodes left in $p_\beta \setminus \{v_\beta\}$ that are not used in a measurement, place as many disjoint zig-zagging bipartite wing measurement schemes (Definition 3.4) as possible, between p_β and p_γ using the remaining nodes, but without involving the designated nodes v_β, v_γ . If one node $v \in p_\beta$ remains that is unable to be placed in a zig-zagging butterfly wing measurement scheme, place a hairpin butterfly wing measurement (Definition 3.5) between p_β and p_γ with $v \in p_\beta$ as the center node and without involving any of the previously used nodes. Note that if $|p_\beta| = |p_\gamma|$, then one of the wing nodes of this hairpin butterfly wing measurement will be v_γ . If there are two nodes $v_1, v_2 \in p_\beta \setminus \{v_\beta\}$ that have not been used in any measurements so far, place a hairpin butterfly wing measurement between p_β and p_γ with v_1, v_2 as its wing nodes, and any unused node in p_γ as the center node. If there are nodes left in $p_\gamma \setminus \{v_\gamma\}$ that have not been used in any measurements so far, place as many disjoint partition butterfly wing measurements (Definition 3.6) as possible within $p_\gamma \setminus \{v_\gamma\}$. If one node u_γ remains in $p_\gamma \setminus \{v_\gamma\}$ that has not been used in any measurements so far, make measurement (u_γ, w_γ) where w_γ is any previously used center node in p_γ . If two nodes u_γ, w_γ remain that have not been used in any measurements so far, place a partition butterfly wing measurement involving $u_\gamma, w_\gamma, v_\gamma$, with w_γ as the center node.

We now describe the strategy for the general k -partite graph with partitions p_1, \dots, p_k satisfying $2 \leq |p_1| \leq \dots \leq |p_k|$. If $k \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, let $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ be the index that achieves the minimum in $\min_{i \in \{1, \dots, k\}} \left\{ \left\lceil \frac{2(|p_i|-1)}{3} \right\rceil + \text{val}(L \setminus \{i\}) \right\}$, and let the partition p_i be called P . If $k \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$, let $i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ be the indices that achieve the minimum in

$$\min_{i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}, i \neq j} \left\{ \left\lceil \frac{2(|p_i| + |p_j| - 2)}{3} \right\rceil + \text{val}(L \setminus \{i, j\}) \right\}.$$

In this case, the partitions p_i and p_j form a bipartite subgraph that will be called B in the following. In both cases, we group the remaining partitions, i.e., indexed by $\{1, \dots, k\} \setminus \{i\}$ in the first case and $\{1, \dots, k\} \setminus \{i, j\}$ in the second case, into tripartite subgraphs in order of the sizes of the partitions. We refer to these tripartite subgraphs as $T_1, \dots, T_{\lfloor k/3 \rfloor}$.

We next implement the following steps.

1. The tripartite graph strategy (Definition 3.11) is applied to T_i for all $i = 1, \dots, \lfloor k/3 \rfloor$.
2. If $k \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, place as many partition butterfly wing measurements (Definition 3.6) within this partition as possible. If any vertices remain in P that were not used in any of these partition butterfly measurements, place a measurement from each of these vertices to w , where w is any center node of a partition butterfly measurement in P .
3. If $k \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$, let p_i, p_j denote the partitions used to form the bipartite subgraph B such that $|p_i| \leq |p_j|$. Maintain one designated node $u \in p_i$. Place as many disjoint zig-zagging bipartite wing measurement schemes (Definition 3.4) as possible, between p_i and p_j without

involving the designated node u . If one node $v \in p_i \setminus \{u\}$ remains that is unable to be placed in a zig-zagging butterfly wing measurement scheme, place a hairpin butterfly wing measurement (Definition 3.5) between p_i and p_j with $v \in p_i \setminus \{u\}$ as the center node, without involving any of the previously used nodes. If there are two nodes $v_1, v_2 \in p_i \setminus \{u\}$ that have not been used in any measurements so far, place a hairpin butterfly wing measurement between p_i and p_j with v_1, v_2 as its wing nodes, and any unused node in p_j as the center node. If there are nodes left in p_j that have not been used in any measurements so far, place as many disjoint partition butterfly wing measurements (Definition 3.6) as possible within p_j . If one node v remains in p_j that has not been used in any measurements so far, make measurement (v, w) where w is any previously used center node in p_j . If two nodes v_1, v_2 remain that have not been used in any measurements so far, place a partition butterfly wing measurement involving v_1, w, v_2 , where w is any previously-used center node in p_j .

We claim that the above measurement strategy suffices.

Measurement Counts. We first count the number of measurements used in the tripartite graph measurement strategy (Definition 3.11). One has to consider nine different cases, depending on the relationships between the partition sizes $|p_\alpha|, |p_\beta|$ and $|p_\gamma|$. It can be verified that these counts are given by the values enumerated in Table 2. Since $|p_\alpha| \leq |p_\beta| \leq |p_\gamma|$ in all cases and the number of measurements must be integer, we see from the values in Table 2 that we have a general upper bound of $2|p_\gamma| - 2$.

For the general k -partite case, we observe that if $k \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$, then we simply have the bounds from the $k/3$ tripartite subgraphs, giving us an upper bound of $\sum_{i \in [k]: i \pmod{3}=0} (2|p_i| - 2)$. If $k \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, then once we select the isolated partition P as per our strategy, we can apply the tripartite upper bound of $2|p_\gamma| - 2$ for each of the tripartite subgraphs $T_i, i = 1, \dots, \lfloor k/3 \rfloor$. By definition of $val(L)$ for an ordered list L of numbers (Definition 2.4) and the choice of P , we have the stated bound. Similarly, in the case where $k \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$, our choice of the bipartite subgraph B and the definition of $val(L)$ gives the stated bound.

Correctness. Consider any two edges $e, e' \in E(G)$ with $e = (a, b)$ and $e' = (a', b')$, where $a \in p_a, b \in p_b, a' \in p_{a'}, b' \in p_{b'}$. We must show that there exists a measurement which gives different effective resistance values when these two edges are altered. Note that this notation implies, for example, that $s \in p_b$ if and only if $b \in p_s$. We will use such facts without explicit mention below. In the case analysis, when we consider tripartite subgraphs T_i, T_j, T_k , we allow for the possibility that some subset of the indices $\{i, j, k\}$ (possibly all) are all equal to each other unless some pairs are explicitly assumed to be unequal in the case under consideration.

Case 1: e has both endpoints in T_i and e' has both endpoints in T_j such that $i \neq j$

We observe that there exists a measurement (r, s) within a tripartite butterfly wing measurement in T_i such that $a \in p_r$. Using this measurement, the effective resistance when e' is altered has value corresponding to column **IX** in Table 4, and for e , the new effective resistance will have value from any of the columns from **I** to **VI** since $a \in p_r$. This implies that these two edges will give differing values of effective resistance for measurement (r, s) when altered.

Case 2: e and e' have both endpoints in T_i for some i

Since there are only three partitions in T_i , one of these partitions must contain an endpoint of both edges. Without loss of generality, let a, a' be in the same partition p_a in T_i .

Cases of Partition Sizes		Number of Measurements
$ p_\beta - p_\alpha \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$	$ p_\gamma - p_\beta \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$	$\frac{2 p_\alpha }{3} + \frac{2 p_\beta }{3} + \frac{2 p_\gamma }{3} - 2$
	$ p_\gamma - p_\beta \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$	$\frac{2 p_\alpha }{3} + \frac{2 p_\beta }{3} + \frac{2 p_\gamma }{3} - \frac{5}{3}$
	$ p_\gamma - p_\beta \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$	$\frac{2 p_\alpha }{3} + \frac{2 p_\beta }{3} + \frac{2 p_\gamma }{3} - \frac{4}{3}$
$ p_\beta - p_\alpha \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$	$ p_\gamma - p_\beta \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$	$\frac{2 p_\alpha }{3} + \frac{2 p_\beta }{3} + \frac{2 p_\gamma }{3} - 2$
	$ p_\gamma - p_\beta \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$	$\frac{2 p_\alpha }{3} + \frac{2 p_\beta }{3} + \frac{2 p_\gamma }{3} - \frac{5}{3}$
	$ p_\gamma - p_\beta \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$	$\frac{2 p_\alpha }{3} + \frac{2 p_\beta }{3} + \frac{2 p_\gamma }{3} - \frac{4}{3}$
$ p_\beta - p_\alpha \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$	$ p_\gamma - p_\beta \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$	$\frac{2 p_\alpha }{3} + \frac{2 p_\beta }{3} + \frac{2 p_\gamma }{3} - 2$
	$ p_\gamma - p_\beta \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$	$\frac{2 p_\alpha }{3} + \frac{2 p_\beta }{3} + \frac{2 p_\gamma }{3} - \frac{5}{3}$
	$ p_\gamma - p_\beta \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$	$\frac{2 p_\alpha }{3} + \frac{2 p_\beta }{3} + \frac{2 p_\gamma }{3} - \frac{4}{3}$

Table 2: Number of Measurements required for various cases of partition sizes in k-partite graphs.

Case 2a: Suppose b and b' are in different partitions. In this case, any measurement (r, s) within a tripartite butterfly wing measurement in T_i such that $r \in p_a$ and $s \in p_b \cup p_{b'}$, will distinguish e and e' . Since b, b' are in different partitions, we may assume (up to a relabeling of the edges) that $s \in p_b$ or equivalently, $b \in p_s$. If $a = r$ and $b = s$, when e is altered, the effective resistance value comes from column **I** and for e' , the value comes from either column **V** if $a' = a$ or column **VI** if $a' \neq a$. Similarly, if $a = r$ and $b \in p_s, b \neq s$, for e , the value comes from column **II**, and for e' , the value comes from either column **V** if $a' = a$ or column **VI** if $a' \neq a$. If $a \neq r$ and $b = s$, when e is altered, the effective resistance value comes from column **III**, and for e' , the value comes from column **V** or column **VI** depending on whether or not $a' = r$. If $a \neq r$ and $b \in p_s, b \neq s$, for e the value comes from column **IV**, and for e' value comes from column **V** or column **VI** depending on whether or not $a' = r$.

Case 2b: Suppose b and b' are in the same partition. We now go through the following possibilities.

Suppose $a = a'$. Either b or b' must be involved in a measurement since there is at most one designated node in the partition containing b, b' . Without loss of generality, let us assume that b is one of the endpoints of the measurement (r, s) with $b = s$. If $r = a = a'$, then the value when e is altered comes from column **I** in Table 4, and for e' , the value comes from column **II**. If $r \in p_a$ but $r \neq a$, then for e , the value comes from **III** and for e' , it is column **IV**. If r is in the partition that is different from p_a and p_b , then for e , the value comes from column **VII** and for e' , we use column **VIII**. Finally, if $r \in p_b$, then for e , the value comes from column **X** in Table 5, and for e' , the value comes from **XI** (Note that to read the values in Table 5, we have to switch the labels of the endpoints of the two edges).

Suppose $b = b'$ (and therefore, $a \neq a'$). Observe that up to relabeling of the labels on the endpoints, this case is the same as the previous case with $a = a'$.

We now consider the situation where $a \neq a'$ and $b \neq b'$. Either a or a' must be involved in a measurement since there is at most one designated node in the partition p_a . Without loss of generality,

let us assume that a is one of the endpoints of the measurement (r, s) with $a = r$. If s is in the partition that does not contain a or b , then if e is altered, the effective resistance value comes from column **V**, and for e' , the value comes from column **VI**. If $s \in p_b$ with $s \neq b'$, then if e is altered, the effective resistance value comes from either column **I** or **II** depending on whether $s = b$ or not, and for e' , the value comes from column **IV**. If $s \in p_b$ with $s = b'$, then there exists a different measurement (\bar{r}, \bar{s}) in the strategy incident on either a or b' (since there are no components of size two in the measurement graph for the outlined measurement strategy). Again, up to switching the labels on the endpoints of the edges, we may assume $\bar{r} = a$. Now we must fall into one of the previously considered cases and we are done. Finally, consider the case where $s \in p_a$. If $s \neq a'$, then for e , the value comes from column **X** in Table 5 and for e' , it comes from column **XI**. If $s = a'$, then there exists a different measurement (\bar{r}, \bar{s}) in the strategy incident on either a or a' (since there are no components of size two in the measurement graph for the outlined measurement strategy). In fact, both \bar{r} and \bar{s} must be in p_a because r, s must be involved in a partition butterfly wing measurement within p_a . We are again able to distinguish edges e, e' using columns **X** and **XI**, respectively, in Table 5.

Case 3: e has both endpoints in T_i and e' has one endpoint in T_j and another in T_k such that $j \neq k$

Without loss of generality, assume $k \neq i$ and $b' \in p_{b'} \subset T_k$. There exists a measurement (r, s) within a tripartite butterfly wing measurement in T_k such that $b' \in p_s$ that will distinguish e and e' . This is because the effective resistance value when e is altered comes from column **IX** in Table 4 since $a, b \notin \{p_r, p_s\}$, and for e' the value comes from columns **VII** or **VIII** depending on whether or not $b' = s$. This implies that the edges will have different values for the effective resistance when altered.

Case 4: e has one endpoint in T_{i_1} and another in T_{i_2} ($i_1 < i_2$) and e' has one endpoint in T_{j_1} and another in T_{j_2} ($j_1 < j_2$)

First, we examine the case in which either $i_1 \neq j_1$ or $i_2 \neq j_2$. We consider the case $i_2 \neq j_2$; the other case has a symmetrical argument. There exists a measurement (r, s) within a tripartite butterfly wing measurement in T_{j_2} such that $b' \in p_s \subset T_{j_2}$. Using this measurement, we will be able to distinguish e and e' as they will have different values for effective resistance; for e , the value comes from column **IX** in Table 4 since $a, b \notin \{p_r, p_s\}$ and for e' , the value comes from **VII** or **VIII** depending on whether or not $b' = s$.

If $i_1 = j_1$ and $i_2 = j_2$, we first consider the case where either $a' \notin p_a$ or $b' \notin p_b$. In the first case, we can use a tripartite measurement (r, s) such that $r \in p_a \cup p_{a'}$ and $s \in T_{i_1} \setminus \{p_a, p_{a'}\}$ to distinguish the edges. Indeed, we may assume (up to changing the labels on the edges) that $a \in p_r$. Therefore, when e is altered, the effective resistance value comes from column **V** or **VI** depending on whether or not $a = r$, and for e' , the value comes from column **IX** as $a', b' \notin \{p_r, p_s\}$. The case where $b' \notin p_b$ can be argued in the same way after switching the labels on the endpoints of both edges.

So, we now consider the situation where $a' \in p_a$ and $b' \in p_b$. Since $e \neq e'$, either $a \neq a'$ or $b \neq b'$. Up to a relabeling of the endpoints, we may assume $b \neq b'$. Since $b, b' \in p_b$, one of them must be involved in a measurement r, s since there is at most one designated vertex in every partition that is not involved in any measurement. Further, there must exist a measurement that involves b or b' but not both since there are no components of size two in the measurement graph associated with the outlined measurement strategy.

Without loss of generality, we assume that $b = s$. Regardless of whether or not $a = a'$, we are able to say the following about the effective resistance values when e and e' are altered. If r is not in the same partition p_b as s , for e , the value comes from column **VII** in Table 4 since $a \notin p_r$, and for e' , the value comes from column **VIII** as $b \in p_s, b \neq s$ and $a' \notin p_r$. If r is in the same partition p_b

as s , for e , the value comes from column **X** in Table 5, and for e' , the value comes from column **XI** as $a' \notin p_r$ and $b' \in p_r$ (Note that one has to switch the labels on the endpoints of the edges to read the values from Table 5).

Case 5: e has one endpoint in P and another in T_i and e' has one endpoint in T_j and another in T_k

For edge e , let $a \in P$ and $b \in T_i$. We use a partition butterfly wing measurement (r, s) within P such that $a = r$. This means that when e is altered, the effective resistance value comes from column **X**, and for e' , the value comes from column **XII** as $a, b \notin p_r$.

Case 6: e has one endpoint in P and another in T_i and e' has one endpoint in P and another in T_j

Let $a, a' \in P$, $b \in T_i$, and $b' \in T_j$. If $a \neq a'$, then there exists a partition butterfly wing measurement (r, s) that uses exactly one of the vertices a and a' , and we may assume without loss of generality that $a = r$. If e is altered, the effective resistance value will come from column **X**, and for e' , the value comes from column **XI**.

If $a = a'$, we use a tripartite butterfly wing measurement (r, s) in T_i such that $s \in p_b \cup p_{b'}$. Without loss of generality, let $s \in p_b$. If $b' \notin p_b$, then the effective resistance value when e is altered comes from columns **VII** or **VIII** depending on whether or not $b = s$, and for e' , the value comes from column **IX** as $a', b' \notin \{p_r, p_s\}$. If $b' \in p_b$, then there exists a measurement involving b or b' but not both as we cannot have more than one designated node within a partition and there cannot be components of size two in the measurement graph for the outlined measurement strategy. Again, without loss of generality, let $b = s$. If $s \notin p_r$, then the effective resistance value when e is altered comes from column **VII** from Table 4 as $a \notin p_r$, and for e' , the value comes from column **VIII** as $a' \notin p_r$ and $b' \in p_s, b' \neq s$. If $s \in p_r$, then for e , the value comes from column **X** in Table 5, and for e' the value comes from column **XI** as $a \notin p_r$ and $b' \in p_r, b' \neq s$ (One has to switch the labels on the endpoints of the edges to read off the values from Table 5).

Case 7: e has both endpoints in B and e' has one endpoint in T_i and another in T_j

Without loss of generality, assume $b' \in T_j$. Regardless of whether $i = j$ or not, we use a measurement (r, s) within a tripartite butterfly wing measurement in T_j such that $b' \in p_s$ (and thus $r \in T_j \setminus p_{b'}$). This measurement allows us to say that when e is altered, the effective resistance value comes from column **IX** in Table 4 as $a, b \notin \{p_r, p_s\}$ and for e' , the value comes from columns **I–VIII** depending on the which partitions a', b', r and s fall into within T_i and T_j (with the possibility that $i = j$).

Case 8: e has both endpoints in B and e' has one endpoint in B and another in T_i

Without loss of generality, let $b' \in p_{b'} \subset T_i$. We use a measurement (r, s) within a tripartite butterfly wing measurement in T_i such that $b' \in p_s$ and r is in another partition in T_i . This means that when e is altered, the effective resistance value comes from column **IX** in Table 4 as $a, b \notin \{p_r, p_s\}$, and for e' , the value comes from column **VII** if $b' = s$ or column **VIII** if $b' \neq s$.

Case 9: e and e' have both endpoints in B

Let $a, a' \in p_a$ and $b, b' \in p_b$. Since $e \neq e'$, either $a \neq a'$ or $b \neq b'$. Up to a relabeling of the endpoints, we may assume that $a \neq a'$. Recall that p_a contains at most one designated node not involved in any measurement. Further, there are no components of size two in the measurement graph associated with the outlined measurement strategy. Therefore, there must exist a measurement (r, s) that involves a or a' but not both. Without loss of generality, let a be this vertex with $a = r$.

Suppose first that $b = b'$. If $s \notin p_r$ and if $b = s$, when e is altered, the effective resistance value comes from column **I** in Table 4 since $a = r$, and for e' , the value comes from column **III** since

$a' \in p_r, a' \neq r$. If $s \notin p_r$ and $b \in p_s$ with $b \neq s$, when e is altered, the value comes from column **II** since $a = r$, and for e' , the value comes from column **IV** since $a' \in p_r, a' \neq r$. If instead $s \in p_r$, the effective resistance value when e is altered comes from column **X** in Table 5 as $a = r$, and for e' , the value comes from column **XI** as $a' \in p_r, a' \neq r$ by the choice of (r, s) .

Suppose now that $b \neq b'$. If $s \in p_r$, then (r, s) is a partition butterfly wing measurement, in which case for e , the effective resistance value comes from column **X** in Table 5, and for e' , the value comes from column **XI** as $a' \in p_r, a' \neq r$ by the choice of (r, s) , and $b \notin p_r$. Now, suppose $s \notin p_r$. If $s \neq b'$, then the effective resistance value when e is altered comes from column **I** or column **II** in Table 4 depending on whether $b = s$ or not, and for e' , the value comes from column **IV** as $a' \in p_r, a' \neq r$ and $b' \in p_s, b' \neq s$. Finally, consider the situation that $s = b'$. Since there are no components of size two in the measurement graph associated with the outlined measurement strategy, there must exist another measurement (\bar{r}, \bar{s}) with either $\bar{r} = a$ or $\bar{s} = b'$, but not both. Then, up to relabeling the endpoints of the edges, we can apply one of the previous arguments within this paragraph.

Case 10: e has one endpoint in B and another in T_i and e' has one endpoint in T_j and another in T_k

Let $a \in p_a \subseteq B$. We can distinguish the edges by using any measurement (r, s) that is a measurement from a zig-zagging butterfly wing scheme or a hairpin butterfly wing measurement and that uses a vertex in p_a . As $b \notin p_s$, when e is altered, the effective resistance value comes from column **V** or column **VI** depending on whether $a = r$ or not, and for e' , the value comes from column **IX** since $a', b' \notin \{p_r, p_s\}$.

Case 11: e has one endpoint in B and another in T_i and e' has one endpoint in B and another in T_j

Let $a \in p_a \subseteq B, a' \in p_{a'} \subseteq B$ and consider the following three subcases.

If $a = a'$, the same argument as that of Case 7 when $a = a'$ can be used to show that a tripartite butterfly wing measurement (r, s) in T_i such that $s \in p_b \cup p_{b'}$ exists and will distinguish e and e' .

Suppose now that $a' \in p_a$, but $a \neq a'$. Recall that there is at most one designated node in any partition that is not involved in a measurement in the strategy, and there are no components of size two in the measurement graph associated with the strategy. Thus, there must exist a measurement (r, s) in B that has a or a' , but not both, as an endpoint; without loss of generality, let $a = r$. If $s \notin p_r$, this means that when e is altered, the effective resistance value comes from column **V** as $a = r$ and $b \notin p_s$, and for e' , the value comes from column **VI** since $a' \in p_r, a' \neq r$ and $b' \notin p_s$. If $s \in p_r$, then for e , the value comes from column **X** as $b \notin \{p_r, p_s\}$, and for e' , the value comes from **XI** since $a' \in p_r, a' \neq r$ and $b' \notin \{p_r, p_s\}$.

Finally, if $a' \notin p_a$, using the same logic, there must exist a measurement that involves exactly one of a or a' as an endpoint; let a be involved in measurement (r, s) with $a = r$. If $s \notin p_r$, this means that e will have value from column **V** as $a = r$ and $b \notin p_s$, and for e' the value comes from column **VI** since $a' \in p_r, a' \neq r$ and $b' \notin p_s$ (after switching the labels on r, s). If $s \in p_r$, then for e , the value comes from column **X**, and for e' , the value comes from **XII** since $a', b' \notin p_r$.

4 Conclusion and future directions

In this paper, we introduce a new combinatorial optimization problem (Definition 1.1) motivated by a fundamental question in fault diagnosis in electrical systems. We believe the problem is mathematically rich and the insights are widely applicable in diverse areas. There are two broad future research directions to pursue:

Structural aspects. In this paper, we focus on giving tight lower and upper bounds on the smallest number of measurements in complete graphs and complete k -partite graphs. It would be great to extend this analysis to other important families of graphs, e.g. grid/lattice graphs (in general d -dimensions), wheels, polyhedral graphs for structured polyhedra such as hypercubes/fullerene graphs, and others. Beyond tight bounds on the smallest number of measurements, one can also give other insights on the structure of the optimal set of measurements for structured graph families, or relate the optimal number of measurements to other well-studied combinatorial properties such as edge covers, matchings etc., or spectral properties of the Laplacian or adjacency matrices.

Algorithmic aspects. The design of efficient algorithms for solving the faulty edge detection problem has never been explored in the literature, to the best of our knowledge. For example, the following question is open:

For what class of graphs can the faulty edge detection problem be solved in polynomial time?

It is not hard to show that the problem can be modeled as a set cover or an integer programming problem. The polyhedral combinatorics of this special set cover/integer programming problem is also worth studying, e.g., deriving classes of valid inequalities for the feasible solutions. This will have computational implications in terms of speeding up integer programming based algorithms for the faulty edge detection problem.

Acknowledgments. The authors gratefully acknowledge the support from the Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR) grant FA9550-25-1-0038. The authors are also very grateful to Prof. Daniel Naiman and Prof. Fadil Santosa at Johns Hopkins University for suggesting the fault detection problem in Definition 1.2 in the first place, and for very helpful discussions around the problem.

References

- [1] Andy Adler, Romina Gaburro, and William Lionheart. Electrical impedance tomography. Handbook of mathematical methods in imaging, pages 701–762, 2015.
- [2] Matthew Aldridge, Oliver Johnson, Jonathan Scarlett, et al. Group testing: an information theory perspective. Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory, 15(3-4):196–392, 2019.
- [3] Giovanni Alessandrini. Stable determination of a crack from boundary measurements. Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh Section A: Mathematics, 123(3):497–516, 1993.
- [4] Giovanni Alessandrini, Elena Beretta, F Santosa, and S Vessella. Stability in crack determination from electrostatic measurements at the boundary-a numerical investigation. Inverse Problems, 11(5):L17, 1995.
- [5] Giovanni Alessandrini and Emmanuele DiBenedetto. Determining 2-dimensional cracks in 3-dimensional bodies: uniqueness and stability. Indiana University Mathematics Journal, pages 1–82, 1997.

- [6] Giovanni Alessandrini and Alvaro Diaz Valenzuela. Unique determination of multiple cracks by two measurements. SIAM journal on control and optimization, 34(3):913–921, 1996.
- [7] Liliana Borcea. Electrical impedance tomography. Inverse problems, 18(6):R99, 2002.
- [8] Huy Duong Bui. Fracture mechanics: inverse problems and solutions, volume 139. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [9] CC Chen and FK Hwang. Detecting and locating electrical shorts using group testing. IEEE transactions on circuits and systems, 36(8):1113–1116, 1989.
- [10] Edward B Curtis and James A Morrow. Inverse problems for electrical networks, volume 13. World Scientific, 2000.
- [11] Ajendra Dwivedi, Xinghuo Yu, Peter Sokolowski, Peter Wong, and Fulvio Buratto. Fault location in power networks using graph theory. In IECON 2010-36th Annual Conference on IEEE Industrial Electronics Society, pages 2436–2441. IEEE, 2010.
- [12] Avner Friedman and Michael Vogelius. Determining cracks by boundary measurements. Indiana University Mathematics Journal, 38(2):497–525, 1989.
- [13] Cynthia M Furse, Moussa Kafal, Reza Razzaghi, and Yong-June Shin. Fault diagnosis for electrical systems and power networks: A review. IEEE Sensors Journal, 21(2):888–906, 2020.
- [14] David S Holder. Electrical impedance tomography: methods, history and applications. CRC press, 2004.
- [15] William H Kautz. Testing for faults in wiring networks. IEEE Transactions on computers, c-23(4):358–363, 1974.
- [16] AA Kazakov. Inverse problems related to electrical networks and the geometry of non-negative grassmannians. arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.16710, 2025.
- [17] Fadil Santosa and Michael Vogelius. A computational algorithm to determine cracks from electrostatic boundary measurements. International journal of engineering science, 29(8):917–937, 1991.
- [18] Weiping Shi and Douglas B West. Diagnosis of wiring networks: An optimal randomized algorithm for finding connected components of unknown graphs. SIAM Journal on Computing, 28(5):1541–1551, 1999.
- [19] Weiping Shi and Douglas B West. Structural diagnosis of wiring networks: Finding connected components of unknown subgraphs. SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics, 14(4):510–523, 2001.
- [20] Vaya Sapobi Samui Vos et al. Methods for determining the effective resistance. PhD thesis, Master’s thesis, University of Lieden, 2016.
- [21] Zhaoyang Wang, Reza Razzaghi, Mario Paolone, and Farhad Rachidi. Electromagnetic time reversal similarity characteristics and its application to locating faults in power networks. IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery, 35(4):1735–1748, 2019.

A The Laplacian and Effective Resistance

We discuss matrix representations of a graph G that are used in obtaining effective resistance values within the original graph G and when an edge $(a, b) \in E$ is altered.

Definition A.1. The *adjacency matrix* of a weighted graph $G = (V, E)$ is a square matrix where each row and column is associated with a vertex in the graph and an entry corresponding to row indexed by $u \in V$ and column $v \in V$ is the weight $w_{(u,v)}$ if $(u, v) \in E$, and 0 otherwise. The *degree matrix* of a graph is a diagonal matrix where the rows and columns represent each vertex in the graph and the diagonal entries represent the sum of the weights of the edges incident at the vertex. The *Laplacian* of a graph is the square matrix defined by the difference of its degree matrix and its adjacency matrix.

Below, given a Laplacian matrix L , $L(v)$ denotes the Laplacian matrix with the v -th row and column removed.

Theorem A.2. Let (V, E, \mathbf{w}) be an electrical network. Let L denote the Laplacian matrix of the corresponding weighted graph and let $v \in V$ be an arbitrary, fixed vertex. Then, the effective resistance R_{rs} of the network between $r, s \in V$ (Definition 1.1) is given by

$$R_{rs} = \begin{cases} L(v)_{rr}^{-1} & \text{for } r \neq v, s = v \\ L(v)_{ss}^{-1} & \text{for } r = v, s \neq v \\ L(v)_{rr}^{-1} + L(v)_{ss}^{-1} - 2L(v)_{rs}^{-1} & \text{for } r, s \neq v \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $L(v)$ represents the Laplacian matrix of the graph with the v -th row and column removed. Moreover, if the weight of the edge $e = (a, b)$ is altered by $-w_e \leq \alpha < +\infty$, i.e., the new weight is $w_e + \alpha$, then the new effective resistance values are given by

$$R'_{rs} = \begin{cases} R_{rs} - \beta (L(b)_{ar}^{-1})^2 & \text{for } r \neq b, s = b \\ R_{rs} - \beta (L(b)_{as}^{-1})^2 & \text{for } r = b, s \neq b \\ R_{rs} - \beta (L(b)_{ar}^{-1} - L(b)_{as}^{-1})^2 & \text{for } r, s \neq b \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $\beta = \frac{\alpha}{1 + \alpha L(b)_{aa}^{-1}}$.

The values in (A.1) are standard in electrical network theory and the values in (A.2) come about from using the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula for computing the Laplacian inverse entries after updating the weight of the edge. For details, see Theorem 5.2 and equation (5.4) in [20].

B Effective resistance values for complete graphs

The Laplacian L of a complete graph \mathbb{K}_n has entries $L_{ii} = n - 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $L_{ij} = -1$ for all $i \neq j$. For any vertex v , after eliminating the v^{th} row and column from L , the inverse $L(v)^{-1}$ has entries $L(v)_{ii}^{-1} = \frac{2}{n}$ and $L(v)_{ij}^{-1} = \frac{1}{n}$ for all $i \neq j$.

Lemma B.1. Given a measurement (r, s) on \mathbb{K}_n and an altered edge (a, b) , we have $R'_{rs} = R_{rs} - \Delta$, where R_{rs} is the effective resistance with no alterations, R'_{rs} is the new effective resistance between r, s , and Δ is given by Table 3, which considers both the cases where the resistance on (a, b) goes to 0 and to $+\infty$.

Change Δ in effective resistance when edge (a, b) is altered				
	$a = r$ $b \neq s$	$a \neq r$ $b = s$	$a \neq r, s$ $b \neq r, s$	$a = r$ $b = s$
$r_{ab} \rightarrow 0$	$\frac{1}{2n}$	$\frac{1}{2n}$	0	$\frac{2}{n}$
$r_{ab} \rightarrow +\infty$	$\frac{-1}{n(n-2)}$	$\frac{-1}{n(n-2)}$	0	$\frac{-4}{n(n-2)}$

Table 3: Different cases for the effective resistance changes for complete graphs

Proof. First, we note that $R_{rs} = \frac{2}{n}$ by (A.1). For R'_{rs} , the value of β in Theorem A.2 is different for when $r_{ab} \rightarrow 0$ (i.e., the edge is shorted and $w_{ab} \rightarrow +\infty$) and when $r_{ab} \rightarrow +\infty$ (i.e., the edge is removed and $w_{ab} \rightarrow 0$). Therefore, we make note of what these two values will be for our substitutions. When the resistance value r_{ab} of the altered edge approaches 0, the change α in weight approaches $+\infty$ and so $\beta = \frac{1}{L(b)_{aa}^{-1}} = \frac{1}{\frac{2}{n}} = \frac{n}{2}$. When the resistance value r_{ab} approaches $+\infty$, the change in weight is -1 and so $\beta = \frac{-1}{1-L(b)_{aa}^{-1}} = \frac{-1}{1-\frac{2}{n}} = \frac{-n}{n-2}$.

When $a \neq r$ and $b = s$, the change in resistance is $\Delta = \beta (L(b)_{ar}^{-1})^2$ from (A.2). Substituting our given values, we obtain $\Delta = \left(\frac{n}{2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{2n}$ when the resistance r_{ab} goes to 0 and $\Delta = \left(\frac{-n}{n-2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^2 = \frac{-1}{n(n-2)}$ when the resistance r_{ab} goes to $+\infty$. The situation $a = r$ and $b \neq s$ is symmetric to when $a \neq r$ and $b = s$ up to a permutation of vertex labels and so the changes must be the same as that case. Alternatively, one can use (A.2) again with $\Delta = \beta (L(b)_{aa}^{-1} - L(b)_{as}^{-1})^2$ since $a = r$ which gives the same values of $\frac{1}{2n}$ and $\frac{-1}{n(n-2)}$.

When $a \neq r, s$ and $b \neq r, s$, the change in resistance is $\Delta = \beta (L(b)_{ar}^{-1} - L(b)_{as}^{-1})^2$ from (A.2). Therefore, we obtain $\Delta = \left(\frac{n}{2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n}\right)^2 = 0$ when the resistance r_{ab} goes to 0 and $\Delta = \left(\frac{-n}{n-2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n}\right)^2 = 0$ when the resistance goes to $+\infty$.

When $a = r$ and $b = s$, the change in resistance is $\Delta = \beta (L(b)_{ar}^{-1})^2 = \beta (L(b)_{aa}^{-1})^2$ from (A.2). Therefore, we obtain the following $\Delta = \left(\frac{n}{2}\right) \left(\frac{2}{n}\right)^2 = \frac{2}{n}$ when the resistance r_{ab} goes to 0 and $\Delta = \left(\frac{-n}{n-2}\right) \left(\frac{2}{n}\right)^2 = \frac{-4}{n(n-2)}$ when the resistance r_{ab} goes to $+\infty$. \square

C Effective resistance values for k-partite graphs

Let $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_k\}$ represent the set of k partitions of a complete k -partite graph G and let $n = \sum_{i=1}^k |p_i|$. The Laplacian matrix of G is a block matrix with blocks of size $|p_i|$ by $|p_j|$. For any $v \in V$, $L(v)$ has the following block representation. We use $\mathbb{1}_{d \times d}$ and $\mathbb{I}_{d \times d}$ to denote the all ones and the identity matrices of size $d \times d$, respectively. We introduce the notation $\tilde{p}_i = p_i - 1$ for this purpose (making the formulas compact when the v^{th} row and column has been removed). For ease of exposition, we give the formulas when $v \in p_1$; when v is in the other partitions, the formulas are modified accordingly.

$$\begin{bmatrix} (n - |p_1|)\mathbb{I}_{|\widetilde{p}_1|x|\widetilde{p}_1|} & -\mathbb{1}_{|\widetilde{p}_1|x|p_2|} & \cdots & -\mathbb{1}_{|\widetilde{p}_1|x|p_k|} \\ -\mathbb{1}_{|p_2|x|\widetilde{p}_1|} & (n - |p_2|)\mathbb{I}_{|p_2|x|p_2|} & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & -\mathbb{1}_{|p_{k-1}|x|p_k|} \\ -\mathbb{1}_{|p_k|x|\widetilde{p}_1|} & \cdots & -\mathbb{1}_{|p_k|x|p_{k-1}|} & (n - |p_k|)\mathbb{I}_{|p_k|x|p_k|} \end{bmatrix}$$

The inverse of $L(v)$ is given by the following block representation, which can be checked by direct matrix multiplication calculations.

$$\frac{1}{n - |p_1|} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{1}_{|\widetilde{p}_1|x|\widetilde{p}_1|} + \mathbb{I}_{|\widetilde{p}_1|x|\widetilde{p}_1|} & \mathbb{1}_{|\widetilde{p}_1|x|p_2|} & \mathbb{1}_{|\widetilde{p}_1|x|p_3|} & \cdots & \mathbb{1}_{|\widetilde{p}_1|x|p_k|} \\ \mathbb{1}_{|p_2|x|\widetilde{p}_1|} & D_{p_2} & \frac{n-1}{n} \mathbb{1}_{|p_2|x|p_3|} & \cdots & \frac{n-1}{n} \mathbb{1}_{|p_2|x|p_k|} \\ \vdots & \frac{n-1}{n} \mathbb{1}_{|p_3|x|p_2|} & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \frac{n-1}{n} \mathbb{1}_{|p_{k-1}|x|p_k|} \\ \mathbb{1}_{|p_k|x|\widetilde{p}_1|} & \frac{n-1}{n} \mathbb{1}_{|p_k|x|p_2|} & \cdots & \frac{n-1}{n} \mathbb{1}_{|p_k|x|p_{k-1}|} & D_{p_k} \end{bmatrix}$$

where

$$D_{p_i} = \frac{|\widetilde{p}_1|n + \sum_{p_j \in P/\{p_1, p_i\}} |p_j|(n-1)}{(n - |p_i|)(n - |p_1|)n} \mathbb{1}_{|p_i|x|p_i|} + \frac{1}{n - |p_i|} \mathbb{I}_{|p_i|x|p_i|}.$$

Given these block matrix forms, we can calculate effective resistance values using the expressions in Theorem A.2.

Lemma C.1. *Given a measurement (r, s) on a k -partite graph, suppose we alter the resistance value on edge (a, b) . The new effective resistance will be $R'_{rs} = R_{rs} - \Delta$, where R_{rs} is the effective resistance with no alterations and Δ is a value obtained from Table 4 or Table 5, depending on which partitions contain r, s, a , and b . Table 5 shows the values when the measurement endpoints r and s are in the same partition and Table 4 shows the values when they are not. Each table displays the different possible cases according to the partitions that contain a and b , and the two cases of having the altered resistance values on the edge (a, b) go to 0 or to $+\infty$.*

We use the following notation to help aid in displaying the expressions: for every $q \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, define

$$C_{p_q} = \frac{|\widetilde{p}_b|n + \sum_{i \notin \{b, q\}} |p_i|(n-1)}{(n - |p_q|)(n - |p_b|)n} = \frac{(n-1)^2 + |\widetilde{p}_b| - |p_q|(n-1)}{(n - |p_q|)(n - |p_b|)n}.$$

Proof. First, we want to show that the values provided in the table are valid. We note that, regardless of what b is selected, R_{rs} will remain constant for given r, s . We show how two cases are obtained, one from each table. The other values follow in a similar way by substituting values from the block matrices into the expressions provided in Theorem A.2.

Let $r \in p_r, s \in p_s$, and the altered edge's has endpoints $a = r$ and $b = s$; thus, we are in column **I** of Table 4. To get the value when r_{ab} goes to 0, use (A.2) with $\beta = \frac{1}{L(b)_{rr}^{-1}}$. The value we obtain when plugging in values from the block matrix form will be $\Delta = \beta (L(b)_{rr}^{-1})^2 = L(b)_{rr}^{-1} = C_{p_r} + \frac{1}{n - |p_r|}$ (As a sanity check, note that in this case, the unaltered effective resistance R_{rs} is also equal to $L(b)_{rr}^{-1}$ by (A.1), and so the new effective resistance $R'_{rs} = R_{rs} - \Delta = 0$ which is to be expected since we

Δ with $r \in p_r, s \in p_s$ and $p_r \neq p_s$		
	I. $a \in p_r, a = r \quad b \in p_s, b = s$	II. $a \in p_r, a = r \quad b \in p_s, b \neq s$
$r_{ab} \rightarrow 0$	$C_{p_r} + \frac{1}{n- p_r }$	$\left(\frac{1}{C_{p_r} + \frac{1}{n- p_r }}\right) \left(C_{p_r} + \frac{1}{n- p_r } - \frac{1}{n- p_s }\right)^2$
$r_{ab} \rightarrow +\infty$	$\frac{-1}{1 - \left(C_{p_r} + \frac{1}{n- p_r }\right)} \left(C_{p_r} + \frac{1}{n- p_r }\right)^2$	$\left(\frac{-1}{1 - \left(C_{p_r} + \frac{1}{n- p_r }\right)}\right) \left(C_{p_r} + \frac{1}{n- p_r } - \frac{1}{n- p_s }\right)^2$
	III. $a \in p_r, a \neq r \quad b \in p_s, b = s$	IV. $a \in p_r, a \neq r \quad b \in p_s, b \neq s$
$r_{ab} \rightarrow 0$	$\frac{C_{p_r}^2}{C_{p_r} + \frac{1}{n- p_r }}$	$\left(\frac{1}{C_{p_r} + \frac{1}{n- p_r }}\right) \left(C_{p_r} - \frac{1}{n- p_s }\right)^2$
$r_{ab} \rightarrow +\infty$	$\frac{-C_{p_r}^2}{1 - \left(C_{p_r} + \frac{1}{n- p_r }\right)}$	$\left(\frac{-1}{1 - \left(C_{p_r} + \frac{1}{n- p_r }\right)}\right) \left(C_{p_r} - \frac{1}{n- p_s }\right)^2$
	V. $a \in p_r, a = r \quad b \notin p_s$	
$r_{ab} \rightarrow 0$	$\left(\frac{1}{C_{p_r} + \frac{1}{n- p_r }}\right) \left(C_{p_r} + \frac{1}{n- p_r } - \frac{n-1}{(n- p_z)n}\right)^2$	
$r_{ab} \rightarrow +\infty$	$\left(\frac{-1}{1 - \left(C_{p_r} + \frac{1}{n- p_r }\right)}\right) \left(C_{p_r} + \frac{1}{n- p_r } - \frac{n-1}{(n- p_z)n}\right)^2$	
	VI. $a \in p_r, a \neq r \quad b \notin p_s$	VII. $a \notin p_r \quad b \in p_s, b = s$
$r_{ab} \rightarrow 0$	$\left(\frac{1}{C_{p_r} + \frac{1}{n- p_r }}\right) \left(C_{p_r} - \frac{n-1}{(n- p_z)n}\right)^2$	$\left(\frac{1}{C_{p_z} + \frac{1}{n- p_z }}\right) \left(\frac{n-1}{n(n- p_s)}\right)^2$
$r_{ab} \rightarrow +\infty$	$\left(\frac{-1}{1 - \left(C_{p_r} + \frac{1}{n- p_r }\right)}\right) \left(C_{p_r} - \frac{n-1}{(n- p_z)n}\right)^2$	$\left(\frac{-1}{1 - \left(C_{p_z} + \frac{1}{n- p_z }\right)}\right) \left(\frac{n-1}{n(n- p_s)}\right)^2$
	VIII. $a \notin p_r \quad b \in p_s, b \neq s$	IX. $a, b \notin p_r \cup p_s$
$r_{ab} \rightarrow 0$	$\left(\frac{1}{C_{p_z} + \frac{1}{n- p_z }}\right) \left(\frac{-1}{n(n- p_s)}\right)^2$	0
$r_{ab} \rightarrow +\infty$	$\left(\frac{-1}{1 - \left(C_{p_z} + \frac{1}{n- p_z }\right)}\right) \left(\frac{-1}{n(n- p_s)}\right)^2$	0

Table 4: Cases for effective resistance changes when measurement end points are in different partitions.

Δ with $r, s \in p_r$			
	X. $a \in p_r, a = r \quad \text{or} \quad a \in p_r, a = s$ $b \notin p_r$	XI. $a \in p_r, a \neq r, s$ $b \notin p_r$	XII. $a, b \notin p_r$
$r_{ab} \rightarrow 0$	$\frac{1}{C_{p_r}(n- p_r)^2 + (n- p_r)}$	0	0
$r_{ab} \rightarrow +\infty$	$\frac{1}{(C_{p_r}-1)(n- p_r)^2 + (n- p_r)}$	0	0

Table 5: Cases for effective resistance changes when measurement end points are in same partition.

have set the resistance to 0 on the edge joining the measurement endpoints r, s). To get the value when r_{ab} goes to $+\infty$, we have that $\beta = \frac{-1}{1-L(b)_{rr}^{-1}} = \frac{-1}{1-(C_{pr} + \frac{1}{n-|p_r|})}$. Upon substitution, we obtain

$$\Delta = \beta (L(b)_{rr}^{-1})^2 = \frac{-1}{1-(C_{pr} + \frac{1}{n-|p_r|})} \left(C_{pr} + \frac{1}{n-|p_r|} \right)^2.$$

Let $r, s \in p_r$, and the altered edge has endpoints $a = r$ and $b \in p_z$ such that $p_z \neq p_s$; thus, we are in column **X** in Table 5. To get the value when r_{ab} goes to 0, we note that $\beta = \frac{1}{L(b)_{rr}^{-1}} = \frac{1}{C_{pr} + \frac{1}{n-|p_r|}}$.

Then plugging in values from our block matrix form into A.2, we obtain $\Delta = \beta (L(b)_{rr}^{-1} - L(b)_{rs}^{-1})^2 = \frac{1}{C_{pr} + \frac{1}{n-|p_r|}} \left(C_{pr} + \frac{1}{n-|p_r|} - C_{pr} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{C_{pr}(n-|p_r|)^2 + (n-|p_r|)}$. To get the value when r_{ab} goes to $+\infty$, we have that $\beta = \frac{-1}{1-L(b)_{rr}^{-1}} = \frac{-1}{1-(C_{pr} + \frac{1}{n-|p_r|})}$. Therefore, the value we obtain is

$$\beta (L(b)_{rr}^{-1} - L(b)_{rs}^{-1})^2 = \frac{-1}{1-(C_{pr} + \frac{1}{n-|p_r|})} \left(C_{pr} + \frac{1}{n-|p_r|} - C_{pr} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{(C_{pr} - 1)(n-|p_r|)^2 + (n-|p_r|)}.$$

□