Single-source Shortest Paths

Tao Hou

Shortest Path Problem

Problem Definition

Given a weighted (directed or undirected) graph $G = (V, E)$, a **source** vertex *s* and a **target** vertex *t* in *G*, compute a path from *s* to *t* of *minimum weight* (i.e., the *shortest* path)

- **The weight is a function** $w : E \to \mathbb{R}$ **on the edges**
- \blacksquare The weight of a path is the sum of weights of all edges on the path

Two variations:

Single-source Shortest Paths

Given a *source* vertex *s* of *G*, compute the shortest paths from *s* to *all other vertices*

All-pair Shortest Paths

Compute the shortest paths for all pairs of vertices

A shortest path from *s* to *t* is: $s \rightarrow e \rightarrow b \rightarrow f \rightarrow t$ of weight 6

In reality, the weight can be the length, cost, or time of roads, transportation lines etc.

More definitions

- The weight of the shortest path from *s* to *t* is called the *distance*, or *shortest-path distance*, from *s* to *t* and is denoted as $\delta(s, t)$.
- **■** We have $\delta(s, t) = \infty$ if there is no path from *s* to *t*

More definitions

- The weight of the shortest path from *s* to *t* is called the *distance*, or *shortest-path distance*, from *s* to *t* and is denoted as $\delta(s, t)$.
- We have *δ*(*s*, *t*) = ∞ if there is no path from *s* to *t*
- In the problem, edge weights can be *negative*.
- However, if there is a *negative-weight* cycle on the path from *s* to *t*, $\delta(s, t)$ (as well as the problem) is not well-defined:
	- \triangleright We can choose go through the cycles for arbitrary times and the weight of the path can arbitrarily lowered.

Single-source Shortest Paths

Algorithms

- **BFS** (Review)
- Dijkstra's algorithm
- Bellman-Ford
- An algorithm for DAG

Graph data structures

We assume *adjacency list* as data structures for graphs

Representing shortest paths from *s*

Through a *shortest-path tree* rooted at *s*, where the (unique) simple path from *s* to any vertex *v* in the tree is a shortest path from *s* to *v*

- \blacksquare There must be no cycles in a shortest path
	- \triangleright The problem is not well-defined with negative-weight cycles
	- \triangleright There can be no cycles with non-negative weight in a shortest path
- **Shortest paths have the** *optimal substructure* property
- We use *P*[*v*] to record the parent of *v* in the tree (like in BFS/DFS)

Example of shortest path tree

Breadth-First Search

- One of the simplest but also a fundamental algorithm
	- ▶ Some more advance graph algorithm such as *Prim*'s and *Dijkstra*'s can be considered as built on BFS

Breadth-First Search

- \blacksquare One of the simplest but also a fundamental algorithm
	- ▶ Some more advance graph algorithm such as *Prim*'s and *Dijkstra*'s can be considered as built on BFS
- *Input:* $G = (V, E)$ and a *source* vertex $s \in V$
	- ▶ explores the graph starting from *s*, touching all vertices that are reachable from *s*
	- ▶ computes the distance of each vertex from *s* ('distance' means minimum number of edges)
	- \rightarrow iterates through the vertices at increasing distance
		- ▶ the algorithm discovers all vertices at distance *k* from *s* before discovering any vertices at distance $k + 1$ (hence the name)
	- ▶ produces a *BFS tree* rooted at *s*
		- ▶ An edge (*u*, *v*) in the tree means that *v* is '*discovered*' by visiting *u*
	- ▶ works on both *directed* and *undirected* graphs

Breadth-First Search

- \blacksquare One of the simplest but also a fundamental algorithm
	- ▶ Some more advance graph algorithm such as *Prim*'s and *Dijkstra*'s can be considered as built on BFS
- *Input:* $G = (V, E)$ and a *source* vertex $s \in V$
	- ▶ explores the graph starting from *s*, touching all vertices that are reachable from *s*
	- ▶ computes the distance of each vertex from *s* ('distance' means minimum number of edges)
	- \rightarrow iterates through the vertices at increasing distance
		- ▶ the algorithm discovers all vertices at distance *k* from *s* before discovering any vertices at distance $k + 1$ (hence the name)
	- ▶ produces a *BFS tree* rooted at *s*
		- ▶ An edge (*u*, *v*) in the tree means that *v* is '*discovered*' by visiting *u*
	- ▶ works on both *directed* and *undirected* graphs
- Breadth-first search computes the single-source shortest paths for *s* with *weights of all edges being 1*.
	- \blacktriangleright The BFS tree is the shortest-path tree in this case

Breadth-First Search: High-level idea

A central data structure: A (FIFO) *Queue*

Two phases of accessing a vertex *u*

- *Discovering*: put *u* into the queue waiting to be *visited*
- *Visiting*: access the adjacency list of *u* and try to *discover* each adjacent vertex

Breadth-First Search: High-level idea

A central data structure: A (FIFO) *Queue*

Two phases of accessing a vertex *u*

- *Discovering*: put *u* into the queue waiting to be *visited*
- *Visiting*: access the adjacency list of *u* and try to *discover* each adjacent vertex

Process

- Initially, the seed *s* is the only vertex discovered (i.e., in the queue)
- Each iteration takes a vertex *u* from from the queue and visits *u*, until the queue is empty

Breadth-First Search: High-level idea

A central data structure: A (FIFO) *Queue*

Two phases of accessing a vertex *u*

- *Discovering*: put *u* into the queue waiting to be *visited*
- *Visiting*: access the adjacency list of *u* and try to *discover* each adjacent vertex

Process

- Initially, the seed *s* is the only vertex discovered (i.e., in the queue)
- Each iteration takes a vertex *u* from from the queue and visits *u*, until the queue is empty

Coloring for vertices:

- **white**: 'undiscovered', initial color
- *gray*: 'discovered', but haven't been 'visited'
- **black**: finished 'visiting'

Example

Example

BFS(*G*, *s*)

- 1 **for** each vertex $u \in V(G) \setminus \{s\}$ 2 $color[u] =$ WHITE 3 $d[u] = \infty$
4 $\pi[u] = \infty$ $\pi[u] = \text{NIL}$ 5 $color[s] =$ GRAY 6 $d[s] = 0$ $7 \quad \pi[s] = \text{NIL}$ 8 *Q* = ∅ 9 **ENQUEUE**(*Q*, *s*)
- 10 **while** $Q \neq \emptyset$ 11 $u = \text{Decou}(\mathbf{Q})$ 12 **for** each $v \in Adj[u]$ 13 **if** $color[v] =$ **white** 14 $color[v] = \text{GRAY}$ 15 $d[v] = d[u] + 1$ 16 $\pi[v] = u$ 17 **ENQUEUE**(*Q*, *v*) 18 $color[u] = \text{Black}$

■ Coloring for vertices:

- ▶ *white*: 'undiscovered', initial color
- ▶ *gray*: 'discovered', but haven't been 'visited'
- ▶ *black*: finished 'visiting'
- \blacktriangleright 'discovering' means first encountered by the search
	- \blacktriangleright 'visiting' means to try to discover all adjacent vertices which are undiscovered
- Central data structure: a queue (first-in, first-out):
	- ▶ Contains *gray* vertices
- Some records we keep:
	- ▶ *color*[*u*]: color of a vertex *u*
	- ▶ *d*[*u*]: distance from *s* to *u*
	- \blacktriangleright $\pi[u]$: a vertex s.t. $(\pi[u], u)$ forms an edge in the BFS tree (there is another interpretation which we will see in Dijkstra's)

BFS(*G*, *s*)

■ Initially, *s* is set as 'discovered': enqueued, *gray* All other vertices are 'undiscovered' (*white*)

```
1 for each vertex u \in V(G) \setminus \{s\}2 color[u] = WHITE
3 d[u] = \infty<br>4 \pi[u] = \infty\pi[u] = \text{NIL}5 color[s] = GRAY
6 d[s] = 0\pi[s] = \text{NIL}8 Q = ∅
9 ENQUEUE(Q, s)
10 while Q \neq \emptyset11 u = \text{Decou}(\mathbf{Q})12 for each v \in Adj[u]13 if color[v] = white
14 color[v] = \text{GRAY}15 d[v] = d[u] + 116 \pi[v] = u17 ENQUEUE(Q, v)
18 color[u] = \text{Black}
```
- Initially, *s* is set as 'discovered': enqueued, *grav* All other vertices are 'undiscovered' (*white*)
- \blacksquare Each iteration:
	- ▶ Dequeues a vertex *u* and tries to 'discover' (enqueue; mark as *gray*) all its adjacent vertices which are 'undiscovered'

- 1 **for** each vertex $u \in V(G) \setminus \{s\}$ 2 $color[u] =$ WHITE 3 $d[u] = \infty$
4 $\pi[u] = \infty$ $\pi[u] = \text{NIL}$ 5 $color[s] =$ GRAY 6 $d[s] = 0$ π [[]s] = NIL 8 *Q* = ∅ 9 **ENQUEUE**(*Q*, *s*) 10 **while** $Q \neq \emptyset$ 11 $u = \text{Decou}(\mathbf{Q})$ 12 **for** each $v \in Adj[u]$ 13 **if** $color[v] =$ white 14 $color[v] = \text{GRAY}$ 15 $d[v] = d[u] + 1$ 16 $\pi[v] = u$ 17 **ENQUEUE**(*Q*, *v*) 18 $color[u] = \text{Black}$
- Initially, *s* is set as 'discovered': enqueued, *grav* All other vertices are 'undiscovered' (*white*)
- \blacksquare Each iteration:
	- ▶ Dequeues a vertex *u* and tries to 'discover' (enqueue; mark as *gray*) all its adjacent vertices which are 'undiscovered'
	- \triangleright Whenever we discover a vertex *v*, we add the edge (u, v) to the BFS-tree (called a *tree edge*)

- 1 **for** each vertex $u \in V(G) \setminus \{s\}$ 2 $color[u] =$ WHITE 3 $d[u] = \infty$
4 $\pi[u] = \infty$ $\pi[u] = \text{NIL}$ 5 $color[s] =$ GRAY 6 $d[s] = 0$ π [[]s] = NIL 8 *Q* = ∅ 9 **ENQUEUE**(*Q*, *s*) 10 **while** $Q \neq \emptyset$ 11 $u = \text{Decou}(\mathbf{Q})$ 12 **for** each $v \in Adj[u]$ 13 **if** $color[v] =$ **white** 14 $color[v] = \text{GRAY}$ 15 $d[v] = d[u] + 1$ 16 $\pi[v] = u$ 17 **ENQUEUE**(*Q*, *v*) 18 $color[u] = \text{Black}$
- Initially, *s* is set as 'discovered': enqueued, *grav* All other vertices are 'undiscovered' (*white*)
- \blacksquare Each iteration:
	- ▶ Dequeues a vertex *u* and tries to 'discover' (enqueue; mark as *gray*) all its adjacent vertices which are 'undiscovered'
	- \triangleright Whenever we discover a vertex *v*, we add the edge (u, v) to the BFS-tree (called a *tree edge*)
	- ▶ After this, we finished visiting *u* and mark *u* as *black*.

BFS (*G* , *s*)

 $Q = \{5,6\}$

BFS (*G* , *s*)

 $Q = \{12\}$

BFS(*G*, *s*)

for each vertex $u \in V(G) \setminus \{s\}$ $color[u] =$ WHITE $d[u] = \infty$
4 $\pi[u] = \infty$ $\pi[u] = \text{NIL}$ $5 \quad color[s] = \text{GRAY}$ 6 $d[s] = 0$ $7 \quad \pi[s] = \text{NIL}$ 8 *Q* = ∅ **ENQUEUE**(*Q*, *s*) **while** $Q \neq \emptyset$ $u = \text{Decou}(\mathbf{Q})$ **for** each $v \in Adj[u]$ **if** $color[v] =$ white $color[v] = \text{GRAY}$ $d[v] = d[u] + 1$ $\pi[v] = u$ **ENQUEUE**(*Q*, *v*) $color[u] = \text{Black}$

 \blacksquare We enqueue a vertex only if it is white, and we immediately color it gray; thus, we enqueue every vertex *at most once*

BFS(*G*, *s*)

for each vertex $u \in V(G) \setminus \{s\}$ $color[u] =$ WHITE $d[u] = \infty$
4 $\pi[u] = \infty$ $\pi[u] = \text{NIL}$ $color[s] =$ GRAY 6 $d[s] = 0$ $7 \quad \pi[s] = \text{NIL}$ 8 *Q* = ∅ **ENQUEUE**(*Q*, *s*) **while** $Q \neq \emptyset$ $u = \text{Decou}(\mathbf{Q})$ **for** each $v \in Adj[u]$ **if** $color[v] =$ white $color[v] = \text{GRAY}$ $d[v] = d[u] + 1$ $\pi[v] = u$ **ENQUEUE**(*Q*, *v*) $color[u] = \text{Black}$

- \blacksquare We enqueue a vertex only if it is white, and we immediately color it gray; thus, we enqueue every vertex *at most once*
- This means that we also dequeue every vertex *at most once*
- So, the (dequeue) while loop executes $O(|V|)$ times

BFS(*G*, *s*)

for each vertex $u \in V(G) \setminus \{s\}$ $color[u] =$ WHITE $d[u] = \infty$
4 $\pi[u] = \infty$ $\pi[u] = \text{NIL}$ $color[s] =$ GRAY 6 $d[s] = 0$ π [[]s] = NIL 8 *Q* = ∅ **ENQUEUE**(*Q*, *s*) **while** $Q \neq \emptyset$ $u = \text{Decou}(\mathbf{Q})$ **for** each $v \in Adj[u]$ **if** $color[v] =$ white $color[v] = \text{GRAY}$ $d[v] = d[u] + 1$ $\pi[v] = u$ **ENQUEUE**(*Q*, *v*) $color[u] = \text{Black}$

- \blacksquare We enqueue a vertex only if it is white, and we immediately color it gray; thus, we enqueue every vertex *at most once*
- This means that we also dequeue every vertex *at most once*
- So, the (dequeue) while loop executes $O(|V|)$ times
- The inner loop: For each vertex *u*, the inner loop executes for no more than out-deg(*u*) times, for a total of $\sum_{u \in V}$ out-deg $(u) =$
Complexity of BFS

BFS(*G*, *s*)

for each vertex $u \in V(G) \setminus \{s\}$ $color[u] =$ WHITE $d[u] = \infty$
4 $\pi[u] = \infty$ $\pi[u] = \text{NIL}$ $5 \quad color[s] = \text{GRAY}$ 6 $d[s] = 0$ π [[]s] = NIL 8 *Q* = ∅ **ENQUEUE**(*Q*, *s*) **while** $Q \neq \emptyset$ $u = \text{Decou}(\mathbf{Q})$ **for** each $v \in Adj[u]$ **if** $color[v] =$ white $color[v] = \text{GRAY}$ $d[v] = d[u] + 1$ $\pi[v] = u$ **ENQUEUE**(*Q*, *v*) $color[u] = \text{Black}$

- \blacksquare We enqueue a vertex only if it is white, and we immediately color it gray; thus, we enqueue every vertex *at most once*
- This means that we also dequeue every vertex *at most once*
- So, the (dequeue) while loop executes $O(|V|)$ times
- The inner loop: For each vertex *u*, the inner loop executes for no more than out-deg(*u*) times, for a total of $\sum_{u \in V}$ out-deg $(u) = |E|$ times

Complexity of BFS

BFS(*G*, *s*)

for each vertex $u \in V(G) \setminus \{s\}$ $color[u] =$ WHITE $d[u] = \infty$
4 $\pi[u] = \infty$ $\pi[u] = \text{NIL}$ $5 \quad color[s] = \text{GRAY}$ 6 $d[s] = 0$ π [[]s] = NIL 8 *Q* = ∅ **ENQUEUE**(*Q*, *s*) **while** $Q \neq \emptyset$ $u = \text{Decou}(\mathbf{Q})$ **for** each $v \in Adj[u]$ **if** $color[v] =$ white $color[v] = \text{GRAY}$ $d[v] = d[u] + 1$ $\pi[v] = u$ **ENQUEUE**(*Q*, *v*) $color[u] = \text{Black}$

- \blacksquare We enqueue a vertex only if it is white, and we immediately color it gray; thus, we enqueue every vertex *at most once*
- This means that we also dequeue every vertex *at most once*
- So, the (dequeue) while loop executes $O(|V|)$ times
- The inner loop: For each vertex *u*, the inner loop executes for no more than out-deg(*u*) times, for a total of $\sum_{u \in V}$ out-deg $(u) = |E|$ times
- So, $O(|V| + |E|)$ (because $|E|$ may be less than $|V|$)

Claim

Let $\delta(s, v)$ be the minimum numbers of edges of any path from *s* to *v*. Then, we claim that $d[v] = \delta(s, v).$

Claim

Let $\delta(s, y)$ be the minimum numbers of edges of any path from s to v. Then, we claim that $d[v] = \delta(s, v)$.

Reason:

- **First, we observe that, before a vertex with distance** $k + 1$ **is visited, all vertices with** distance ≤ *k* have been visited
	- ▶ At the beginning, there is only one vertex *s* with distance \leq 0, and *s* is the first vertex visited. When visiting *s*, we discover all vertices with distance ≤ 1
	- ▶ When visiting vertices with distance 1, we discover all vertices with distance ≤ 2
	- ▶ ... (The predecessor of every vertex with distance *k* must be a vertex with distance *k* − 1)

Claim

Let $\delta(s, y)$ be the minimum numbers of edges of any path from s to v. Then, we claim that $d[v] = \delta(s, v)$.

Reason:

- **First, we observe that, before a vertex with distance** $k + 1$ **is visited, all vertices with** distance ≤ *k* have been visited
	- ▶ At the beginning, there is only one vertex *s* with distance \leq 0, and *s* is the first vertex visited. When visiting *s*, we discover all vertices with distance ≤ 1
	- ▶ When visiting vertices with distance 1, we discover all vertices with distance ≤ 2
	- ▶ ... (The predecessor of every vertex with distance *k* must be a vertex with distance *k* − 1)
- **For contradiction, suppose the claim is not true, and consider the first vertex** *v* **visited by** BFS s.t. $\delta(s, v) \neq d[v]$
- Assume *v* is discovered when visiting *u*. We have $d[v] = d[u] + 1$.
- Since $\delta(s, v) \leq d[v]$, we have that $\delta(s, v) < d[v]$.

Claim

Let $\delta(s, y)$ be the minimum numbers of edges of any path from s to v. Then, we claim that $d[v] = \delta(s, v)$.

Reason:

- **First, we observe that, before a vertex with distance** $k + 1$ **is visited, all vertices with** distance ≤ *k* have been visited
	- ▶ At the beginning, there is only one vertex *s* with distance \leq 0, and *s* is the first vertex visited. When visiting *s*, we discover all vertices with distance ≤ 1
	- ▶ When visiting vertices with distance 1, we discover all vertices with distance ≤ 2
	- ▶ ... (The predecessor of every vertex with distance *k* must be a vertex with distance *k* − 1)
- **F** For contradiction, suppose the claim is not true, and consider the first vertex *v* visited by BFS s.t. $\delta(s, v) \neq d[v]$
- Assume *v* is discovered when visiting *u*. We have $d[v] = d[u] + 1$.
- Since $\delta(s, v) \leq d[v]$, we have that $\delta(s, v) < d[v]$.
- Let *w* be the predecessor of *v* on a shortest path from *s* to *v*. We have $\delta(s, w) = \delta(s, v) 1$. So $\delta(s, w) < d[v] - 1 = d[u] = \delta(s, u)$.
- This means that *w* must be visited before *u*, and when we visit *w*, we must have marked *v* as gray. This contradicts the fact that when we visit *u*, the color of *v* is still white.

Here we prove that the underlying undirected graph is an (undirected) tree

Consider only vertices connected to *s* (i.e., in the connected component containing *s*), and let the number of vertices connected to *s* be n_0

- Consider only vertices connected to *s* (i.e., in the connected component containing *s*), and let the number of vertices connected to *s* be n_0
- The number of tree edges:

- Consider only vertices connected to *s* (i.e., in the connected component containing *s*), and let the number of vertices connected to *s* be n_0
- The number of tree edges: $n_0 1$

- Consider only vertices connected to *s* (i.e., in the connected component containing *s*), and let the number of vertices connected to s be n_0
- **■** The number of tree edges: $n_0 1$
- \blacksquare The underlying undirected graph formed by these vertices and edges is definitely connected (because we are only attaching an edge to the partial graph we are building)

- Consider only vertices connected to *s* (i.e., in the connected component containing *s*), and let the number of vertices connected to s be n_0
- **■** The number of tree edges: $n_0 1$
- The underlying undirected graph formed by these vertices and edges is definitely connected (because we are only attaching an edge to the partial graph we are building)
- Previous fact: A connected, undirected graph with *n* vertices and *n*−1 edges is a tree

Dijkstra's Algorithm

- Assumes all edges have *non-negative* weights
- **A** *greedy* algorithm

Dijkstra's Algorithm

DIJKSTRA(*G*, *s*, *w*)

- 1 $N = \emptyset$
- 2 **for** each vertex $v \in V(G)$
- 3 $D[v] = \infty$ 4 $P[V] = NIL$
- 5 $D[s] = 0$
- 6 while $N \neq V(G)$
- 7 find $u \notin N$ such that $D[u]$ is minimal
- 8 $N = N \cup \{u\}$

9 **for all**
$$
v \in Adj(u) \setminus N
$$

- 10 **if** $D[u] + w(u, v) < D[v]$ 11 $D[v] = D[u] + w(u, v)$
- 12 $P[v] = u$

(all algorithms for S-S have the same *initialization* and *relaxation* process)

- Grows a shortest-path tree from *s*
	- ▶ *N*: vertices in the (partial) shortest path tree
	- \blacktriangleright *P*[*v*]: parent of *v* in the (partial) shortest path tree (also the vertex preceding *v* on the shortest path from *s*)
- Maintains an 'estimate' of the distance to *v*
	- ▶ *D*[*v*]: weight of the shortest path from *s* to *v* where all edges other than the last is from the partial tree
- \blacksquare In each step, makes a greedy choice by adding to the tree a vertex *u* with minimum value of *D*
- After adding *u* to the tree, updates *D*[*v*] for the neighbors of *u* outside the tree if needed (*relaxation*)
- Stops when the tree spans the graph

Dijkstra's Algorithm: Complexity

DIJKSTRA(*G*, *s*, *w*)

■ Use a heap *H* for storing *D*

- ▶ Line 7: EXTRACT-MIN from *H*
- ▶ Line 11: UPDATE-KEY in *H*

Time complexity: $O(|E|\log |V|)$

Some facts:

- **■** If there is no path from *s* to a *v*, then $D[v] = \infty$ at all time in the algorithm:
	- ▶ Observe the following: whenever *D*[*v*] < ∞, it always corresponds to a path from *s* to *v*
- \bullet *δ*(*s*, *v*) \leq *D*[*v*] for all *v*
	- ▶ Again, whenever *D*[*v*] < ∞, it always corresponds to a path from *s* to *v*

Loop variant:

At the start of each iteration of the **while** loop, $D[v] = \delta(s, v)$ for each $v \in N$

Loop variant:

At the start of each iteration of the **while** loop, $D[v] = \delta(s, v)$ for each $v \in N$

- \blacksquare Initially, $N = \emptyset$ and this is trivially true
- \blacksquare We only need to show that the invariant is true for all the following iterations

Loop variant:

At the start of each iteration of the **while** loop, $D[v] = \delta(s, v)$ for each $v \in N$

- \blacksquare Initially, $N = \emptyset$ and this is trivially true
- \blacksquare We only need to show that the invariant is true for all the following iterations
- For contradiction, let *u* be the first vertex for which $D[u] \neq \delta(s, u)$ when it is added to N
	- ▶ We must have *u* \neq *s* because *s* is the first vertex added to *N* and δ (*s*, *s*) = *D*[*s*] = 0; we also have that $N \neq \emptyset$ before *u* is added to *N*

Loop variant:

At the start of each iteration of the **while** loop, $D[v] = \delta(s, v)$ for each $v \in N$

- \blacksquare Initially, $N = \emptyset$ and this is trivially true
- \blacksquare We only need to show that the invariant is true for all the following iterations
- For contradiction, let *u* be the first vertex for which $D[u] \neq \delta(s, u)$ when it is added to N
	- ▶ We must have *u* \neq *s* because *s* is the first vertex added to *N* and δ (*s*, *s*) = *D*[*s*] = 0; we also have that $N \neq \emptyset$ before *u* is added to *N*
- Since $D[u] \neq \delta(s, u)$, there must be a path from *s* to *u*, because otherwise $D[u] = \infty$ for always (previous facts) and $D[u] = \delta(s, u) = \infty$

Loop variant:

At the start of each iteration of the **while** loop, $D[v] = \delta(s, v)$ for each $v \in N$

- \blacksquare Initially, $N = \emptyset$ and this is trivially true
- \blacksquare We only need to show that the invariant is true for all the following iterations
- For contradiction, let *u* be the first vertex for which $D[u] \neq \delta(s, u)$ when it is added to N
	- ▶ We must have $u \neq s$ because *s* is the first vertex added to *N* and $\delta(s, s) = D[s] = 0$; we also have that $N \neq \emptyset$ before *u* is added to *N*
- Since $D[u] \neq \delta(s, u)$, there must be a path from *s* to *u*, because otherwise $D[u] = \infty$ for always (previous facts) and $D[u] = \delta(s, u) = \infty$
- Let *p* be the shortest path from *s* to *u*
- Consider the *N* before adding *u*: Since the start of *p* is *s* ∈ *N* and the end of *p* is *u* < *N*, we can let *y* be the first vertex along *p* such that $y \notin N$, and let *x* be predecessor of *y* along *p* (*x* ∈ *N*).

(Figure from CLRS)

(Figure from CLRS)

Because *u* is the first vertex added to *N* for which $D[u] \neq \delta(s, u)$, we have $D[x] = \delta(s, x)$ when *x* was added

(Figure from CLRS)

- Because *u* is the first vertex added to *N* for which $D[u] \neq \delta(s, u)$, we have $D[x] = \delta(s, x)$ when *x* was added
- From the path *p*, we know that $\delta(s, y) = \delta(s, x) + w(x, y)$. So when *x* was added to *N*, $D[y] = \delta(s, y)$ after the update in Line 9-11

(Figure from CLRS)

- Because *u* is the first vertex added to *N* for which $D[u] \neq \delta(s, u)$, we have $D[x] = \delta(s, x)$ when *x* was added
- From the path *p*, we know that $\delta(s, y) = \delta(s, x) + w(x, y)$. So when *x* was added to *N*, $D[y] = \delta(s, y)$ after the update in Line 9-11
- **F** From the path *p*, we know that $\delta(s, y) \leq \delta(s, u)$. So

 $D[y] = \delta(s, y) \leq \delta(s, u) \leq D[u]$

(Figure from CLRS)

- Because *u* is the first vertex added to *N* for which $D[u] \neq \delta(s, u)$, we have $D[x] = \delta(s, x)$ when *x* was added
- From the path *p*, we know that $\delta(s, y) = \delta(s, x) + w(x, y)$. So when *x* was added to *N*, $D[y] = \delta(s, y)$ after the update in Line 9-11
- **F** From the path *p*, we know that $\delta(s, y) \leq \delta(s, u)$. So

$$
D[y] = \delta(s, y) \leq \delta(s, u) \leq D[u]
$$

Because both *u* and *y* were not in *N* when *u* was chosen in Line 7, we have $D[u] \le D[y]$. So the above become equalities

$$
D[y] = \delta(s, y) = \delta(s, u) = D[u]
$$

A contradiction!

Bellman-Ford algorithm

- The *most general-purpose* algorithm for computing single-source shortest paths: allows *negative weights* on edges, and works for *any* graphs
- **Returns a** *boolean* value indicating whether or not there is a negative-weight cycle that is reachable from the source
	- ▶ If there is such a cycle, the algorithm indicates that *no solution* exists.
	- \triangleright If there is no such cycle, the algorithm produces the shortest paths and their weights.
- \blacksquare The idea of the algorithm is simple, after the initialization (common to all S-S shortest path algorithms), it has |*V*| − 1 *rounds*, where each round *relaxes all the edges*

Bellman-Ford algorithm

RELAX(*u*, *v*) 1 **if** $D[u] + w(u, v) < D[v]$ 2 $D[v] = D[u] + w(u, v)$ $P[v] = u$

Time complexity: $O(|V| \times |E|)$

 (e)

(Example from CLRS)

Proposition 1

We always have $D[v] \ge \delta(s, v)$ in the algorithm. Furthermore, after $D[v] = \delta(s, v)$, $D[v]$ does not change no matter what relaxations we perform in the algorithm.

- We have seen the argument for $D[v] \ge \delta(s, v)$ before, i.e., $D[v]$ always corresponds to the weight of an actual path from *s* to *v* (or else $D[v] = \infty$), and so it cannot be less than the optimal one, *δ*(*s*, *v*).
- For the second part, notice that a relaxation always decreases $D[x]$ for a vertex *x*. If we already have $D[v] = \delta(s, v)$, then $D[v]$ cannot be further decreased because $D[v] \geq \delta(s, v)$.

Path-relaxation property

Let $p = \langle v_0 = s, v_1, \ldots, v_k \rangle$ be a shortest path from *s* to v_k . After relaxing the edges in the order $(v_0, v_1), (v_1, v_2), \ldots, (v_{k-1}, v_k)$, we have $D[v_k] = \delta(s, v_k)$. This property holds even if there are relaxations of other edges intermixed with relaxations of the edges on *p*.

Path-relaxation property

Let $p = \langle v_0 = s, v_1, \ldots, v_k \rangle$ be a shortest path from *s* to v_k . After relaxing the edges in the order $(v_0, v_1), (v_1, v_2), \ldots, (v_{k-1}, v_k)$, we have $D[v_k] = \delta(s, v_k)$. This property holds even if there are relaxations of other edges intermixed with relaxations of the edges on *p*.

Proof:

We prove by induction that, for each *i*, before relaxing $(\nu_i,\nu_{i+1}),$ we have $D[\nu_i]=\mathcal{S}(s,\nu_i),$ and after the relaxation, we have $D[v_{i+1}] = \delta(s, v_{i+1})$.

Path-relaxation property

Let $p = \langle v_0 = s, v_1, \ldots, v_k \rangle$ be a shortest path from *s* to v_k . After relaxing the edges in the order $(v_0, v_1), (v_1, v_2), \ldots, (v_{k-1}, v_k)$, we have $D[v_k] = \delta(s, v_k)$. This property holds even if there are relaxations of other edges intermixed with relaxations of the edges on *p*.

- We prove by induction that, for each *i*, before relaxing $(\nu_i,\nu_{i+1}),$ we have $D[\nu_i]=\mathcal{S}(s,\nu_i),$ and after the relaxation, we have $D[v_{i+1}] = \delta(s, v_{i+1})$.
- Unlike other proofs by inductions, we prove the **induction step** first.
- Assume for $i-1,$ the claim is true. We have that after relaxing $(v_{i-1},v_i),$ $D[v_i]=\mathcal{S}(s,v_i)$ (inductive assumption).
- After that, no matter what relaxations we perform, we always have $D[v_i] = \mathcal{S}(s, v_i)$ (Proposition 1).

Path-relaxation property

Let $p = \langle v_0 = s, v_1, \ldots, v_k \rangle$ be a shortest path from *s* to v_k . After relaxing the edges in the order $(v_0, v_1), (v_1, v_2), \ldots, (v_{k-1}, v_k)$, we have $D[v_k] = \delta(s, v_k)$. This property holds even if there are relaxations of other edges intermixed with relaxations of the edges on *p*.

- We prove by induction that, for each *i*, before relaxing $(\nu_i,\nu_{i+1}),$ we have $D[\nu_i]=\mathcal{S}(s,\nu_i),$ and after the relaxation, we have $D[v_{i+1}] = \delta(s, v_{i+1})$.
- Unlike other proofs by inductions, we prove the **induction step** first.
- Assume for $i-1,$ the claim is true. We have that after relaxing $(v_{i-1},v_i),$ $D[v_i]=\mathcal{S}(s,v_i)$ (inductive assumption).
- After that, no matter what relaxations we perform, we always have $D[v_i] = \mathcal{S}(s, v_i)$ (Proposition 1).
- Then, before relaxing $(v_i, v_{i+1}),$ we have $\mathit{D}[v_i] = \mathcal{S}(\mathsf{s}, v_i)$ (first part is true)

Path-relaxation property

Let $p = \langle v_0 = s, v_1, \ldots, v_k \rangle$ be a shortest path from *s* to v_k . After relaxing the edges in the order $(v_0, v_1), (v_1, v_2), \ldots, (v_{k-1}, v_k)$, we have $D[v_k] = \delta(s, v_k)$. This property holds even if there are relaxations of other edges intermixed with relaxations of the edges on *p*.

- We prove by induction that, for each *i*, before relaxing $(\nu_i,\nu_{i+1}),$ we have $D[\nu_i]=\mathcal{S}(s,\nu_i),$ and after the relaxation, we have $D[v_{i+1}] = \delta(s, v_{i+1})$.
- Unlike other proofs by inductions, we prove the **induction step** first.
- Assume for $i-1,$ the claim is true. We have that after relaxing $(v_{i-1},v_i),$ $D[v_i]=\mathcal{S}(s,v_i)$ (inductive assumption).
- After that, no matter what relaxations we perform, we always have $D[v_i] = \mathcal{S}(s, v_i)$ (Proposition 1).
- Then, before relaxing $(v_i, v_{i+1}),$ we have $\mathit{D}[v_i] = \mathcal{S}(\mathsf{s}, v_i)$ (first part is true)
- When relaxing $(v_i, v_{i+1}),$ if $D[v_{i+1}] = \delta(s, v_{i+1})$ already, then we have nothing to prove.

Path-relaxation property

Let $p = \langle v_0 = s, v_1, \ldots, v_k \rangle$ be a shortest path from *s* to v_k . After relaxing the edges in the order $(v_0, v_1), (v_1, v_2), \ldots, (v_{k-1}, v_k)$, we have $D[v_k] = \delta(s, v_k)$. This property holds even if there are relaxations of other edges intermixed with relaxations of the edges on *p*.

- We prove by induction that, for each *i*, before relaxing $(\nu_i,\nu_{i+1}),$ we have $D[\nu_i]=\mathcal{S}(s,\nu_i),$ and after the relaxation, we have $D[v_{i+1}] = \delta(s, v_{i+1})$.
- Unlike other proofs by inductions, we prove the **induction step** first.
- Assume for $i-1,$ the claim is true. We have that after relaxing $(v_{i-1},v_i),$ $D[v_i]=\mathcal{S}(s,v_i)$ (inductive assumption).
- After that, no matter what relaxations we perform, we always have $D[v_i] = \mathcal{S}(s, v_i)$ (Proposition 1).
- Then, before relaxing $(v_i, v_{i+1}),$ we have $\mathit{D}[v_i] = \mathcal{S}(\mathsf{s}, v_i)$ (first part is true)
- When relaxing $(v_i, v_{i+1}),$ if $D[v_{i+1}] = \delta(s, v_{i+1})$ already, then we have nothing to prove.
- **If** $D[v_{i+1}] > \delta(s, v_{i+1})$, then $D[v_{i+1}] > \delta({\sf s},v_{i+1}) = \delta({\sf s},v_i) + w(v_i,v_{i+1}) = D[v_i] + w(v_i,v_{i+1}),$ so $D[v_{i+1}]$ must be α updated to $D[v_i] + w(v_i, v_{i+1}) = \delta(s, v_{i+1})$ by the relaxation.

Path-relaxation property

Let $p = \langle v_0 = s, v_1, \ldots, v_k \rangle$ be a shortest path from *s* to v_k . After relaxing the edges in the order $(v_0, v_1), (v_1, v_2), \ldots, (v_{k-1}, v_k)$, we have $d[v_k] = \delta(s, v_k)$. This property holds even if there are relaxations of other edges intermixed with relaxations of the edges on *p*.

- For the **base case**, we first have that $D[v_0] = 0$ always for $v_0 = s$.
- \blacksquare The verification for the rest of the base case is the same as that for the induction step.

The two lemmas combined indicate that Bellman-Ford is correct:

Lemma 1

If *G* contains no negative-weight cycles reachable from *s*, then the algorithm returns TRUE, and we have $D[v] = \delta(s, v)$ for every vertex $v \in V$.

Lemma 2

If *G* contains a negative-weight cycle reachable from *s*, then the algorithm returns FALSE.

Lemma 1

If *G* contains no negative-weight cycles reachable from *s*, then the algorithm returns TRUE, and we have $D[V] = \delta(s, v)$ for every vertex $v \in V$.

Lemma 1

If *G* contains no negative-weight cycles reachable from *s*, then the algorithm returns TRUE, and we have $D[v] = \delta(s, v)$ for every vertex $v \in V$.

Proof:

- **If** a vertex *v* is reachable from *s*, then let $p = \langle u_0 = s, u_1, \ldots, u_k = v \rangle$ be a shortest path from *s* to *v*.
- **■** Since *p* contains no cycle, then the number of vertices on the path is $k + 1 \leq |V|$ (i.e, k ≤ |*V*| − 1).
- So we have
	- \blacktriangleright The first round (*i* = 1) relaxes (u_0, u_1)
	- \blacktriangleright The second round (*i* = 2) relaxes (*u*₁, *u*₂)
	- ▶ ...
	- ▶ The *k*-th round ($i = k ≤ |V| 1$) relaxes (u_{k-1}, u_k)

After the relaxations, $D[v] = \delta(s, v)$ (by Path-relaxation property)

Lemma 1

If *G* contains no negative-weight cycles reachable from *s*, then the algorithm returns TRUE, and we have $D[v] = \delta(s, v)$ for every vertex $v \in V$.

Proof:

- **If** a vertex *v* is reachable from *s*, then let $p = \langle u_0 = s, u_1, \ldots, u_k = v \rangle$ be a shortest path from *s* to *v*.
- Since *p* contains no cycle, then the number of vertices on the path is $k + 1 \leq |V|$ (i.e, k ≤ |*V*| − 1).
- So we have
	- \blacktriangleright The first round (*i* = 1) relaxes (u_0, u_1)
	- \blacktriangleright The second round (*i* = 2) relaxes (*u*₁, *u*₂)
	- ▶ ...
	- ▶ The *k*-th round ($i = k ≤ |V| 1$) relaxes (u_{k-1}, u_k)

After the relaxations, $D[v] = \delta(s, v)$ (by Path-relaxation property)

■ If a vertex *v* is not reachable from *s*, then we have that $D[v] = ∞ = δ(s, v)$ always.

Lemma 1

If *G* contains no negative-weight cycles reachable from *s*, then the algorithm returns TRUE, and we have $D[v] = \delta(s, v)$ for every vertex $v \in V$.

Proof:

We still need to prove that the algorithm returns TRUE.
Lemma 1

If *G* contains no negative-weight cycles reachable from *s*, then the algorithm returns TRUE, and we have $D[v] = \delta(s, v)$ for every vertex $v \in V$.

Proof:

■ We still need to prove that the algorithm returns TRUE.

For each edge (u, v) , we have

$$
D[v] = \delta(s, v) \tag{1}
$$

$$
\leq \delta(s, u) + w(u, v) \tag{2}
$$

$$
= D[u] + w(u, v) \tag{3}
$$

(1)-(2) follows from 'triangle inequality'

Lemma 2

If *G* contains a negative-weight cycle reachable from *s*, then the algorithm returns FALSE.

Lemma 2

If *G* contains a negative-weight cycle reachable from *s*, then the algorithm returns FALSE.

- Let $c = \langle v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_k \rangle$ be a negative-weight cycle reachable from *s* where $v_0 = v_k$.
- We have $\sum_{i=1}^{k} w(v_{i-1}, v_i) < 0$.

Lemma 2

If *G* contains a negative-weight cycle reachable from *s*, then the algorithm returns FALSE.

- Let $c = \langle v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_k \rangle$ be a negative-weight cycle reachable from *s* where $v_0 = v_k$.
- We have $\sum_{i=1}^{k} w(v_{i-1}, v_i) < 0$.
- For contradiction, assume the algorithm returns TRUE.
- T hen, $D[v_i] \leq D[v_{i-1}] + w(v_{i-1}, v_i)$, for $i = 1, ..., k$

Lemma 2

If *G* contains a negative-weight cycle reachable from *s*, then the algorithm returns FALSE.

- Let $c = \langle v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_k \rangle$ be a negative-weight cycle reachable from *s* where $v_0 = v_k$.
- We have $\sum_{i=1}^{k} w(v_{i-1}, v_i) < 0$.
- For contradiction, assume the algorithm returns TRUE.
- T hen, $D[v_i] \leq D[v_{i-1}] + w(v_{i-1}, v_i)$, for $i = 1, ..., k$
- \blacksquare Summing all the above inequalities:

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{k} D[v_i] \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} (D[v_{i-1}] + w(v_{i-1}, v_i))
$$

=
$$
\sum_{i=1}^{k} D[v_{i-1}] + \sum_{i=1}^{k} w(v_{i-1}, v_i)
$$

Lemma 2

If *G* contains a negative-weight cycle reachable from *s*, then the algorithm returns FALSE.

Proof:

- Let $c = \langle v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_k \rangle$ be a negative-weight cycle reachable from *s* where $v_0 = v_k$.
- We have $\sum_{i=1}^{k} w(v_{i-1}, v_i) < 0$.
- For contradiction, assume the algorithm returns TRUE.
- T hen, $D[v_i] \leq D[v_{i-1}] + w(v_{i-1}, v_i)$, for $i = 1, ..., k$
- \blacksquare Summing all the above inequalities:

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{k} D[v_i] \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} (D[v_{i-1}] + w(v_{i-1}, v_i))
$$

=
$$
\sum_{i=1}^{k} D[v_{i-1}] + \sum_{i=1}^{k} w(v_{i-1}, v_i)
$$

Since $v_0 = v_k$, we have $\sum_{i=1}^k D[v_i] = \sum_{i=1}^k D[v_{i-1}]$

Lemma 2

If *G* contains a negative-weight cycle reachable from *s*, then the algorithm returns FALSE.

Proof:

- Let $c = \langle v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_k \rangle$ be a negative-weight cycle reachable from *s* where $v_0 = v_k$.
- We have $\sum_{i=1}^{k} w(v_{i-1}, v_i) < 0$.
- For contradiction, assume the algorithm returns TRUE.
- T hen, $D[v_i] \leq D[v_{i-1}] + w(v_{i-1}, v_i)$, for $i = 1, ..., k$
- \blacksquare Summing all the above inequalities:

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{k} D[v_i] \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} (D[v_{i-1}] + w(v_{i-1}, v_i))
$$

=
$$
\sum_{i=1}^{k} D[v_{i-1}] + \sum_{i=1}^{k} w(v_{i-1}, v_i)
$$

Since $v_0 = v_k$, we have $\sum_{i=1}^k D[v_i] = \sum_{i=1}^k D[v_{i-1}]$

So the inequality becomes $0 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} w(v_{i-1}, v_i)$ (contradiction)

- Assumes the graph is a DAG (directed acyclic graph)
- Edges can have *negative* weights
	- \triangleright Since we are dealing with DAG, no (negative-weight) cycles can exist
- Finding the shortest-path distance for vertices based on the *order of topological sort*

Time complexity: $O(|V| + |E|)$

Proof of correctness

■ Hint: The single-source shortest paths algorithm for DAG can be viewed as a 'smarter' way of doing Bellman-Ford, and therefore you can adjust the justification for Bellman-Ford to show the correctness of the DAG-algorithm.