

Module 5

Graph Algorithms

Dr. Natarajan Meghanathan
Professor of Computer Science
Jackson State University
Jackson, MS 39217
E-mail: natarajan.meghanathan@jsums.edu




Minimum Spanning Trees








Minimum Spanning Tree Problem

- Given a weighted graph, we want to determine a tree that spans all the vertices in the tree and the sum of the weights of all the edges in such a spanning tree should be minimum.
- Kruskal algorithm: Consider edges in the increasing order of their weights and include an edge in the tree, if and only if, by including the edge in the tree, we do not create a cycle!!
 - For a graph of E edges, we spend $\Theta(E \cdot \log E)$ time to sort the edges and this is the most time consuming step of the algorithm.
- To start with, each vertex is in its own component.
- In each iteration, we merge two components using an edge of minimum weight connecting the vertices across the two components.
 - The merged component does not have a cycle and the sum of all the edge weights within a component is the minimum possible.
- To detect a cycle, the vertices within a component are identified by a component ID. If the edge considered for merging two components comprises of end vertices with the same component ID, then the edge is not considered for the merger.
 - An edge is considered for merging two components only if its end vertices are identified with different component IDs.

Property of any MST Algorithm



- Given two components of vertices (that are a tree by themselves of the smallest possible weights), any MST algorithm would choose an edge of the smallest weight that could connect the two components such that the merger of the two components is also a tree and is of the smallest possible weight.






Iteration 5
Min. Spanning Tree


MST
Weight
10







Initialization



Iteration 1



Iteration 2



MST
Weight
39


Proof of Correctness: Kruskal's Algorithm

- Let T be the spanning tree generated by Kruskal's algorithm for a graph G . Let T' be a minimum spanning tree for G . We need to show that both T and T' have the same weight.
- Assume that $wt(T') < wt(T)$.
- Hence, there should be an edge e in T that is not in T' and likewise there should be an edge e' in T' that is not in T . Because, if every edge of T is in T' , then $T = T'$ and $wt(T) = wt(T')$.
- Remove the edge e' that is in T' . This would disconnect the T' to two components. The edge e that was in T and not in T' should be one of the edges (along with e') that cross the two split components of T' .
- Depending on how Kruskal's algorithm works, $wt(e) \leq wt(e')$. Hence, the two components of T' could be merged using edge e (instead of e') and this would only lower the weight of T' from what it was before (and not increase it).
- That is, $wt(\text{modified } T') = wt(T' - \{e'\} \cup \{e\}) \leq wt(T')$.
- We could repeat the above procedure for all edges that are in T' and not in T , and eventually transform T' to T , without increasing the cost of the spanning tree.
- Hence, T is a minimum spanning tree.


Proof of Correctness

Let T be the spanning tree determined using Kruskal's


Let T' be a hypothetical spanning tree that is a MST such that $W(T') < W(T)$



T




T'




$$Wt(e) \leq Wt(e')$$

$Wt(T' - \{e'\} \cup \{e\}) \leq Wt(T')$. Hence, by reducing the edge difference and making T' approach T , we are able to only decrease the weight of T' further, if possible, making T' not a MST to start with, a contradiction.




Candidate edges to merge the two components




Modified $T' = T' - \{e'\} \cup \{e\}$

Properties of Minimum Spanning Tree


- **Property 1:** If a graph does not have unique edge weights, there could be more than one minimum spanning tree for the graph.
- **Proof (by Example)**



Graph



One Min. Spanning Tree



Another Min. Spanning Tree


- **Property 2:** If all the edges in a weighted graph have unique weights, then there can be only one minimum spanning tree of the graph.
- **Proof:** Consider a graph G whose edges are of distinct weights. Assume there are two different spanning trees T and T' , both are of minimum weight; but have at least one edge difference. Let e' be an edge in T' that is not in T . Removing e' from T' will split the latter into two components. There should be an edge e that is not part of T' but part of T and should also be a candidate edge to connect the two components of the split T' .

Properties of Minimum Spanning Tree

- **Property 2:** If all the edges in a weighted graph have unique weights, then there can be only one minimum spanning tree of the graph.
- **Proof (continued..):** If $wt(e) < wt(e')$, then we could merge the two components of T' using e and this would lower the weight of T' from what it was before. Hence, $wt(e) \geq wt(e')$.
- However, since the graph has unique edge weights, $wt(e) > wt(e')$. But, if this is the case, then we could indeed remove e from T and have e' to merge the two components of T resulting from the removal of e . This would only lower the weight of T from what it was before.
- So, if T and T' have to be two different MSTs $\rightarrow wt(e) = wt(e')$.
 - This is a contradiction to the given statement that the graph has unique edge weights.
- Not $(wt(e) = wt(e')) \rightarrow$ Not (T and T' have to be two different MSTs)
- That is, $wt(e) \neq wt(e') \rightarrow T$ and T' have to be the same MST.
- Hence, if a graph has unique edge weights, there can be only one MST for the graph.

Property 2

Assume that both T and T' are MSTs, but different MSTs to start with.




$W(e) < W(e') \Rightarrow T'$ is not a MST

$W(e) > W(e') \Rightarrow T$ is not a MST

Hence, for both T and T' to be two different MSTs $\rightarrow W(e) = W(e')$.

But the graph has unique edge weights.



$W(e) \neq W(e) \rightarrow$ Both T and T' have to be the same.




**Candidate edges to merge
the two components**

Maximum Spanning Tree


- A Maximum Spanning Tree is a spanning tree such that the sum of its edge weights is the maximum.
- We can find a Maximum Spanning Tree through any one of the following ways:
 - Straightforward approach: Run Kruskal's algorithm by selecting edges in the decreasing order of edge weights (i.e., edge with the largest weight is chosen first) as long as the end vertices of an edge are in two different components
 - Alternate approach (Example for Transform and Conquer): Given a weighted graph, set all the edge weights to be negative, run a minimum spanning tree algorithm on the negative weight graph, then turn all the edge weights to positive on the minimum spanning tree to get a maximum spanning tree.




Initialization




Iteration 1




Iteration 2




Iteration 3



Iteration 4



Iteration 5



Iteration 6: Max. Sp Tree

MST
Weight
59

Practice Proofs

- Similar to the proof of correctness that we saw for the Minimum Spanning Trees, write the proof of correctness for the Kruskal's algorithm to find Maximum Spanning Trees.
- Prove the following property: If all the edges in a weighted graph have unique weights, then there can be only one maximum spanning tree of the graph.

Dijkstra's Shortest Path Algorithm

Shortest Path (Min. Wt. Path) Problem

- Path p of length k from a vertex s to a vertex d is a sequence $(v_0, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k)$ of vertices such that $v_0 = s$ and $v_k = d$ and $(v_{i-1}, v_i) \in E$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$

- Weight of a path $p = (v_0, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k)$ is $w(p) = \sum_{i=1}^k w(v_{i-1}, v_i)$

- The weight of a shortest path from s to d is given by
$$\delta(s, d) = \begin{cases} \min \{w(p) : s \xrightarrow{p} d \text{ if there is a path from } s \text{ to } d\} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

:


Dijkstra Algorithm

- **Assumption:** $w(u, v) > 0$ for each edge $(u, v) \in E$ (i.e., the edge weights are positive)
- **Objective:** Given $G = (V, E, w)$, find the shortest weight path between a given source s and destination d
- **Principle:** Greedy strategy
- Maintain a minimum weight path estimate $d[v]$ from s to each other vertex v .
- At each step, pick the vertex that has the smallest minimum weight path estimate
- **Output:** After running this algorithm for $|V|$ iterations, we get the shortest weight path from s to all other vertices in G
- **Time Complexity:** Dijkstra algorithm – $\Theta(|E| \log |V|)$

Dr. Meg's YouTube Video Explanation:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V8VxK1cr0x0>

Principle of Dijkstra Algorithm



Relaxation Condition

If $W_{s-v} > W_{s-u} + W(u, v)$ then

$$W_{s-v} = W_{s-u} + W(u, v)$$



$$\text{Predecessor}(v) = u$$

else



Retain the current path from s to v

Principle in a nutshell


During the beginning of each iteration we will pick a vertex u that has the minimum weight path to s . We will then explore the neighbors of u for which we have not yet found a minimum weight path. We will try to see if by going through u , we can reduce the weight of path from s to v , where v is a neighbor of u .




Instead of using the current route from s to v , we will go through u to reach v from s




We will stay with the current route we know from s to v .




Given Graph, Initialization




Iteration 1




Iteration 2



Iteration 3




Iteration 4









Iteration 5


**Dijkstra Algorithm
Example 1**

Shortest Path Tree





Dijkstra Algorithm Example 2



Dijkstra Algorithm

Begin Algorithm *Dijkstra* (G, s)

1 **For** each vertex $v \in V$

2 $d[v] \leftarrow \infty$ // an estimate of the min-weight path from s to v

3 **End For**

4 $d[s] \leftarrow 0$

5 $S \leftarrow \Phi$ // set of nodes for which we know the min-weight path from s

6 $Q \leftarrow V$ // set of nodes for which we know estimate of min-weight path from s

7 **While** $Q \neq \Phi$

8 $u \leftarrow \text{EXTRACT-MIN}(Q)$

9 $S \leftarrow S \cup \{u\}$

10 **For** each vertex v such that $(u, v) \in E$

11 **If** $v \in Q$ and $d[v] > d[u] + w(u, v)$ then

12 $d[v] \leftarrow d[u] + w(u, v)$

13 Predecessor(v) = u

13 **End If**

14 **End For**

15 **End While**

16 **End** *Dijkstra*

Dijkstra Algorithm: Time Complexity

Begin Algorithm *Dijkstra* (G, s)

```

1  For each vertex  $v \in V$ 
2       $d[v] \leftarrow \infty$  // an estimate of the min-weight path from  $s$  to  $v$ 
3  End For
4   $d[s] \leftarrow 0$ 
5   $S \leftarrow \Phi$  // set of nodes for which we know the min-weight path from  $s$ 
6   $Q \leftarrow V$  // set of nodes for which we know estimate of min-weight path from  $s$ 
7  While  $Q \neq \Phi$  done  $|V|$  times =  $\Theta(V)$  time
8       $u \leftarrow \text{EXTRACT-MIN}(Q)$  done Each extraction takes  $\Theta(\log V)$  time
9       $S \leftarrow S \cup \{u\}$ 
10     For each vertex  $v$  such that  $(u, v) \in E$  done  $\Theta(E)$  times totally
11         If  $v \in Q$  and  $d[v] > d[u] + w(u, v)$  then
12              $d[v] \leftarrow d[u] + w(u, v)$ 
13             Predecessor( $v$ ) =  $u$ 
14         End If
15     End For
16 End While
17 End Dijkstra








```

$\Theta(V)$ time

$\Theta(V \log V)$ time to Construct a Min-heap

It takes $\Theta(\log V)$ time when done once


Overall Complexity: $\Theta(V) + \Theta(V \log V) + \Theta(V \log V) + \Theta(E \log V)$
 Since the $|E| \geq |V| - 1$, the $V \log V$ term is dominated by the $E \log V$ term. Hence, overall complexity = $\Theta(|E| \cdot \log |V|)$



Dijkstra Algorithm Example 3

Theorems on Shortest Paths and Dijkstra Algorithm

- **Theorem 1:** Sub path of a shortest path is also shortest.
- **Proof:** Lets say there is a shortest path from s to d through the vertices $s - a - b - c - d$.
- Then, the shortest path from a to c is also $a - b - c$.
- If there is a path of lower weight than the weight of the path from $a - b - c$, then we could have gone from s to d through this alternate path from a to c of lower weight than $a - b - c$.
- However, if we do that, then the weight of the path $s - a - b - c - d$ is not the lowest and there exists an alternate path of lower weight.
- This contradicts our assumption that $s - a - b - c - d$ is the shortest (lowest weight) path.



Assume: $s - a - b - c - d$ is a shortest path of weight $5 + 3 + 2 + 4 = 14$.


Then, $a - b - c$ is also a shortest path of weight $3 + 2 = 5$. If there exists an a path Between a and c of weight less than 5, then $s - a - b - c - d$ is not a shortest path (a contradiction).

Theorems on Shortest Paths and Dijkstra Algorithm

- **Theorem 2**: The weights of the vertices that are optimized are in the non-decreasing (i.e., typically increasing) order.
- **Proof**: We want to prove that if a vertex u is optimized in an earlier iteration (say iteration i), then the weight of the vertex v optimized at a later iteration (say iteration j ; $i < j$) is always greater than or equal to that of vertex u .
- Given that vertex u was picked (for optimization) instead of vertex v at the beginning of the i th iteration: $\text{weight}_i(v) \geq \text{weight}_i(u)$.
- We need to explore whether vertex v could have been relaxed by any of its neighbors in a later iteration (say j : $i < j$) such that $\text{weight}_i(v)$ could become less than $\text{weight}_i(u)$.
 - Note that if any such neighbor x exists for v , $\text{weight}_i(x) \geq \text{weight}_i(u)$. That is, vertex x is not optimized until the end of iteration i . Since all edge weights are positive, if the neighbors of vertex x are relaxed in a later iteration (say, iteration $j > i$), $\text{weight}_j(v) \geq \text{weight}_i(x) \geq \text{weight}_i(u)$.
- Hence, the weights of the vertices that are optimized are in the non-decreasing (i.e., typically increasing) order.

Proof for Theorem 2

Scenario: Vertex v is a neighbor of Vertex u through which it is 'relaxed'




Iteration i

$$\text{Weight}(v)_i \geq \text{Weight}(u)_i$$

Iteration j

$$\text{Weight}(v)_j \geq \text{Weight}(u)_j$$

Scenario: Vertex v is NOT a neighbor of Vertex u , but a neighbor of some other vertex x through which it is 'relaxed'



Iteration i

$$\text{Weight}(v)_i \geq \text{Weight}(x)_i \geq \text{Weight}(u)_i$$

Iteration j

$$\text{Weight}(v)_j \geq \text{Weight}(x)_j \geq \text{Weight}(u)_j$$

Theorems on Shortest Paths and Dijkstra Algorithm


- **Theorem 3:** When a vertex v is picked for relaxation/optimization, every intermediate vertex on the $s \dots v$ shortest path is already optimized.
- **Proof:** Let there be a path from s to v that includes a vertex x (i.e., $s \dots x \dots v$) for which we have not yet found the shortest path.
- So, if vertex v is picked for optimization (based on a path $s \dots x \dots v$) and vertex x is not yet optimized, the weight ($s \dots x$) must be greater than weight ($s \dots x \dots v$)
- From Theorem 2, vertices are optimized in the non-decreasing/increasing order of shortest path weights. Hence, if vertex x is optimized in a later iteration, the weight of the path $s \dots x$ would be still greater than the weight of the path $s \dots x \dots v$. This would violate Theorem 1 that the sub path $s \dots x$ of a shortest path is also a shortest path (i.e., the requirement $\text{weight}(s \dots x) < \text{weight}(s \dots x \dots v)$ will not be satisfied).
- A contradiction.

Theorem 4: When a vertex v is picked for relaxation, we have optimized the vertex (i.e., found the shortest path for the vertex from the source vertex s).

Hypothetical Path P' that

We assume:

$\text{Weight}(s \dots v)_{P'} < \text{Weight}(s \dots v)_P$



**Path P found by
Dijkstra algorithm**

Proof: Let $P: s \dots v$ be the path found by Dijkstra algorithm. Assume there exists a hypothetical path P' from s to v such that **$\text{Weight}(s \dots v)_{P'} < \text{Weight}(s \dots v)_P$** .

If all the intermediate vertices on the path P' are already optimized, then such a path $P': s \dots v$ would have been identified during the relaxation steps of the intermediate vertices.

Since the Dijkstra algorithm did not identify such an optimal path P' (and instead concluded P is the optimal path), there must be an intermediate vertex u in the $P': s \dots u \dots v$ path that is not yet optimized.


From Theorem 2, even if vertex u on the $P': s \dots u$ path is optimized in a later iteration, the weight of the $P': s \dots u$ path would be greater than that of the $P: s \dots v$ path. Since the path $s \dots u$ is a sub path of the path $P': s \dots u \dots v$, the weight of the path $P': s \dots v$ can be only greater than the path $P: s \dots v$, and not otherwise. This is a contradiction.

Bellman-Ford Algorithm


- The Bellman-Ford algorithm is a single source shortest path algorithm that can be run for weighted directed graphs with positive and/or negative edge weights.
 - Note that the Dijkstra algorithm will work only for graphs with positive edge weights, and is typically applied for undirected graphs.
- The Bellman-Ford algorithm maintains an estimate of the shortest path distance from the source to every vertex (including itself) and tries to reduce the estimate as much as possible by a going through series of iterations.
 - In each iteration, we try to reduce the estimate of the shortest path distance for a node on the basis of the estimate of the shortest path distance for its INCOMING neighbors (calculated in the previous iteration).
 - The incoming neighbor node that gives the smallest value for the estimate is chosen/updated as the predecessor.
 - We go through a series of $V-1$ iterations for a graph of V vertices.
 - Optimization: If the estimates for the shortest path distances do not change for any vertex during an iteration, stop the algorithm.

Bellman-Ford Algorithm



Operating Principle



$11 + 3 = 14$ is lower than $12 + 5$ and $14 + 2$. So, N3 is chosen as the Predecessor for D





Bellman-Ford Algorithm: Example 1





	Initial	
	Est.	Pred
S	0	-
A	inf	-
B	inf	-
C	inf	-
D	inf	-

Bellman-Ford Algorithm: Example 1





	Initial		Iteration 1	
	Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred
S	0	-	0	-
A	inf	-	6	S
B	inf	-	inf	-
C	inf	-	7	S
D	inf	-	inf	-

Bellman-Ford Algorithm: Example 1





	Iteration 1		Iteration 2	
	Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred
S	0	-	0	-
A	6	S	6	S
B	inf	-	4	C
C	7	S	7	S
D	inf	-	2	A

Bellman-Ford Algorithm: Example 1




	Iteration 2		Iteration 3	
	Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred
S	0	-	0	-
A	6	S	2	B
B	4	C	4	C
C	7	S	7	S
D	2	A	2	A

Bellman-Ford Algorithm: Example 1



		Iteration 3		Iteration 4	
		Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred
S		0	-	0	-
A		2	B	2	B
B		4	C	4	C
C		7	S	7	S
D		2	A	-2	A

Bellman-Ford Algorithm: Example 1



Sample Shortest Path (S...D)

S A → D

S B → A → D


S C → B → A → D

S → C → B → A → D

Note that the property “sub path of a shortest path is also a shortest path” is still satisfied.

	Initial		Iteration 1		Iteration 2		Iteration 3		Iteration 4	
	Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred
S	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
A	inf	-	6	S	6	S	2	B	2	B
B	inf	-	inf	-	4	C	4	C	4	C
C	inf	-	7	S	7	S	7	S	7	S
D	inf	-	inf	-	2	A	2	A	-2	A


Bellman-Ford Algorithm: Example 2



	Weight Matrix				
	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	0	3	8	∞	-4
v2	∞	0	∞	1	7
v3	∞	4	0	∞	∞
v4	2	∞	-5	0	∞
v5	∞	∞	∞	6	0







Note: An entry in the cell (i, j) indicates the weight of the edge $i \rightarrow j$ (i.e., row i , column j).

The entries in the column j indicate the weights of the incoming edges to vertex v_j .









Let v_1 be the source

Bellman-Ford Algorithm: Example 2



	Initial	
	Est.	Pred
v1	0	-
v2	inf	-
v3	inf	-
v4	inf	-
v5	inf	-



Bellman-Ford Algorithm: Example 2



	Initial		Iteration 1	
	Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred
v1	0	-	0	-
v2	inf	-	3	v1
v3	inf	-	8	v1
v4	inf	-	inf	-
v5	inf	-	-4	v1





Bellman-Ford Algorithm: Example 2





		Iteration 1		Iteration 2		
		Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred	
v1		0	-	0	-	
v2		3	v1	3	v1	
v3		8	v1	8	v1	
v4		inf	-	2	v5	
v5		-4	v1	-4	v1	

Bellman-Ford Algorithm: Example 2




		Iteration 2		Iteration 3		
		Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred	
v1		0	-	0	-	
v2		3	v1	3	v1	
v3		8	v1	-3	v4	
v4		2	v5	2	v5	
v5		-4	v1	-4	v1	

Bellman-Ford Algorithm: Example 2



		Iteration 3		Iteration 4	
		Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred
v1		0	-	0	-
v2		3	v1	1	v3
v3		-3	v4	-3	v4
v4		2	v5	2	v5
v5		-4	v1	-4	v1

Bellman-Ford Algorithm: Example 2



Sample Shortest Path (v1 ... v2)

v1 v3 → v2



v1 v4 → v3 → v2

v1 v5 → v4 → v3 → v2

v1 → v5 → v4 → v3 → v2
-4 6 -5 4

	Initial		Iteration 1		Iteration 2		Iteration 3		Iteration 4	
	Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred
v1	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
v2	inf	-	3	v1	3	v1	3	v1	1	v3
v3	inf	-	8	v1	8	v1	-3	v4	-3	v4
v4	inf	-	inf	-	2	v5	2	v5	2	v5
v5	inf	-	-4	v1	-4	v1	-4	v1	-4	v1



Bellman-Ford Algorithm: Example 3



	Initial	
	Est.	Pred
v1	0	-
v2	inf	-
v3	inf	-
v4	inf	-
v5	inf	-





Bellman-Ford Algorithm: Example 3



	Initial		Iteration 1	
	Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred
v1	0	-	0	-
v2	inf	-	inf	-
v3	inf	-	3	v1
v4	inf	-	inf	-
v5	inf	-	inf	-




Bellman-Ford Algorithm: Example 3




		Iteration 1		Iteration 2	
		Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred
v1		0	-	0	-
v2		inf	-	10	v3
v3		3	v1	3	v1
v4		inf	-	4	v3
v5		inf	-	6	v3

Bellman-Ford Algorithm: Example 3




Note that the Estimates did Not change in Iterations 2 and 3. We can STOP!



	Iteration 2		Iteration 3	
	Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred
v1	0	-	0	-
v2	10	v3	10	v3
v3	3	v1	3	v1
v4	4	v3	4	v3
v5	6	v3	6	v3

Bellman-Ford Algorithm: Example 3



$v1 \rightarrow v3$
 $v1 \rightarrow v3 \rightarrow v2$
 $v1 \rightarrow v3 \rightarrow v4$
 $v1 \rightarrow v3 \rightarrow v5$

Optimization Possible!!

	Initial		Iteration 1		Iteration 2		Iteration 3		Iteration 4	
	Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred	Est.	Pred
v1	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-		
v2	inf	-	inf	-	10	v3	10	v3		
v3	inf	-	3	v1	3	v1	3	v1		
v4	inf	-	inf	-	4	v3	4	v3		
v5	inf	-	inf	-	6	v3	6	v3		

NOT NEEDED


All Pairs Shortest Paths Problem

Dynamic Programming Algorithm for All Pairs Shortest Paths

Problem: In a weighted (di)graph, find shortest paths between every pair of vertices

idea: construct solution through series of matrices $D^{(0)}, \dots, D^{(n)}$ using increasing subsets of the vertices allowed as intermediate

Example:




The algorithm we are going to see was developed by two people Floyd and Warshall. We will shortly refer to the algorithm as the FW algorithm

FW Algorithm: Operating Principle

- **Operating Principle:** The vertices are numbered from 1 to n . There are ' n ' iterations. In the k th iteration, the candidate set of vertices available to choose from as intermediate vertices are $\{1, 2, 3, \dots, k\}$.
- **Initialization:** No vertex is a candidate intermediate vertex. There is a path between two vertices only if there is a direct edge between them (i.e., $i \rightarrow j$); otherwise, not.
- **Iteration 1:** Candidate intermediate vertex $\{1\}$. Hence, the candidate paths to choose from are (depending on the graph, the following two may be true):
 $i \rightarrow j$ (or) $i \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow j$
- **Iteration 2:** Candidate intermediate vertices $\{1, 2\}$. Hence, the candidate paths to choose from are (depending on the graph; the following in an exhaustive list for a complete graph in case of a brute force approach):
 $i \rightarrow j$ (or) $i \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow j$ (or) $i \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow j$ (or) $i \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow j$ (or) $i \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow j$
- **Iteration 3:** Candidate intermediate vertices $\{1, 2, 3\}$. Hence, the candidate paths to choose from are (depending on the graph; the following in an exhaustive list for a complete graph in case of a brute force approach):
 $i \rightarrow j$ (or) $i \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow j$ (or) $i \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow j$ (or) $i \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow j$ (or) $i \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow j$ (or) $i \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow j$ (or) $i \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow j$ (or) $i \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow j$ (or) $i \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow j$ (or) $i \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow j$ (or) $i \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow j$ (or) $i \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow j$ (or) $i \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow j$ (or) $i \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow j$ (or) $i \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow j$ (or) $i \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow j$


FW Algorithm: Operating Principle

the minimum weight path from i to k involving zero or more intermediate vertices from the set $\{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$



the minimum weight path from i to j involving zero or more intermediate vertices from the set $\{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$

$$D^{(k-1)}[i,j]$$



the minimum weight path from k to j involving zero or more intermediate vertices from the set $\{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$

$$D^{(k-1)}[k,j]$$

$$\pi_{kj}^{(k-1)}$$

$$D^{(0)}[i,j] = w_{ij} \quad \text{if } i \rightarrow j \in E$$

$$D^{(0)}[i,j] = \infty \quad \text{if } i \rightarrow j \notin E$$

$$\pi_{ij}^{(0)} = i \quad \text{if } i \rightarrow j \in E$$


$$\pi_{ij}^{(0)} = N/A \quad \text{if } i \rightarrow j \notin E$$

$$D^{(k)}[i,j] = \min \{ D^{(k-1)}[i,j], D^{(k-1)}[i,k] + D^{(k-1)}[k,j] \}$$

$$\pi_{ij}^{(k)} = \begin{cases} \pi_{ij}^{(k-1)} & \text{if } D_{ij}^{(k-1)} \leq D_{ik}^{(k-1)} + D_{kj}^{(k-1)} \\ \pi_{kj}^{(k-1)} & \text{if } D_{ij}^{(k-1)} > D_{ik}^{(k-1)} + D_{kj}^{(k-1)} \end{cases}$$


FW Algorithm: Working Principle

- In iteration k , we highlight the row and column corresponding to vertex k , and check whether the values for each of the other cells could be reduced from what they were prior to that iteration. We do not change the values for the cells in the row and column corresponding to vertex k .




We update a cell (i, j) if the value in the cell is greater than the sum of the Values of the cells (i, k) and (k, j)

If we update cell (i, j) , we also update the predecessor for (i, j) to be the value corresponding to the predecessor for (k, j) in row k .



FW Algorithm: Example 1 (1)



Iteration 1

$D^{(0)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	0	∞	3	∞
v2	2	0	∞	∞
v3	∞	7	0	1
v4	6	∞	∞	0

$\Pi^{(0)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	N/A	N/A	v1	N/A
v2	v2	N/A	N/A	N/A
v3	N/A	v3	N/A	v3
v4	v4	N/A	N/A	N/A


$D^{(1)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	0	∞	3	∞
v2	2			
v3	∞			
v4	6			

$\Pi^{(1)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	N/A	N/A	v1	N/A
v2	v2			
v3	N/A			
v4	v4			

FW Algorithm: Example 1 (1)



Iteration 1

$D^{(0)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	0	∞	3	∞
v2	2	0	∞	∞
v3	∞	7	0	1
v4	6	∞	∞	0

$\Pi^{(0)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	N/A	N/A	v1	N/A
v2	v2	N/A	N/A	N/A
v3	N/A	v3	N/A	v3
v4	v4	N/A	N/A	N/A


$D^{(1)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	0	∞	3	∞
v2	2	0	5	∞
v3	∞	7	0	1
v4	6	∞	9	0

$\Pi^{(1)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	N/A	N/A	v1	N/A
v2	v2	N/A	v1	N/A
v3	N/A	v3	N/A	v3
v4	v4	N/A	v1	N/A

FW Algorithm: Example 1 (2)



Iteration 2

$D^{(1)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	0	∞	3	∞
v2	2	0	5	∞
v3	∞	7	0	1
v4	6	∞	9	0

$\Pi^{(1)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	N/A	N/A	v1	N/A
v2	v2	N/A	v1	N/A
v3	N/A	v3	N/A	v3
v4	v4	N/A	v1	N/A


$D^{(2)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1		∞		
v2	2	0	5	∞
v3		7		
v4		∞		

$\Pi^{(2)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1		N/A		
v2	v2	N/A	v1	N/A
v3		v3		
v4		N/A		

FW Algorithm: Example 1 (2)



Iteration 2

$D^{(1)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	0	∞	3	∞
v2	2	0	5	∞
v3	∞	7	0	1
v4	6	∞	9	0

$\Pi^{(1)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	N/A	N/A	v1	N/A
v2	v2	N/A	v1	N/A
v3	N/A	v3	N/A	v3
v4	v4	N/A	v1	N/A


$D^{(2)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	0	∞	3	∞
v2	2	0	5	∞
v3	9	7	0	1
v4	6	∞	9	0

$\Pi^{(2)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	N/A	N/A	v1	N/A
v2	v2	N/A	v1	N/A
v3	v2	v3	N/A	v3
v4	v4	N/A	v1	N/A

FW Algorithm: Example 1 (3)



Iteration 3

$D^{(2)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	0	∞	3	∞
v2	2	0	5	∞
v3	9	7	0	1
v4	6	∞	9	0

$\Pi^{(2)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	N/A	N/A	v1	N/A
v2	v2	N/A	v1	N/A
v3	v2	v3	N/A	v3
v4	v4	N/A	v1	N/A


$D^{(3)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1			3	
v2			5	
v3	9	7	0	1
v4			9	

$\Pi^{(3)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1			v1	
v2			v1	
v3	v2	v3	N/A	v3
v4			v1	

FW Algorithm: Example 1 (3)



Iteration 3

$D^{(2)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	0	∞	3	∞
v2	2	0	5	∞
v3	9	7	0	1
v4	6	∞	9	0

$\Pi^{(2)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	N/A	N/A	v1	N/A
v2	v2	N/A	v1	N/A
v3	v2	v3	N/A	v3
v4	v4	N/A	v1	N/A


$D^{(3)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	0	10	3	4
v2	2	0	5	6
v3	9	7	0	1
v4	6	16	9	0

$\Pi^{(3)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	N/A	v3	v1	v3
v2	v2	N/A	v1	v3
v3	v2	v3	N/A	v3
v4	v4	v3	v1	N/A

FW Algorithm: Example 1 (4)



Iteration 4

$D^{(3)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	0	10	3	4
v2	2	0	5	6
v3	9	7	0	1
v4	6	16	9	0

$\Pi^{(3)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	N/A	v3	v1	v3
v2	v2	N/A	v1	v3
v3	v2	v3	N/A	v3
v4	v4	v3	v1	N/A


$D^{(4)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1				4
v2				6
v3				1
v4	6	16	9	0

$\Pi^{(4)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1				v3
v2				v3
v3				v3
v4	v4	v3	v1	N/A

FW Algorithm: Example 1 (4)



Iteration 4

$D^{(3)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	0	10	3	4
v2	2	0	5	6
v3	9	7	0	1
v4	6	16	9	0

$\Pi^{(3)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	N/A	v3	v1	v3
v2	v2	N/A	v1	v3
v3	v2	v3	N/A	v3
v4	v4	v3	v1	N/A


$D^{(4)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	0	10	3	4
v2	2	0	5	6
v3	7	7	0	1
v4	6	16	9	0

$\Pi^{(4)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	N/A	v3	v1	v3
v2	v2	N/A	v1	v3
v3	v4	v3	N/A	v3
v4	v4	v3	v1	N/A

FW Algorithm: Example 1 (5)



$D^{(4)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	0	10	3	4
v2	2	0	5	6
v3	7	7	0	1
v4	6	16	9	0

$\Pi^{(4)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4
v1	N/A	v3	v1	v3
v2	v2	N/A	v1	v3
v3	v4	v3	N/A	v3
v4	v4	v3	v1	N/A

Path from v2 to v4

$\pi(v2 \dots v4)$

$= \pi(v2 \dots v3) \rightarrow v3 \rightarrow v4$

$= \pi(v2 \dots v1) \rightarrow v1 \rightarrow v3 \rightarrow v4$

$= v2 \rightarrow v1 \rightarrow v3 \rightarrow v4$

Path from v4 to v2

$\pi(v4 \dots v2)$

$= \pi(v4 \dots v3) \rightarrow v3 \rightarrow v2$

$= \pi(v4 \dots v1) \rightarrow v1 \rightarrow v3 \rightarrow v2$

$= v4 \rightarrow v1 \rightarrow v3 \rightarrow v2$

FW Algorithm (pseudocode and analysis)

ALGORITHM *Floyd*($W[1..n, 1..n]$)

//Implements Floyd's algorithm for the all-pairs shortest-paths problem

//Input: The weight matrix W of a graph with no negative-length cycle

//Output: The distance matrix of the shortest paths' lengths

$D \leftarrow W$ //is not necessary if W can be overwritten

for $k \leftarrow 1$ **to** n **do**

for $i \leftarrow 1$ **to** n **do**

for $j \leftarrow 1$ **to** n **do**


$D[i, j] \leftarrow \min\{D[i, j], D[i, k] + D[k, j]\}$

return D

Time efficiency: $\Theta(n^3)$

Space efficiency: $\Theta(n^2)$

FW Algorithm: Example 2(1)



	Weight Matrix				
	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	0	3	8	∞	-4
v2	∞	0	∞	1	7
v3	∞	4	0	∞	∞
v4	2	∞	-5	0	∞
v5	∞	∞	∞	6	0

$$D^{(0)}$$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	0	3	8	∞	-4
v2	∞	0	∞	1	7
v3	∞	4	0	∞	∞
v4	2	∞	-5	0	∞
v5	∞	∞	∞	6	0

$$\Pi^{(0)}$$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	N/A	v1	v1	N/A	v1
v2	N/A	N/A	N/A	v2	v2
v3	N/A	v3	N/A	N/A	N/A
v4	v4	N/A	v4	N/A	N/A
v5	N/A	N/A	N/A	v5	N/A

$$D^{(1)}$$


	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	0	3	8	∞	-4
v2	∞				
v3	∞				
v4	2				
v5	∞				

$$\Pi^{(1)}$$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	N/A	v1	v1	N/A	v1
v2	N/A				
v3	N/A				
v4	v4				
v5	N/A				

Iteration 1

FW Algorithm - Example 2(1)


 $D^{(0)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	0	3	8	∞	-4
v2	∞	0	∞	1	7
v3	∞	4	0	∞	∞
v4	2	∞	-5	0	∞
v5	∞	∞	∞	6	0

 $\Pi^{(0)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	N/A	v1	v1	N/A	v1
v2	N/A	N/A	N/A	v2	v2
v3	N/A	v3	N/A	N/A	N/A
v4	v4	N/A	v4	N/A	N/A
v5	N/A	N/A	N/A	v5	N/A

		Weight Matrix				
	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5	
v1	0	3	8	∞	-4	
v2	∞	0	∞	1	7	
v3	∞	4	0	∞	∞	
v4	2	∞	-5	0	∞	
v5	∞	∞	∞	6	0	

 $D^{(1)}$


	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	0	3	8	∞	-4
v2	∞	0	∞	1	7
v3	∞	4	0	∞	∞
v4	2	5	-5	0	-2
v5	∞	∞	∞	6	0

 $\Pi^{(1)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	N/A	v1	v1	N/A	v1
v2	N/A	N/A	N/A	v2	v2
v3	N/A	v3	N/A	N/A	N/A
v4	v4	v1	v4	N/A	v1
v5	N/A	N/A	N/A	v5	N/A

Iteration 1

FW Algorithm: Example 2(2)



	Weight Matrix				
	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	0	3	8	∞	-4
v2	∞	0	∞	1	7
v3	∞	4	0	∞	∞
v4	2	∞	-5	0	∞
v5	∞	∞	∞	6	0

$D^{(1)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	0	3	8	∞	-4
v2	∞	0	∞	1	7
v3	∞	4	0	∞	∞
v4	2	5	-5	0	-2
v5	∞	∞	∞	6	0

$\Pi^{(1)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	N/A	v1	v1	N/A	v1
v2	N/A	N/A	N/A	v2	v2
v3	N/A	v3	N/A	N/A	N/A
v4	v4	v1	v4	N/A	v1
v5	N/A	N/A	N/A	v5	N/A

$D^{(2)}$


	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1		3			
v2	∞	0	∞	1	7
v3		4			
v4		5			
v5		∞			

$\Pi^{(2)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1		v1			
v2	N/A	N/A	N/A	v2	v2
v3		v3			
v4		v1			
v5		N/A			

Iteration 2

FW Algorithm: Example 2(2)



		Weight Matrix				
	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5	
v1	0	3	8	∞	-4	
v2	∞	0	∞	1	7	
v3	∞	4	0	∞	∞	
v4	2	∞	-5	0	∞	
v5	∞	∞	∞	6	0	

$D^{(1)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	0	3	8	∞	-4
v2	∞	0	∞	1	7
v3	∞	4	0	∞	∞
v4	2	5	-5	0	-2
v5	∞	∞	∞	6	0

$\Pi^{(1)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	N/A	v1	v1	N/A	v1
v2	N/A	N/A	N/A	v2	v2
v3	N/A	v3	N/A	N/A	N/A
v4	v4	v1	v4	N/A	v1
v5	N/A	N/A	N/A	v5	N/A

$D^{(2)}$


	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	0	3	8	4	-4
v2	∞	0	∞	1	7
v3	∞	4	0	5	11
v4	2	5	-5	0	-2
v5	∞	∞	∞	6	0

$\Pi^{(2)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	N/A	v1	v1	v2	v1
v2	N/A	N/A	N/A	v2	v2
v3	N/A	v3	N/A	v2	v2
v4	v4	v1	v4	N/A	v1
v5	N/A	N/A	N/A	v5	N/A

Iteration 2

FW Algorithm: Example 2(3)



	Weight Matrix				
	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	0	3	8	∞	-4
v2	∞	0	∞	1	7
v3	∞	4	0	∞	∞
v4	2	∞	-5	0	∞
v5	∞	∞	∞	6	0

$D^{(2)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	0	3	8	4	-4
v2	∞	0	∞	1	7
v3	∞	4	0	5	11
v4	2	5	-5	0	-2
v5	∞	∞	∞	6	0

$\Pi^{(2)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	N/A	v1	v1	v2	v1
v2	N/A	N/A	N/A	v2	v2
v3	N/A	v3	N/A	v2	v2
v4	v4	v1	v4	N/A	v1
v5	N/A	N/A	N/A	v5	N/A

$D^{(3)}$


	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	0	3	8	4	-4
v2	∞	0	∞	1	7
v3	∞	4	0	5	11
v4	2	-1	-5	0	-2
v5	∞	∞	∞	6	0

$\Pi^{(3)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	N/A	v1	v1	v2	v1
v2	N/A	N/A	N/A	v2	v2
v3	N/A	v3	N/A	v2	v2
v4	v4	v3	v4	N/A	v1
v5	N/A	N/A	N/A	v5	N/A

Iteration 3

FW Algorithm: Example 2(4)



	Weight Matrix				
	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	0	3	8	∞	-4
v2	∞	0	∞	1	7
v3	∞	4	0	∞	∞
v4	2	∞	-5	0	∞
v5	∞	∞	∞	6	0

$D^{(3)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	0	3	8	4	-4
v2	∞	0	∞	1	7
v3	∞	4	0	5	11
v4	2	-1	-5	0	-2
v5	∞	∞	∞	6	0

$\Pi^{(3)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	N/A	v1	v1	v2	v1
v2	N/A	N/A	N/A	v2	v2
v3	N/A	v3	N/A	v2	v2
v4	v4	v3	v4	N/A	v1
v5	N/A	N/A	N/A	v5	N/A

$D^{(4)}$


	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	0	3	-1	4	-4
v2	3	0	-4	1	-1
v3	7	4	0	5	3
v4	2	-1	-5	0	-2
v5	8	5	1	6	0

$\Pi^{(4)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	N/A	v1	v4	v2	v1
v2	v4	N/A	v4	v2	v1
v3	v4	v3	N/A	v2	v1
v4	v4	v3	v4	N/A	v1
v5	v4	v3	v4	v5	N/A

Iteration 4

FW Algorithm: Example 2(5)



	Weight Matrix				
	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	0	3	8	∞	-4
v2	∞	0	∞	1	7
v3	∞	4	0	∞	∞
v4	2	∞	-5	0	∞
v5	∞	∞	∞	6	0

$D^{(4)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	0	3	-1	4	-4
v2	3	0	-4	1	-1
v3	7	4	0	5	3
v4	2	-1	-5	0	-2
v5	8	5	1	6	0

$\Pi^{(4)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	N/A	v1	v4	v2	v1
v2	v4	N/A	v4	v2	v1
v3	v4	v3	N/A	v2	v1
v4	v4	v3	v4	N/A	v1
v5	v4	v3	v4	v5	N/A

$D^{(5)}$


	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	0	1	-3	2	-4
v2	3	0	-4	1	-1
v3	7	4	0	5	3
v4	2	-1	-5	0	-2
v5	8	5	1	6	0

$\Pi^{(5)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	N/A	v3	v4	v5	v1
v2	v4	N/A	v4	v2	v1
v3	v4	v3	N/A	v2	v1
v4	v4	v3	v4	N/A	v1
v5	v4	v3	v4	v5	N/A

Iteration 5

FW Algorithm: Example 2(6)



$D^{(5)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	0	1	-3	2	-4
v2	3	0	-4	1	-1
v3	7	4	0	5	3
v4	2	-1	-5	0	-2
v5	8	5	1	6	0

$\Pi^{(5)}$

	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	N/A	v3	v4	v5	v1
v2	v4	N/A	v4	v2	v1
v3	v4	v3	N/A	v2	v1
v4	v4	v3	v4	N/A	v1
v5	v4	v3	v4	v5	N/A

Path from v3 to v1

$\pi(v3 \dots v1)$

$= \pi(v3 \dots v4) \rightarrow v4 \rightarrow v1$

$= \pi(v3 \dots v2) \rightarrow v2 \rightarrow v4 \rightarrow v1$

$= v3 \rightarrow v2 \rightarrow v4 \rightarrow v1$

Path from v1 to v3

$\pi(v1 \dots v3)$

$= \pi(v1 \dots v4) \rightarrow v4 \rightarrow v3$

$= \pi(v1 \dots v5) \rightarrow v5 \rightarrow v4 \rightarrow v3$

$= v1 \rightarrow v5 \rightarrow v4 \rightarrow v3$

Comparison of the Shortest Path Algorithms

	Dijkstra	Bellman-Ford	Floyd-Warshall
Type	Single source shortest path	Single source shortest path	All pairs shortest path
Typical Graphs	Undirected	Directed	Undirected and Directed
Edge Weights	Positive only	Positive and/ or Negative	Positive and/ or Negative
Time Complexity	$\Theta(E \cdot \log V)$	$\Theta(E \cdot V)$	$\Theta(V^3)$

Floyd Warshall or Dijkstra for All Pairs Shortest Paths

- If we run Dijkstra algorithm once for each vertex (as the source vertex), we will be finding the shortest path trees rooted at each vertex, thereby finding the all pairs shortest paths.
 - Time complexity of Dijkstra algorithm for all pairs shortest paths is:
 $\Theta(E \log V * V) = \Theta(EV \log V)$
- **Sparse Graphs**
 - # Edges, $E = \Theta(V)$
 - Dijkstra algorithm's time complexity = $\Theta(V^2 \log V)$, which is less than that of Floyd-Warshall algorithm's $\Theta(V^3)$.
- **Dense Graphs**
 - # Edges, $E = \Theta(V^2)$
 - Dijkstra algorithm's time complexity = $\Theta(V^3 \log V)$, which will be larger than that of Floyd-Warshall algorithm's $\Theta(V^3)$.