

# Shortest Paths, and Dijkstra's Algorithm: Overview

- Graphs with lengths/weights/costs on edges.
- Shortest paths in edge-weighted graphs
- Dijkstra's classic algorithm for computing single-source shortest paths.

# Graphs with edge “length” (or “weight/cost”)

An **edge-weighted directed graph**,  $G = (V, E, w)$ , has a **length/weight/cost** function,  $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , which maps each edge  $(u, v) \in E$  to a non-negative integer “length” (or “weight”, or “cost”):  $w(u, v) \in \mathbb{N}$ .

We can **extend** the “length” function  $w$  to a function  $w : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ , by letting  $w(u, u) = 0$ , for all  $u \in V$ , and letting  $w(u, v) = \infty$  for all  $(u, v) \notin E$ .

Consider a directed path:

$$x_0 e_1 x_1 e_2 \dots e_n x_n$$

from  $u = x_0 \in V$  to  $v = x_n \in V$ , in graph  $G = (V, E, w)$ . The **length** of this path is defined to be:  $\sum_{i=1}^n w(x_{i-1}, x_i)$ .

# Graphs with edge “length” (or “weight/cost”)

An **edge-weighted directed graph**,  $G = (V, E, w)$ , has a **length/weight/cost** function,  $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , which maps each edge  $(u, v) \in E$  to a non-negative integer “length” (or “weight”, or “cost”):  $w(u, v) \in \mathbb{N}$ .

We can **extend** the “length” function  $w$  to a function  $w : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ , by letting  $w(u, u) = 0$ , for all  $u \in V$ , and letting  $w(u, v) = \infty$  for all  $(u, v) \notin E$ .

Consider a directed path:

$$x_0 e_1 x_1 e_2 \dots e_n x_n$$

from  $u = x_0 \in V$  to  $v = x_n \in V$ , in graph  $G = (V, E, w)$ . The **length** of this path is defined to be:  $\sum_{i=1}^n w(x_{i-1}, x_i)$ .

**Question:** Given  $G$  and a pair of vertices  $u, v \in V$ , how do we compute the length of the **shortest path** from  $u$  to  $v$ ?

# Dijkstra's single-source shortest-path algorithm

**Input:** Edge-weighted graph,  $G = (V, E, w)$ , with (*extended*) weight function  $w : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , and a source vertex  $s \in V$ .

**Output:** Function  $L : V \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ , such that for all  $v \in V$ ,  $L(v)$  is the length of the shortest path from  $s$  to  $v$  in  $G$ .

## Algorithm:

Initialize:  $S := \{s\}$ ;  $L(s) := 0$ ;

Initialize:  $L(v) := w(s, v)$ , for all  $v \in V - \{s\}$ ;

**while** ( $S \neq V$ ) **do**

$u := \arg \min_{z \in V - S} \{L(z)\}$

$S := S \cup \{u\}$

**for all**  $v \in V - S$  such that  $(u, v) \in E$  **do**

$L(v) := \min\{L(v), L(u) + w(u, v)\}$

**end for**

**end while**

Output function  $L(\cdot)$ .

# Why does Dijkstra's algorithm work?

**Claim:** The While loop of Dijkstra's algorithm maintains the following **invariant** properties of the function  $L$  and the set  $S$ :

1.  $\forall v \in S$ ,  $L(v)$  is the shortest path length from  $s$  to  $v$  in  $G$ .
2.  $\forall v \in V - S$ ,  $L(v)$  is the length of the shortest path from  $s$  to  $v$  which uses only vertices in  $S \cup \{v\}$ .
3. For all  $u \in S$  and  $v \in V - S$ ,  $L(u) \leq L(v)$ .

Note that the three invariants hold after initialization, just prior to the first iteration of the while loop.

The claim follows once we prove (on board) that **if** the invariants hold just prior to a while loop iteration **then** they hold just after.

Since each iteration adds one vertex to  $S$ , it follows that the algorithm halts, at which point  $S = V$ , and thus, by invariant (1.), the function  $L : V \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  is the correct answer.

# Remarks on Dijkstra's Algorithm

- If Dijkstra's algorithm is implemented naively, it has running time  $O(n^2)$ , where  $n = |V|$ .
- With clever data structures (e.g., so called “Fibonacci Heaps”) Dijkstra's algorithm can be implemented much more efficiently: essentially in time  $O(m + n \log n)$  where,  $n = |V|$  and  $m = |E|$ .

This increased efficiency can make a **big difference** on huge “sparse” graphs, where  $m$  is much smaller than  $n^2$  (e.g., when out-degree is a fixed constant,  $m \in O(n)$ ).

- Dijkstra's algorithm can be augmented to also output a description of a shortest path from the source vertex  $s$  to every other vertex  $v$ .

We will not describe these extensions, and we will certainly not assume that you know them.

# Graph Colouring

# Graph Colouring

Suppose we have  $k$  distinct colours with which to colour the vertices of a graph. Let  $[k] = \{1, \dots, k\}$ . For an undirected graph,  $G = (V, E)$ , an admissible vertex  **$k$ -colouring** of  $G$  is a function  $c: V \rightarrow [k]$ , such that for all  $u, v \in V$ , if  $\{u, v\} \in E$  then  $c(u) \neq c(v)$ .

For an integer  $k \geq 1$ , we say an undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$  is  **$k$ -colourable** if there exists a  $k$ -colouring of  $G$ .

The **chromatic number** of  $G$ , denoted  $\chi(G)$ , is the *smallest positive integer*  $k$ , such that  $G$  is  $k$ -colourable.



# Some observations about Graph colouring

- Note that any graph  $G$  with  $n$  vertices is  $n$ -colourable.
- The  **$n$ -Clique**,  $K_n$ , i.e., the complete graph on  $n$  vertices, has chromatic number  $\chi(K_n) = n$ . All its vertices must get assigned different colours in any admissible colouring.
- The **clique number**,  $\omega(G)$ , of a graph  $G$  is the maximum positive integer  $r \geq 1$ , such that  $K_r$  is a subgraph of  $G$ .
- Note that for all graphs  $G$ ,  $\omega(G) \leq \chi(G)$ : if  $G$  has an  $r$ -clique then it is not  $(r - 1)$ -colorable.
- However, in general,  $\omega(G) \neq \chi(G)$ . For instance, The 5-cycle,  $C_5$ , has  $\omega(C_5) = 2 < \chi(C_5) = 3$ .

# More observations about colouring

- As already mentioned, any bipartite graph is 2-colourable. Indeed, that is an equivalent definition of being bipartite.
- More generally, a graph  $G$  is  $k$ -colourable precisely if it is  $k$ -partite, meaning its vertices can be partitioned into  $k$  disjoint sets such that all edges of the graph are between nodes in different parts.

# Algorithms/complexity of colouring graphs

To determine whether a  $n$ -vertex graph  $G = (V, E)$  is  $k$ -colourable by “*brute force*”, we could try all possible colourings of  $n$  nodes with  $k$  colours.

**Difficulty:** There are  $k^n$  such  $k$ -colouring functions  $c : V \rightarrow [k]$ .

**Question:** Is there an efficient (polynomial time) algorithm for determining whether a given graph  $G$  is  $k$ -colourable?

# Algorithms/complexity of colouring graphs

To determine whether a  $n$ -vertex graph  $G = (V, E)$  is  $k$ -colourable by “*brute force*”, we could try all possible colourings of  $n$  nodes with  $k$  colours.

**Difficulty:** There are  $k^n$  such  $k$ -colouring functions  $c : V \rightarrow [k]$ .

**Question:** Is there an efficient (polynomial time) algorithm for determining whether a given graph  $G$  is  $k$ -colourable?

**Answer:** No, no generally efficient (polynomial time) algorithm is known, and even the problem of determining whether a given graph is 3-colourable is **NP-complete**. (Even approximating the chromatic number of a given graph is NP-hard.)

In practice, there are heuristic algorithms that do obtain good colourings for many classes of graphs.

# Applications of Graph Colouring (many)

## Final Exam Scheduling

- There are  $n$  courses,  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ .
- Some courses have the same students registered for both, so their exams can't be scheduled at the same time.
- Let  $G = (\{1, \dots, n\}, E)$  be a graph such that  $\{i, j\} \in E$  if and only if  $i \neq j$  and courses  $i$  and  $j$  have a student in common.
- **Question:** What is the minimum number of exam time slots needed to schedule all  $n$  exams?
- **Answer:** This is precisely the chromatic number  $\chi(G)$  of  $G$ .

Furthermore, a  $k$ -colouring of  $G$  yields an *admissible schedule* of exams into  $k$  time slots, allowing all students to attend all their exams, as long as different “colors” are scheduled in disjoint time slots.