#### Introduction to Algorithms 6.046J/18.401J



#### **LECTURE 18** Shortest Paths II

- Bellman-Ford algorithm
- Linear programming and difference constraints
- VLSI layout compaction

#### **Prof. Erik Demaine**

November 16, 2005

Copyright © 2001-5 by Erik D. Demaine and Charles E. Leiserson L18.1



## **Negative-weight cycles**

**Recall:** If a graph G = (V, E) contains a negativeweight cycle, then some shortest paths may not exist.





## Negative-weight cycles

**Recall:** If a graph G = (V, E) contains a negativeweight cycle, then some shortest paths may not exist.



**Bellman-Ford algorithm:** Finds all shortest-path lengths from a *source*  $s \in V$  to all  $v \in V$  or determines that a negative-weight cycle exists.



## **Bellman-Ford algorithm**

 $d[s] \leftarrow 0$  $d[s] \leftarrow 0$ for each  $v \in V - \{s\}$  initialization  $do d[v] \leftarrow \infty$ for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to |V| - 1**do for** each edge  $(u, v) \in E$ do if d[v] > d[u] + w(u, v)then  $d[v] \leftarrow d[u] + w(u, v)$  relaxation step

for each edge  $(u, v) \in E$ **do if** d[v] > d[u] + w(u, v)then report that a negative-weight cycle exists At the end,  $d[v] = \delta(s, v)$ , if no negative-weight cycles. Time = O(VE).

Copyright © 2001-5 by Erik D. Demaine and Charles E. Leiserson November 16, 2005 L18.4









November 16, 2005

Copyright © 2001-5 by Erik D. Demaine and Charles E. Leiserson L18.6





#### Order of edge relaxation.





































November 16, 2005 Copyright © 2001-5 by Erik D. Demaine and Charles E. Leiserson I

L18.16





































#### End of pass 2 (and 3 and 4).



#### Correctness

**Theorem.** If G = (V, E) contains no negativeweight cycles, then after the Bellman-Ford algorithm executes,  $d[v] = \delta(s, v)$  for all  $v \in V$ .



#### Correctness

**Theorem.** If G = (V, E) contains no negativeweight cycles, then after the Bellman-Ford algorithm executes,  $d[v] = \delta(s, v)$  for all  $v \in V$ . *Proof.* Let  $v \in V$  be any vertex, and consider a shortest path *p* from *s* to *v* with the minimum number of edges.



Since *p* is a shortest path, we have  $\delta(s, v_i) = \delta(s, v_{i-1}) + w(v_{i-1}, v_i).$ 



Initially,  $d[v_0] = 0 = \delta(s, v_0)$ , and  $d[v_0]$  is unchanged by subsequent relaxations (because of the lemma from *Shortest Paths I* that  $d[v] \ge \delta(s, v)$ ).

- After 1 pass through *E*, we have  $d[v_1] = \delta(s, v_1)$ .
- After 2 passes through *E*, we have  $d[v_2] = \delta(s, v_2)$ .
- After *k* passes through *E*, we have  $d[v_k] = \delta(s, v_k)$ . Since *G* contains no negative-weight cycles, *p* is simple. Longest simple path has  $\leq |V| - 1$  edges.



#### **Detection of negative-weight** cycles

**Corollary.** If a value d[v] fails to converge after |V| - 1 passes, there exists a negative-weight cycle in *G* reachable from *s*.



# Linear programming

Let *A* be an  $m \times n$  matrix, *b* be an *m*-vector, and *c* be an *n*-vector. Find an *n*-vector *x* that maximizes  $c^{T}x$  subject to  $Ax \leq b$ , or determine that no such solution exists.





# Linear-programming algorithms

**Algorithms for the general problem** 

- Simplex methods practical, but worst-case exponential time.
- Interior-point methods polynomial time and competes with simplex.



# Linear-programming algorithms

#### **Algorithms for the general problem**

- Simplex methods practical, but worst-case exponential time.
- Interior-point methods polynomial time and competes with simplex.

*Feasibility problem:* No optimization criterion. Just find x such that Ax < b.

• In general, just as hard as ordinary LP.



# **Solving a system of difference constraints**

Linear programming where each row of A contains exactly one 1, one -1, and the rest 0's.

**Example:** 

 $\begin{array}{c} x_1 - x_2 \leq 3 \\ x_2 - x_3 \leq -2 \\ x_1 - x_3 \leq 2 \end{array}$   $x_j - x_i \leq w_{ij}$ 



# **Solving a system of difference constraints**

Linear programming where each row of A contains exactly one 1, one -1, and the rest 0's.

**Solution: Example:**  $\begin{array}{c} x_1 - x_2 \leq 3 \\ x_2 - x_3 \leq -2 \\ x_1 - x_3 \leq 2 \end{array}$   $x_j - x_i \leq w_{ij}$  $x_1 = 3$  $x_2 = 0$  $x_3 = 2$ 



# Solving a system of difference constraints

Linear programming where each row of A contains exactly one 1, one -1, and the rest 0's.

Example:Solution: $x_1 - x_2 \le 3$  $x_1 = 3$  $x_2 - x_3 \le -2$  $x_j - x_i \le w_{ij}$  $x_1 - x_3 \le 2$  $x_j - x_i \le w_{ij}$  $x_3 = 2$ 

Constraint graph:  $x_j - x_i \le w_{ij}$   $\bigvee_{ij}$   $\bigvee_{ij}$   $v_{ij}$  (The "A" matrix has dimensions  $|E| \times |V|$ .)



### **Unsatisfiable constraints**

**Theorem.** If the constraint graph contains a negative-weight cycle, then the system of differences is unsatisfiable.



## **Unsatisfiable constraints**

**Theorem.** If the constraint graph contains a negative-weight cycle, then the system of differences is unsatisfiable.

*Proof.* Suppose that the negative-weight cycle is  $v_1 \rightarrow v_2 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow v_k \rightarrow v_1$ . Then, we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} x_{2} - x_{1} & \leq w_{12} \\ x_{3} - x_{2} & \leq w_{23} \\ & \vdots \\ x_{k} - x_{k-1} & \leq w_{k-1, k} \\ x_{1} - x_{k} & \leq w_{k1} \end{array}$$



## **Unsatisfiable constraints**

**Theorem.** If the constraint graph contains a negative-weight cycle, then the system of differences is unsatisfiable.

*Proof.* Suppose that the negative-weight cycle is  $v_1 \rightarrow v_2 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow v_k \rightarrow v_1$ . Then, we have



Therefore, no values for the  $x_i$  can satisfy the constraints.



## Satisfying the constraints

**Theorem.** Suppose no negative-weight cycle exists in the constraint graph. Then, the constraints are satisfiable.



# Satisfying the constraints

**Theorem.** Suppose no negative-weight cycle exists in the constraint graph. Then, the constraints are satisfiable. *Proof.* Add a new vertex *s* to *V* with a 0-weight edge to each vertex  $v_i \in V$ .



# Satisfying the constraints

**Theorem.** Suppose no negative-weight cycle exists in the constraint graph. Then, the constraints are satisfiable. *Proof.* Add a new vertex *s* to *V* with a 0-weight edge to each vertex  $v_i \in V$ .



Note:

No negative-weight cycles introduced  $\Rightarrow$  shortest paths exist.



## **Proof (continued)**

**Claim:** The assignment  $x_i = \delta(s, v_i)$  solves the constraints. Consider any constraint  $x_j - x_i \le w_{ij}$ , and consider the shortest paths from *s* to  $v_i$  and  $v_i$ :



The triangle inequality gives us  $\delta(s, v_j) \le \delta(s, v_i) + w_{ij}$ . Since  $x_i = \delta(s, v_i)$  and  $x_j = \delta(s, v_j)$ , the constraint  $x_j - x_i \le w_{ij}$  is satisfied.



#### **Bellman-Ford and linear programming**

**Corollary.** The Bellman-Ford algorithm can solve a system of *m* difference constraints on *n* variables in O(mn) time.

Single-source shortest paths is a simple LP problem.

In fact, Bellman-Ford maximizes  $x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_n$ subject to the constraints  $x_j - x_i \le w_{ij}$  and  $x_i \le 0$ (exercise).

Bellman-Ford also minimizes  $\max_i \{x_i\} - \min_i \{x_i\}$  (exercise).



#### **Application to VLSI layout compaction**



minimum separation  $\lambda$ 

**Problem:** Compact (in one dimension) the space between the features of a VLSI layout without bringing any features too close together.



**Constraint:**  $x_2 - x_1 \ge d_1 + \lambda$ 

Bellman-Ford minimizes  $\max_i \{x_i\} - \min_i \{x_i\}$ , which compacts the layout in the *x*-dimension.