ALL PAIRS SHORTEST PATHS / FLOYD-WARSHALL ALGORITHM

input: An edge-weighted digraph G = (V, E) with no negative-weight cycles. To ease notation assume $V = \{1, 2, ..., n\}$.

output: An array of shortest-path distances d such that for all $u, w \in V$, d[u, w] = dist(u, w) is the minimum shortest-path distance in G from u to w.

Here is the algorithm. Fix any input instance G = (V, E).

subproblems. For each $u, w \in V$ and $i \in \{0, 1, 2, ..., n\}$ define M[u, w, i] to be the minimum weight of any u-to-w path in G whose interior vertices are all in $\{1, 2, ..., i\}$. (If there is no such path, then $M[u, w, i] = \infty$.) The final answer is given by an array d where d[u, w] = M[u, w, n] for all $u, w \in V$.

recurrence. For any $u, w \in V$ and $i \in \{0, 1, ..., n\}$,

$$M[u, w, i] = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } u = w \\ \text{wt}(u, w) & \text{if } u \neq w, i = 0, \text{ and } (u, w) \in E \\ \infty & \text{if } u \neq w, i = 0, \text{ and } (u, w) \notin E \\ \min(M[u, w, i - 1], M[u, i, i - 1] + M[i, w, i - 1]) & \text{if } u \neq w \text{ and } i \neq 0 \end{cases}$$

The intuition for the main case of the recurrence (when $i \neq 0$ and $u \neq w$) is as follows. Say a path p from u to w in G is feasible for M[u, w, i] if the interior vertices of p (the vertices in p other than the endpoints u and w) are all in $\{1, 2, \ldots, i\}$. Then M[u, w, i] is the minimum weight of any feasible path for M[u, w, i]. We partition the feasible paths for M[u, w, i] into three sets: (i) those that don't have i as an interior vertex, (ii) those on which i occurs once as an interior vertex, and (iii) those on which i occurs more than once as an interior vertex.

The paths in the first set (i) are just those that are feasible for M[u, w, i - 1]. The minimum weight of any path in set (i) is M[u, w, i - 1].

The paths in the second set (ii) are those paths p that can be obtained as follows. Let p_1 be any feasible path for M[u, i, i-1]. Let p_2 be any feasible path for M[i, w, i-1]. Obtain path $p = p_1 \cup p_2$ by appending p_2 to p_1 , so $\mathsf{wt}(p) = \mathsf{wt}(p_1) + \mathsf{wt}(p_2)$. A minimum weight path p in set (ii) can be obtained by taking p_1 to be a minimum-weight feasible path for M[u, i, i-1], and taking p_2 to be a minimum-weight feasible path for M[i, w, i-1], so p has weight M[u, i, i-1] + M[i, w, i-1].

We can ignore any path p in the third set (iii), because by removing cycles (from i to i) from p, we can find a path p' in set (ii) with $\mathsf{wt}(p') \leq \mathsf{wt}(p)$.

time. There are $O(n^3)$ subproblems. For each, the right-hand side of the recurrence can be evaluated in time O(1). So the total time to compute d[u, w] for all $u, w \in V$ is $O(n^3)$.

correctness. Here's a long-form proof that the recurrence is correct.

Lemma 1. The recurrence is correct.

Proof (long form).

- 1. Following the explanation, for any $u, w \in V$ and $i \in \{0, ..., n\}$, say a path p from u to w is feasible for M[u, w, i] if all interior vertices of p are in $\{1, 2, ..., i\}$. Then M[u, w, i] is the minimum weight of any feasible path for M[u, w, i].
- 2.1. Consider any $u, w \in V$ and $i \in \{0, 1, ..., n\}$.
- 2.2. First we consider the boundary cases of the recurrence.
- 2.3.1. Case 1. Suppose u = w.
- 2.3.2. The empty path (of weight zero) is a u-to-w path.
- 2.3.3. There is no path of less weight (as the graph has no negative cycles).
- 2.3.4. So M[u, w, i] = 0, and the recurrence holds in Case 1.
- 2.4.1. Case 2. Suppose $u \neq w$, i = 0, and $(u, w) \in E$.
- 2.4.2. As i=0, the feasible paths for M[u,w,i] are the u-to-w paths with no interior vertices.
- 2.4.3. The only such path consists of just the edge (u, w), with weight wt(u, w).
- 2.4.4. So $M[u, w, i] = \mathsf{wt}(u, w)$, and the recurrence holds in Case 2.
- 2.5.1. Case 3. Suppose $u \neq w$, i = 0, and $(u, w) \notin E$.
- 2.5.2. As i=0, the feasible paths for M[u,w,i] are the u-to-w paths with no interior vertices.
- 2.5.3. Since (u, w) is not an edge, there is no such feasible path.
- 2.5.4. So $M[u, w, i] = \infty$, and the recurrence holds in Case 3.
- 2.6. Next we consider the main case of the recurrence.
- 2.7.1. Case 4. In the remaining case, $u \neq w$, and $i \neq 0$.
- 2.7.2. We show that $M[u, w, i] = \min(M[u, w, i-1], M[u, i, i-1] + M[i, w, i-1]).$
- 2.7.3. Every feasible path for M[u, w, i-1] is also feasible for M[u, w, i].
- 2.7.4. So $M[u, w, i] \leq M[u, w, i 1]$.
- 2.7.5. Next we show $M[u, w, i] \le M[u, i, i 1] + M[i, w, i 1]$.
- 2.7.6. If $M[u, i, i-1] + M[i, w, i-1] = \infty$, then the above inequality holds, so assume otherwise.
- 2.7.7. Let p_1 be a feasible path for M[u, i, i-1] with $\mathsf{wt}(p_1) = M[u, i, i-1]$.

(It exists, as M[u, i, i-1] is finite.)

- 2.7.8. Let p_2 be a feasible path for M[i, w, i-1] with $\mathsf{wt}(p_2) = M[i, w, i-1]$. (It exists, as M[i, w, i-1] is finite.)
- 2.7.9. Then $p = p_1 \cup p_2$ is a path from u to w whose interior vertices are all in $\{1, \ldots, i\}$.
- 2.7.10. That is, p is a feasible path for M[u, w, i].
- 2.7.11. So $M[u, w, i] \le \mathsf{wt}(p) = \mathsf{wt}(p_1) + \mathsf{wt}(p_2) = M[u, i, i-1] + M[i, w, i-1].$
- 2.7.12. By this and Step 2.7.4, $M[u, w, i] \leq \min(M[u, w, i-1], M[u, i, i-1] + M[i, w, i-1])$.
- 2.7.13. Next we show $M[u, w, i] \ge \min(M[u, w, i 1], M[u, i, i 1] + M[i, w, i 1])$.
- 2.7.14. If M[u, w, i] is infinite, then the inequality above holds, so assume otherwise.
- 2.7.15. Let p be an acyclic feasible path for M[u, w, i] with $\mathsf{wt}(p) = M[u, w, i]$.

(It exists, because M[u, w, i] is finite, and the graph has no negative-weight cycles.)

- 2.7.16.1. Case 4.1 First consider the case that i is not an interior vertex of p.
- 2.7.16.2. Then p is feasible for M[u, w, i-1], so $M[u, w, i-1] \le \mathsf{wt}(p) = M[u, w, i]$.
- 2.7.16.3. So $M[u, w, i] \ge \min(M[u, w, i-1], M[u, i, i-1] + M[i, w, i-1]).$
- 2.7.17.1. Case 4.2 Otherwise i occurs as an interior vertex of p, just once since p is acyclic.
- 2.7.17.2. Let p_1 be the prefix of p ending at i. Let p_2 be the suffix of p starting at i.
- 2.7.17.3. Since i occurs just once as an interior vertex of p, i is not an interior vertex of p_1 or p_2 .
- 2.7.17.4. So p_1 is a feasible path for M[u, i, i-1], and p_2 is a feasible path for M[i, w, i-1].
- 2.7.17.5. So $wt(p_1) \ge M[u, i, i-1]$, and $wt(p_2) \ge M[i, w, i-1]$.

```
\begin{array}{l} 2.7.17.6. \text{ So } M[u,w,i] = \mathsf{wt}(p) = \mathsf{wt}(p_1) + \mathsf{wt}(p_2) \geq M[u,i,i-1] + M[i,w,i-1]. \\ 2.7.17.7. \text{ So } M[u,w,i] \geq \min(M[u,w,i-1],M[u,i,i-1] + M[i,w,i-1]). \\ 2.7.18. \text{ By Blocks } 2.7.16 \text{ and } 2.7.17, \ M[u,w,i] \geq \min(M[u,w,i-1],M[u,i,i-1] + M[i,w,i-1]). \\ 2.7.19. \text{ By this and Step } 2.7.12, \ M[u,w,i] = \min(M[u,w,i-1],M[u,i,i-1] + M[i,w,i-1]). \end{array}
```

2.7.20. So the recurrence holds in Case 4.

2.8. By Blocks 2.3-2.7, the recurrence holds for M[u, w, i].