# Poll: Attendance

Today is

- A) Monday
- B) Tuesday
- C) Wednesday
- D) Thursday
- E) Friday

# Plan for today

- 1. Directed acyclic graphs and topological sort
- 2. Algorithms for topological sort

# **COSC 290 Discrete Structures**

Lecture 20: Graph search continued

Prof. Michael Hay Friday, Mar. 23, 2018

Colgate University

Directed acyclic graphs and topological sort

# **Recall: Directed Acyclic Graphs**

## Definition (Directed Acyclic Graph)

A directed acyclic graph (DAG) is a directed graph that contains no directed cycles.

### Example



Figure 1: Example DAG

# Algorithms for topological ordering

Today, we will look at three algorithms:

- · version 1: repeatedly find a "minimal" vertex
- · version 2: same idea, more efficient than v1
- · version 3: based on depth-first search (as efficient as v2)

# Topological ordering

## Definition

Given a DAG, a topological ordering is an ordering of the vertices (a sequence) such that for every directed edge  $(u,v) \in E$ , vertex u comes before v in the ordering.

### Example

Continuing the todo list example, a topological ordering is valid way to order the tasks such that all precedence constraints are obeyed.

- · borrowBook, study, eat, brushTeeth, sleep, attendClass
- · eat, brushTeeth, sleep, borrowBook, study, attendClass

are both valid topological orderings.

Algorithms for topological sort

# Version 1: repeatedly find minimal

8: return order

```
Input: Directed graph G = (V, E).
Output: list of vertices, in some topological order
 1: Initialize order to empty list
 2: S := V
 3: while S is not empty do
      X := findMinimal(S)
       choose any x from X
       S := S - \{x\}
       append x to order
                                              put x at end of order
```

Where findMinimal(S) returns a subset of  $X \subseteq S$  of vertices that are minimal with respect to S.

x is minimal with respect to S if  $x \in S$  and  $\forall v \in S - \{x\} : (v,x) \notin E$ .

(Apply to example on board.)

## Version 2: same idea, more efficient

```
Input: Directed graph G = (V, E).
Output: list of vertices, in some topological order
 1: Initialize order to empty list
 2: Let count[x] := |\{ y \in V : (y, x) \in E \}|. \triangleright count x's incoming edges
 3: Initialize X := \{x \in V : count[x] = 0\}.
                                                          ⊳ x is minimal
 4: while X is not empty do
       remove any x from X
       append x to order
                                                 put x at end of order
       for each y \in V such that (x, y) \in E do

    v is x's neighbor

           count[v] := count[v] - 1
 8:
           if count[y] = 0 then ▷ y is now minimal among remaining
 9:
              X := X \cup \{y\}
                                                            ⊳ add y to X
11: return order
```

(Apply to example on board, Why more efficient than version 1?)

## Poll: Reasoning about findMinimal

```
findMinimal(S) returns a subset of X \subseteq S of vertices that are minimal
with respect to S, x is minimal with respect to S if x \in S and
\forall v \in S - \{x\} : (v, x) \notin E.
Let's consider how X changes in each iteration of previous
algorithm. Let's use X^{(1)} to denote X in first iteration, X^{(2)} to denote X
in second iteration, etc. So, for example,

    X<sup>(1)</sup> := findMinimal(V)

   • X^{(2)} := findMinimal(V - \{x\}) for some x \in findMinimal(V)
What must be true about X(1) and X(2)? Choose the best answer:
A) X<sup>(1)</sup> ⊂ X<sup>(2)</sup>
B) X^{(2)} \subset X^{(1)}

 C) X<sup>(2)</sup> - X<sup>(1)</sup> could contain any vertex in V - { x }

D) if v \in X^{(2)} - X^{(1)}, then v is a neighbor of x
F) More than one of above
```

11: return order

```
Poll: Reasoning about version 2
                                                   Initially the count for each
  Input: Directed graph G = (V, E).
                                                   vertex x is equal to x's
  Output: list of vertices, in some
                                                   in-degree (number of
      topological order
                                                   incoming edges). Vertex x will
   1: Initialize order to empty list
                                                   only be added to the order
   2: Let count[x] := |\{ y \in V : (y, x) \in E \}|.
                                                    when its count reaches zero.
   3: Initialize X := \{ x \in V : count[x] = 0 \}.
                                                   Suppose the initial count for
   4: while X is not empty do
                                                   vertex v is 2 and for vertex v'
         remove any x from X
                                                   is 1. Which of the following
         append x to order
                                                   statements is most accurate
                                                    about the final order?
         for each y \in V such that (x, y) \in E
      do
                                                   A) v appears before v'
             count[v] := count[v] - 1
   8:
                                                   B) y' appears before y
             if count[y] = 0 then
   9:
                                                   C) y may appear before y'
                 X := X \cup \{v\}
                                                   D) y' may appear before y
```

F) more than one of above

## Version 3

Version 3 is based on depth-first search.

It is as efficient as version 2.

# Depth-first search

- 1: function DFS(x, marked)
- : marked[x] := true
- 3: for each neighbor y of x do
  α: if marked(v) = false then
- 5: DFS(y, marked)

## Apply to example:

- · Initialize marked[x] := false for all x.
- · DFS(e, marked)
- DFS(a, marked)

# Poll: DFS behavior

- 1: function DFS(x, marked)
- 2: marked[x] := true
- 3: for each neighbor y of x do
- 4: **if** marked[y] = false **then** 5: DFS(v, marked)

What does a single invocation of DFS(x, marked) do?

- Δ) It marks x
- B) It marks x and x's neighbors
- C) It marks x and x's previously unmarked neighbors
- D) It marks x and x's descendants
- E) It marks x and x's previously unmarked descendants

# **Key property**

Key property After the recursive calls on neighbors, all of x's descendants have been marked.

Suppose we modify procedure to build up a total order as it goes. Thus, recursive calls on neighbors on x's neighbors add them to the order. Given above property, when/where should we add x?

11

12

10

# Keeping track of topological order

1: function DES(x, marked, order) marked[x] := truefor each neighbor y of x do if marked[v] = false then DFS(y, marked, order)

new parameter order

 put x at front of order prepend x to order

Why prepend to order after for loop? Why not append to order before for loop?

# Poll: reasoning about BadDFS

function BADDFS(x, marked, order) marked[x] := trueappend x to order for each neighbor y of x do if marked[y] = false then BADDFS(y, marked, order) Suppose marked[x] := falsefor all x. Then we call BADDFS(a, marked). Assuming that d appears before b in a's list of neighbors, what does the algorithm output?

A) a, b, d, e B) a, b, d, e, c

C) a. d. b. e.

D) a. d. b. e. c

E) More than one / None of ahove

## Incorrect version

This version does not work:

1: function BADDFS(x, marked, order)

marked[x] := trueappend x to order 3:

put x at end of order

if marked[y] = false then 6:

for each neighbor y of x do BADDFS(v. marked, order)

## Good vs. bad

function DES(x, marked, order) marked[x] := truefor each neighbor y of x do if marked[v] = false then

DFS(v. marked, order) prepend x to order

function BADDFS(x, marked, order)

marked[x] := trueappend x to order for each neighbor v of x do if marked[v] = false then BADDFS(y, marked, order)

DFS is correct; BadDFS is not. Why does DFS work?

- · Suppose marked initialized to all false, and we call DFS( $x_0$ , marked, order) for some  $x_0$ . Computation ensues and now, for some x, DFS(x, marked, order) is about to be executed.
- · Consider x's ancestors: have they been added to order?
- · Consider x's descendants; have they been added to order?

# Wrapping up

Version 3, which uses DFS to help with topological sort, is wrapped up at the beginning of the next class.