

# Shortest-paths – Proofs

- ▶ Weight of path  $p = v_0 \rightarrow v_1 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow v_k$ :

$$w(p) = \sum_{i=1}^k w(v_{i-1}, v_i)$$

- ▶ Shortest-path weight  $u \rightsquigarrow v$

$$\delta(u, v) = \begin{cases} \min\{w(p) : u \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} v\} & \text{if there exists a path } u \rightsquigarrow v \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- ▶ Shortest-path  $u \rightsquigarrow v$

any path  $p$  such that  $w(p) = \delta(u, v)$

# Shortest-paths – Proofs

Triangular inequality:

for all  $(u, v) \in E$ ,  $\delta(u, v) \leq \delta(u, x) + \delta(x, v)$ .

*Proof: Note that*

Weight of shortest path  $s \rightsquigarrow v$   $\leq$  weight of any path  $s \rightsquigarrow v$

*The path  $s \rightsquigarrow u \rightarrow v$  is a path  $s \rightsquigarrow v$ , and if we use a shortest path  $s \rightsquigarrow u$ , its weight is  $\delta(u, x) + \delta(x, v)$ .*

# Shortest-paths – Proofs

Upper-bound property:

*Always have  $d[v] \geq \delta(s, v)$  for all  $v$ . Once  $d[v] = \delta(s, v)$ , it never changes.*

*Proof.* Initially true. Suppose there exists a vertex such that  $d[v] < \delta(s, v)$ . Without loss of generality,  $v$  is first vertex for which this happens. Let  $u$  be the vertex that causes  $d[v]$  change. Then  $d[v] = d[u] + w(u, v)$ . So

$$\begin{aligned} d[v] &< \delta(s, v) \\ &\leq \delta(s, u) + w(u, v) \\ &\leq d[u] + w(u, v) \end{aligned}$$

which implies  $d[v] < d[u] + w(u, v)$ . Contradicts  $d[v] = d[u] + w(u, v)$ . Once  $d[v]$  reaches  $\delta(s, v)$ , it never goes lower. It never goes up, since relaxations only lower shortest-path weights.

# Shortest-paths – Proofs

No-path property:

If  $\delta(s, v) = \infty$ , then  $d[v] = \infty$  always.

*Proof.*  $d[v] \geq \delta(s, v) = \infty \Rightarrow d[v] = \infty$ .

# Shortest-paths – Proofs

Convergence property:

*If  $s \rightsquigarrow u \rightarrow v$  is a shortest-path, and  $d[u] = \delta(s, u)$ . Then after “Relax  $u \rightarrow v$ ”,  $d[v] = \delta(s, v)$ .*

*Proof.* After relaxation

$$\begin{aligned}d[v] &\leq d[u] + w(u, v) \\&= \delta(s, u) + w(u, v) \\&= \delta(s, v)\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have  $d[v] \geq \delta(s, v)$ . Therefore, it must have  $d[v] = \delta(s, v)$ .

# Shortest-paths – Proofs

## Path relaxation property

*Let  $p = v_0 \rightarrow v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_k$  be a shortest-path. If we relax in order,  $(v_0, v_1), (v_1, v_2), \dots, (v_{k-1}, v_k)$ , even intermixed with other relaxations, then  $d[v_k] = \delta(v_0, v_k)$ .*

*Proof.* Induction to show  $d[v_i] = \delta(s, v_i)$  after  $(v_{i-1}, v_i)$  is relaxed.

- ▶ Basis step:  $i = 0$ . Initially  $d[v_0] = \delta(s, v_0) = \delta(s, s)$
- ▶ Inductive step: Assume  $d[v_{i-1}] = \delta(s, v_{i-1})$ . Relax  $(v_{i-1}, v_i)$ . By convergence property,  $d[v_i] = \delta(s, v_i)$  afterward and  $d[v_i]$  never changes.

# Shortest-paths – Proofs

## Correctness of the Bellman-Ford algorithm

*It is guaranteed to converge after  $|V| - 1$  passes, assuming no negative-weight cycles.*

*Proof.* Use path-relaxation property.

Let  $v$  be reachable from  $s$ , and let  $p = v_0 \rightarrow v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_k$  be the shortest path from  $s$  to  $v$ , where  $v_0 = s$  and  $v_k = v$ .

Since  $p$  is acyclic, it has  $\leq |V| - 1$  edges, so that  $k \leq |V| - 1$  edges.

Each iteration of the **for** loop relaxes all edges:

- ▶ First iteration relaxes  $(v_0, v_1)$
- ▶ Second iteration relaxes  $(v_1, v_2)$
- ▶ ...
- ▶  $k$ th iteration relaxes  $(v_{k-1}, v_k)$

By the path-relaxation property,  $d[v] = d[v_k] = \delta(s, v_k) = \delta(s, v)$ .

# Shortest-paths – Proofs

## Correctness of Dijkstra's algorithm

*Show that  $d[u] = \delta(s, u)$  when  $u$  is added to  $S$  in each iteration.*

*Proof:*

- ▶ We prove by contradiction. Suppose there exists  $u$  such that  $d[u] \neq \delta(s, u)$ . Without loss of generality, let  $u$  be the first vertex for which  $d[u] \neq \delta(s, u)$  when  $u$  is added to  $S$  in each iteration.
- ▶ Observation:
  - ▶  $u \neq s$ , since  $d[s] = \delta(s, s) = 0$ .
  - ▶ Therefore,  $s \in S$  and  $S \neq \emptyset$
  - ▶ There must have been some path  $s \rightsquigarrow u$ , since otherwise  $d[u] = \delta(s, u) = \infty$  by no-path property.

So, there is a path  $s \rightsquigarrow u$ . Then there is a shortest path  $s \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} u$ .

- ▶ Just before  $u$  is added to  $S$ , path  $p$  connects a vertex in  $S$  (i.e.,  $s$ ) to a vertex in  $V - S$  (i.e.,  $u$ ). Let  $y$  be first vertex along  $p$  that's in  $V - S$  and let  $x$  be  $y$ 's predecessor.
- ▶ Decompose  $p$  into

$$s \overset{p_1}{\rightsquigarrow} x \rightarrow y \overset{p_2}{\rightsquigarrow} u$$

(could have  $x = s$  or  $y = u$ , so that  $p_1$  or  $p_2$  may have no edges.)



# Shortest-paths – Proofs

## Correctness of Dijkstra's algorithm, cont'd

► Claim:<sup>1</sup>  $d[y] = \delta(s, y)$  when  $u$  is added to  $S$ .

► Now we can get a contradiction to  $d[u] \neq \delta(s, u)$ :

$y$  is on shortest path  $s \rightsquigarrow u$ , and all edge weights are nonnegative

$$\Downarrow$$
$$\delta(s, y) \leq \delta(s, u)$$

$$\Downarrow$$
$$d[y] = \delta(s, y) \leq \delta(s, u) \leq d[u] \text{ (upper bound property)}$$

Also, both  $y$  and  $u$  were in  $Q$  when we chose  $u$ , so that

$$d[u] \leq d[y]$$

Therefore,  $d[y] = \delta(s, y) = \delta(s, u) = d[u]$ . Contradicts assumption that  $d[u] \neq \delta(s, u)$ .

► Hence, Dijkstra's algorithm is correct.

---

<sup>1</sup>Proof.  $x \in S$  and  $u$  is the first vertex such that  $d[u] = \delta(s, u)$  when  $u$  is added to  $S$   $\Rightarrow d[x] = \delta(s, x)$  when  $x$  is added to  $S$ . Relaxed  $(x, y)$  at that time, so by the convergence property,  $d[y] = \delta(s, y)$ .