

Non-adaptive Bellman-Ford: Yen’s improvement is optimal

Jialu Hu and László Kozma

Institut für Informatik, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany
firstname.lastname@fu-berlin.de

Abstract

The Bellman-Ford algorithm for single-source shortest paths repeatedly updates tentative distances in an operation called *relaxing an edge*. In several important applications a *non-adaptive* (oblivious) implementation is preferred, which means fixing the entire sequence of relaxations upfront, independent of the edge-weights. In a dense graph on n vertices, the algorithm in its standard form performs $(1 + o(1))n^3$ relaxations. An improvement by Yen from 1970 reduces the number of relaxations by a factor of two. We show that no further constant-factor improvements are possible, and every *non-adaptive deterministic* algorithm based on relaxations must perform $(\frac{1}{2} - o(1))n^3$ steps. This improves an earlier lower bound of Eppstein of $(\frac{1}{6} - o(1))n^3$. Given that a *non-adaptive randomized* variant of Bellman-Ford with at most $(\frac{1}{3} + o(1))n^3$ relaxations (with high probability) is known, our result implies a strict separation between deterministic and randomized strategies, answering an open question of Eppstein.

1 Introduction

The Bellman-Ford algorithm [Bel58, For56, Moo59] is a classical method for computing *single-source shortest paths* in edge-weighted, directed graphs. Similarly to Dijkstra’s algorithm, the Bellman-Ford algorithm uses *edge relaxations*. Relaxing an edge (u, v) means setting the tentative distance from the source s to v to the tentative distance from s to u plus the weight of the edge (u, v) , if this is smaller than the current tentative distance from s to v . Initially setting all tentative distances to $+\infty$, the algorithm proceeds via repeated edge-relaxations, updating tentative distances until they reach their final values, the true distances. Relaxing an edge (u, v) changes the tentative distance from s to v to its final (correct) value, if and only if the tentative distance from s to u is already correct and (u, v) is the last edge of a shortest path from s to v . Algorithms of this type are also known as *label-correcting*.

Besides correctly handling negative edge-weights, an important feature of the Bellman-Ford algorithm is that it can be executed in a *non-adaptive* (also called oblivious) way. This means that the sequence of edge-relaxations is fixed in advance, independent of the edge-weights of the input graph and independent of the outcomes of previous operations. This reduces overhead while attaining the same asymptotic worst-case bound, and makes the algorithm more amenable for implementation in parallel or distributed settings, e.g., in network routing protocols [Hed88, MR17].

*Supported by DFG Grant KO 6140/1-2.

It is easy to see that a sequence of (non-adaptive) edge-relaxations correctly computes the distance from s to v , if and only if the edges of some shortest path from s to v are relaxed in the order in which they appear on the path (possibly with other edge-relaxations in-between). Moreover, if for every possible path from s to v , the edges of the path are relaxed in the order they appear going from s to v , then the correct distance from s to v must have been computed. Conversely, if the edges of some path do not appear as a subsequence of the relaxation sequence, then, for some configuration of the edge-weights (e.g., with weights on the path set to 0 and all other weights set to 1) the correct distance will not have been reached.

The problem of finding the most efficient edge-relaxation sequence thus maps to the combinatorial problem of finding the shortest sequence of edges in which every possible path from s to another vertex appears as a subsequence. The standard version of the Bellman-Ford algorithm relaxes edges in a round-robin fashion. In its non-adaptive implementation, this requires relaxing each edge $n - 1$ times, where n is the number of vertices. In a complete directed graph this leads to $(1 + o(1))n^3$ relaxations and a proportional overall running time.

A classical improvement by Yen [Yen70] reduces the number of relaxations by a factor of two, while preserving the non-adaptive nature of the algorithm. Yen’s algorithm decomposes the edge-set of the input graph into *forward edges* and *backward edges*, both sets forming acyclic subgraphs. It then alternates between relaxing all forward- and all backward edges in topological order.

The question of whether a better relaxation order exists than the one given by Yen’s method has been open since 1970. Recently, Eppstein [Epp23] showed that every non-adaptive deterministic algorithm must do $(\frac{1}{6} + o(1))n^3$ relaxations in dense graphs, leaving open the possibility of a further factor-three improvement. Bannister and Eppstein [BE12] obtained a *randomized* improvement to Yen’s algorithm, with a high-probability guarantee on the algorithm’s success. In the non-adaptive setting, this improves Yen’s bound by a factor of $\frac{2}{3}$.

When adaptivity is allowed, i.e., the algorithm can decide which edge to relax based on the outcomes of past relaxations (and possibly other calculations involving edge-weights), better bounds are known (e.g., see [Epp23] and references therein), this setting is, however, not our concern in this paper. Lower bounds for adaptive algorithms have so far been elusive.

Our result. We show that every non-adaptive deterministic algorithm based on edge-relaxations must perform $(\frac{1}{2} - o(1))n^3$ relaxation steps on a complete directed graph with n vertices. This shows that Yen’s algorithm cannot be improved with the choice of a better relaxation sequence, by any constant factor. Moreover, since faster randomized approaches are known, randomization strictly helps for non-adaptive relaxation sequences. This answers an open question of Eppstein [Epp23].

2 Deterministic lower bound

Let G be the complete directed graph with vertex set V and edge set E , with $|V| = n$ and $|E| = n(n - 1)$, and let $s \in V$ be a special vertex (the source). Let $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote the edge-weights. Note that G is simple, containing no loops or multiple edges.

The Bellman-Ford algorithm and its variants compute the distances from s to every vertex in V by initially setting $d(s, s) = 0$ and $d(s, v) = +\infty$ for all $v \in V \setminus \{s\}$, and repeatedly performing operations $\text{relax}(e)$ for edges $e \in E$. The operation $\text{relax}(e)$ for $e = (u, v)$ sets $d(s, v) \leftarrow \min\{d(s, v), d(s, u) + w(e)\}$. The goal is to execute such steps until $d(s, v)$ is the correct distance from s to v for all $v \in V$. We assume that the graph contains no negative weight cycle (such a

cycle can be detected by checking if any relax operation still reduces tentative distances after the algorithm has finished).

As we consider non-adaptive algorithms, the behaviour of the algorithm is fully specified by the sequence of relax operations $S = (e_1, \dots, e_L)$ it performs, where $e_i \in E$ for all $1 \leq i \leq L$. We refer to $L = |S|$ as the length of the sequence.

All paths considered are simple. We say that a sequence S of edges *contains* a path (v_1, \dots, v_k) if S contains $(v_1, v_2), \dots, (v_{k-1}, v_k)$ as a subsequence (in the given order, but not necessarily contiguously). A k -path is a path (s, v_1, \dots, v_k) for some set of k distinct vertices $v_1, \dots, v_k \in V \setminus \{s\}$. We say that a sequence of edges S is k -valid, if it contains every possible k -path. By our earlier discussion, a sequence S is a valid relaxation sequence in a non-adaptive single-source shortest path algorithm, if and only if it is $(n-1)$ -valid.

Let T_k denote the length of the shortest k -valid sequence for graph G .

Theorem 2.1. $T_k \geq (k-2)\binom{n-1}{2} + (n-1)^2$, for all $2 \leq k \leq n-1$.

Our claimed result follows by setting $k = n-1$ and observing $(n-3)\binom{n-1}{2} + (n-1)^2 \geq \frac{n^3}{2} - O(n^2)$. In the remainder of the section we prove Theorem 2.1.

We proceed by induction on k . For $k = 2$, the claim holds: to contain every 2-path, a sequence must contain every edge except those pointing to s , and thus have length at least $(n-1)^2$.

Assume now $k > 2$ and let $S = (e_1, \dots, e_{T_k})$ be a shortest k -valid sequence. Observe that if S contains every k -path, then it also contains every $(k-1)$ -path, i.e., it is $(k-1)$ -valid.

For each entry e_i of S , call e_i *critical*, if and only if some h -path P with $h \leq k-1$ is contained in (e_1, \dots, e_i) but not in (e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}) . In words, e_i *finishes* P and is the first edge in the sequence to do so. Otherwise, call e_i *non-critical*.

Let N be the number of non-critical entries in S . Observe that $T_k = |S| \geq T_{k-1} + N$. This is because, as the non-critical edges are not needed for finishing any prefix of a $(k-1)$ -path, the subsequence of S obtained by removing all non-critical edges is still $(k-1)$ -valid, and thus of length at least T_{k-1} .

Let q_i be the endpoint of e_i , i.e., $e_i = (x, q_i)$, for some $x, q_i \in V$. Let Q_i denote the set of endpoints of critical edges in the sequence (e_i, \dots, e_{T_k}) . More precisely, set $Q_{T_k+1} = \emptyset$, and for $i = T_k, \dots, 1$, set $Q_i = Q_{i+1} \cup \{q_i\}$, if e_i is critical, and set $Q_i = Q_{i+1}$ if e_i is non-critical. Let us also denote, $\bar{Q}_i = (V \setminus \{s\}) \setminus Q_i$.

Call a critical entry e_i *supercritical* whenever $|Q_i| > |Q_{i+1}|$. In words, such an edge e_i adds the new endpoint q_i to the set of critical endpoints as we go right to left. As S contains paths ending in every vertex (other than the source), notice that $Q_1 = V \setminus \{s\}$. This means that there are $n-1$ supercritical entries in S . Denote these (left-to-right) by $e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_{n-1}}$, with their (distinct) endpoints $q_{i_1}, \dots, q_{i_{n-1}}$.

Consider now some supercritical edge e_i with endpoint q_i . For S to be a k -valid sequence, it must contain, after e_i , all edges of the form (q_i, y) for $y \in \bar{Q}_i$. This is because there exists some h -path (with $h \leq k-1$) P ending in q_i that is contained in (e_1, \dots, e_i) but not in (e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}) . Thus, the $(h+1)$ -path formed by appending the edge (q_i, y) to P cannot be contained in (e_1, \dots, e_i) , but must be contained in S . Notice that such a later occurrence of (q_i, y) cannot be critical, as then $y \in Q_i$, and therefore $y \notin \bar{Q}_i$ would follow. Thus, (q_i, y) must appear as a non-critical entry.

Repeating the argument for each supercritical edge, we conclude that all edges (q_{i_b}, q_{i_a}) for $1 \leq a < b \leq n - 1$ must appear as non-critical entries. This implies a lower bound on the number of non-critical entries $N \geq \binom{n-1}{2}$, from which $T_k = |S| \geq T_{k-1} + \binom{n-1}{2}$ follows. Using the induction hypothesis to lower bound T_{k-1} yields the claimed result.

References

- [BE12] Michael J. Bannister and David Eppstein. Randomized speedup of the Bellman–Ford algorithm. In *2012 Proceedings of the Ninth Workshop on Analytic Algorithmics and Combinatorics (ANALCO)*, pages 41–47. SIAM, 2012.
- [Bel58] Richard Bellman. On a routing problem. *Quarterly of applied mathematics*, 16(1):87–90, 1958.
- [Epp23] David Eppstein. Lower bounds for non-adaptive shortest path relaxation. In *Algorithms and Data Structures - 18th International Symposium, WADS 2023, Proceedings*, volume 14079 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 416–429. Springer, 2023.
- [For56] Lester Randolph Ford. *Network flow theory*. 1956.
- [Hed88] Charles Hedrick. *Routing Information Protocol*, June 1988. RFC 1058.
- [Moo59] Edward F. Moore. The shortest path through a maze. In *Proc. of the International Symposium on the Theory of Switching*, pages 285–292. Harvard University Press, 1959.
- [MR17] Deep Medhi and Karthik Ramasamy. *Network routing: algorithms, protocols, and architectures*. Morgan Kaufmann, 2017.
- [Yen70] Jin Y. Yen. An algorithm for finding shortest routes from all source nodes to a given destination in general networks. *Quarterly of applied mathematics*, 27(4):526–530, 1970.