

# Single-Source Shortest Paths with Negative Real Weights in $\tilde{O}(mn^{8/9})$ Time

Jeremy T. Fineman  
Georgetown University  
jf474@georgetown.edu

## Abstract

This paper presents a randomized algorithm for the problem of single-source shortest paths on directed graphs with real (both positive and negative) edge weights. Given an input graph with  $n$  vertices and  $m$  edges, the algorithm completes in  $\tilde{O}(mn^{8/9})$  time with high probability. For real-weighted graphs, this result constitutes the first asymptotic improvement over the classic  $O(mn)$ -time algorithm variously attributed to Shimbel, Bellman, Ford, and Moore.

# 1 Introduction

This paper considers the problem of single-source shortest paths (SSSP) with possibly negative real weights. The input to the SSSP problem is a directed graph  $G = (V, E, w)$  with real edge weights given by the function  $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and a designated source vertex  $s$ . If the graph does not contain any negative-weight cycles, then the goal is to output the shortest-path distance from the source  $s$  to every vertex  $v \in V$ . If there is a negative-weight cycle in the graph, then the algorithm should instead report the presence of such a cycle.<sup>1</sup>

The classic algorithm for SSSP with real weights, due to Shimbel [15], Ford [8], Bellman [2], and Moore [14], henceforth called the Bellman-Ford algorithm, has a running time of  $O(mn)$  on a graph with  $m$  edges and  $n$  vertices. With no further restrictions to graph topology or weights, this algorithm remains the best known algorithm for SSSP. When the weights are all *nonnegative* reals, Dijkstra’s algorithm applies, which can be made to run in  $O(m + n \log n)$  time [9].

For the case of *integer* weights (negative and positive), there has been significant further progress [1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 16], culminating in a nearly linear-time algorithm [3]. All of these integer-weight solutions apply a scaling approach, and their running times depend on at least a  $\log W$  term, where  $-W$  is the most-negative weight in the graph. The  $O(mn)$ -time Bellman-Ford algorithm remains the best strongly polynomial runtime known even for the case of integer weights.

The main result of this paper is captured by the following theorem. Throughout the paper, the model used is a Real RAM to allow for standard manipulation of edge weights in constant time; specifically, addition, subtraction, negation, and comparison of real numbers (i.e., the edge weights) each take constant time. (The algorithms presented in this paper do not perform any multiplication or division of edge weights.)

**Theorem 1.1.** *There exists a (Las Vegas) randomized algorithm that solves the SSSP problem for real-weighted graphs in  $\tilde{O}(mn^{8/9})$  time, with high probability, where  $m$  is the number of edges and  $n$  is the number of vertices in the graph.*

## 1.1 Preliminaries

The  $\tilde{O}$  denotes the soft-O notation. Formally,  $f(x) = \tilde{O}(g(x))$  if there exists an integer  $k$  such that  $f(x) = O(g(x) \cdot \log^k(g(x)))$ .

For the following, consider a graph  $G = (V, E, w)$ , let  $m = |E|$  and  $n = |V|$ . For a path  $p$ , the total **weight** of the path is given by  $w(p) = \sum_{e \in p} w(e)$ . The **size** of the path is the number of edges on the path, denoted by  $|p|$ . A **cycle**  $C$  is a path that starts and ends at the same vertex, and a negative-weight cycle is one where  $w(C) < 0$ . A path  $p$  from  $u$  to  $v$  is a **shortest path** if all  $u$ -to- $v$  paths  $p'$  satisfy  $w(p) \leq w(p')$ . If there exists a shortest path  $p$  from  $u$  to  $v$ , then we define the **shortest-path distance** from  $u$ -to- $v$  as  $dist_G(u, v) = w(p)$ ; if there is no  $u$ -to- $v$  path, then  $dist_G(u, v) = \infty$ ; if there is a path but no shortest path (i.e., there is a negative-weight cycle), then  $dist_G(u, v) = -\infty$ . When  $G$  is clear from context, we often write  $dist(u, v)$  in place of  $dist_G(u, v)$ .

For a subset  $S \subseteq V$  of vertices, the shortest-path distance from any vertex in  $S$  to  $v$ , denoted by  $dist_G(S, v)$ , is defined as

$$dist_G(S, v) = \min_{u \in S} (dist_G(u, v)) .$$

The problem of computing  $dist_G(S, v)$  for all  $v \in V$  corresponds to that of solving SSSP on a slightly augmented graph: create a “super source” vertex  $s$ , for all  $u \in S$  add edges  $(s, u)$  with

---

<sup>1</sup>Some algorithms only report a negative-weight cycle if such a cycle is reachable from  $s$ . But it is not hard to build black-box reductions from each version of the problem to the other.

$w(s, u) = 0$  to the graph, and finally solve SSSP from the super source  $s$  in the augmented graph. Johnson’s algorithm [12] uses this same graph augmentation with  $S = V$ .

**Simplifying assumptions (without loss of generality).** We shall make the following assumptions about the input graph throughout. (1) If  $(u, v) \in E$  and  $w(u, v) < 0$ , then  $u$  has only one outgoing edge; thus, there are at most  $n$  negative-weight edges in the graph.<sup>2</sup> (2) Every vertex has degree at most  $O(m/n)$ ; thus, a subgraph on  $n/r$  vertices has  $O(m/r)$  edges.<sup>3</sup> These assumptions are without loss of generality as they can be obtained from an arbitrary input graph via a simple graph transformation without increasing the size of the graph by more than a constant factor and without changing distances between vertices in the original vertex set.

We shall also assume that  $m \geq 2n$  to keep some of the statements of performance bounds more concise. A constant of at least two here also implies that the number of edges is dominated by the number of edges with nonnegative weight.

**Hop-limited shortest paths.** It is a simple exercise to construct a SSSP algorithm that runs in  $\tilde{O}(hm)$  time when shortest paths are limited to  $h \geq 1$  negative-weight edges or “hops.” (Section 2 introduces corresponding notation and briefly summarizes such an algorithm.) The novel algorithm in this paper applies hop-limited SSSP as a subroutine.

## Price functions

As with most of the integer-weight algorithms for SSSP, the algorithm in this paper relies on price functions introduced by Johnson [12] to transform the graph to an equivalent one without negative weights; then Dijkstra’s algorithm can be used to solve the SSSP problem on the reweighted graph. In more detail, a **price function** is a function  $\phi : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Given a price function  $\phi$ , define  $w_\phi(u, v) = w(u, v) + \phi(u) - \phi(v)$  and  $G_\phi = (V, E, w_\phi)$ . Modifying the weights in this way has the following key properties [12]: (1) every cycle  $C$  has the same weight in both  $G$  and  $G_\phi$ , so negative-weight cycles are preserved, and (2) a path  $p$  is a shortest path in  $G_\phi$  if and only if it is a shortest path in  $G$ . More precisely, all  $u$ -to- $v$  paths  $p$  satisfy  $w_\phi(p) = w(p) + \phi(u) - \phi(v)$ ; if  $p$  is a cycle then  $\phi(u) = \phi(v)$  and hence  $w_\phi(p) = w(p)$ . Price functions also compose in the natural way, i.e.,  $(w_{\phi_1})_{\phi_2}(u, v) = w_{\phi_1 + \phi_2}(u, v)$ .

We call  $\phi$  or  $w_\phi$  a **valid reweighting** if  $w_\phi$  does not cause any edge weights to become negative. That is, if  $\forall e \in E((w(e) \geq 0) \implies (w_\phi(e) \geq 0))$ . We say that  $\phi$  or  $w_\phi$  **eliminates** a negative edge  $e \in E$  if  $w(e) < 0$  and  $w_\phi(e) \geq 0$ .

Johnson [12] shows that (assuming no negative-weight cycles) the problem of eliminating *all* negative-weight edges can be accomplished by setting  $\phi(v) = \text{dist}(V, v)$ . Using Bellman-Ford to solve the super-source problem, the running time is  $O(mn)$ . When there are  $k \ll n$  negative-weight edges, applying hop-limited SSSP is better, giving a running time of  $\tilde{O}(km)$ .

---

<sup>2</sup>This first assumption is for convenience of exposition, not to simplify the algorithm. The assumption implies a one-to-one correspondence between negative-weight edges and vertices with outgoing negative-weight edges, so referring to either is equivalent. Without the assumption, various statements and definitions would need to be altered, but the algorithm would otherwise remain unchanged.

<sup>3</sup>This second assumption is common in randomized graph algorithms. Unlike the first, this one does simplify the algorithm. For example, to obtain the same results without this assumption, vertices would have to be randomly sampled proportional to their degree instead of uniformly.

## 1.2 Main Result

This paper solves the problem of efficiently computing a reweighting that eliminates a significant number of negative-weight edges. We say that an algorithm is an  **$f(k)$ -elimination algorithm** if, when given an input graph  $G = (V, E, w)$  with  $k = |\{e \in E \mid w(e) < 0\}|$  negative-weight edges, the algorithm either (1) computes a valid reweighting that eliminates at least  $f(k)$  negative-weight edges<sup>4</sup>, or (2) correctly determines that the graph contains a negative-weight cycle. Given an  $f(k)$ -elimination algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$ , SSSP can be solved by repeatedly applying  $\mathcal{A}$  until no negative-weight edges remain, and then applying Dijkstra’s algorithm.<sup>5</sup> This strategy of gradually eliminating negative-weight edges is reminiscent of Goldberg’s algorithm [11] for integer-weighted graphs.

**Theorem 1.2.** *There exists a randomized  $\Theta(k^{1/3})$ -elimination algorithm for real-weighted graphs that has running time  $\tilde{O}(mk^{2/9})$ , with high probability, where  $m$  and  $k$  are the number of edges and negative-weight edges in the input graph, respectively.*

**Theorem 1.1 is a corollary of Theorem 1.2.** A similar argument occurs in [11], so the full proof is omitted here. The main idea is that  $O(k^{2/3})$  repetitions of  $\Theta(k^{1/3})$ -elimination suffice to reduce the number of negative-weight edges by a constant factor. The total running time of these repetitions is  $\tilde{O}(mk^{8/9}) = \tilde{O}(mn^{8/9})$  to reduce  $k \leq n$  by a constant factor. And  $O(\log n)$  of these constant-factor reductions are enough to eliminate all negative-weight edges.

**Sketch of algorithm.** The remainder of this paper focuses on solving the problem of  $\Theta(k^{1/3})$ -elimination, thereby proving Theorem 1.2. At a very high level, the algorithm entails reweighting the graph so that  $\Omega(k^{1/3})$  of the negative-weight edges are “remote” or “far away” from most of the graph. (In particular, only an  $O(1/k^{1/9})$  fraction of the graph is “nearby” these edges.) Then, reweight the graph again to eliminate these  $\Theta(k^{1/3})$  negative-weight edges by applying Johnson’s strategy. Because these remote edges are far from most of the graph, it turns out that it is possible to eliminate these edges in  $\tilde{O}(k^{1/3} \cdot (m/k^{1/9})) = \tilde{O}(k^{2/9}m)$  time, which improves over the straightforward but insufficient  $\tilde{O}(k^{1/3}m)$  bound by a factor of  $k^{1/9}$ .

A key challenge is, of course, to establish this remote subset of negative-weight edges. The algorithm modifies the starting graph in two ways as it progresses: the algorithm performs several gradual reweighting steps to ensure remoteness, and the algorithm drops some negative edges from consideration. Each gradual reweighting uses hop-limited shortest paths. In slightly more detail, the first reweighting selects a random sample of vertices and uses hop-limited shortest paths to “spread out” the graph. Then, search for a large subset of negative edges that are relatively “close together,” or failing that find a large subset that are “independent.” (Resolving the latter case is easier.) Drop all other negative edges from consideration. Another reweighting moves most of the graph away from those close-together edges, making the edges remote. Then a final reweighting step is performed to eliminate these now remote edges; this last reweighting is the only one guaranteed to eliminate any negative-weight edges.

### Outline

Before giving any further detail of the algorithm, Section 2 establishes useful notations and definitions to formalize these types of manipulations. Section 3 then gives an overview of the algorithm

<sup>4</sup>The reweighted graph  $G_\phi$  thus has at most  $k - f(k)$  negative-weight edges.

<sup>5</sup>To be useful, the running time of the elimination algorithm should be much better than  $O(mf(k))$ , i.e., much better than  $O(m)$  per edge eliminated. Obtaining an algorithm whose runtime is  $\tilde{O}(m/k^\epsilon)$  per eliminated edge would generally translate to an  $\tilde{O}(mn^{1-\epsilon})$  algorithm for SSSP.

with some intuition. Finally, Sections 4–7 provide details of each step of the algorithm and the analysis.

## 2 Preliminaries

This section provides basic definitions and notation. In addition, this section discusses one of the main black-box subroutines: hop-limited shortest path. There are various definitions introduced later in the paper as well, but most of those represent novel insights into the structure of an efficient solution. This section also includes several useful claims for which the proofs are all simple exercises and hence omitted.

**General graph notation.** Consider a graph  $G = (V, E, w)$ , and let  $X \subseteq V$  be any subset of vertices. Then  $out(X)$  denotes the set of outgoing edges from  $X$ , i.e.,  $out(X) = \{(x, y) \in E \mid x \in X\}$ .

For a fixed target  $t$ , the problem of computing  $dist_G(u, t)$  for all  $u \in V$  is called the **single-target shortest-paths (STSP)** problem. This problem can be solved by solving SSSP from  $t$  in the transpose graph. The **transpose graph** is the graph obtained by reversing all the edges. That is, the transpose graph is a graph  $G^T = (V, E^T, w^T)$  where  $E^T = \{(v, u) \mid (u, v) \in E\}$  and  $w^T(v, u) = w(u, v)$ .

**Negative edges, nonnegative edges, and the input graph.** The **input graph** refers to the graph  $G$  on which the main algorithm of Theorem 1.2 is called, possibly with a modified weight function. We shall always denote the input graph by  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$ , where the edge set has been partitioned into the **nonnegative edges**  $E^+$  and the **negative edges**  $E^-$ . Initially,  $E^+ = \{e \in E \mid w(e) \geq 0\}$  and  $E^- = \{e \in E \mid w(e) < 0\}$ , where  $E = E^+ \cup E^-$  is the full edge set. For every edge  $(u, v) \in E^-$ , the vertex  $u$  is called a **negative vertex**. Recall that, WLOG, every negative vertex has one outgoing edge. Throughout, let  $n = |V|$ ,  $m = |E|$ , and  $k = |E^-|$ .

As a slight abuse of notation, the  $\cup$  symbol in  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$  is not simply a union, but also signifies which edges are classified as negative edges (those in  $E^-$ ), and which are nonnegative (those in  $E^+$ ). As the algorithm progresses, the weight function changes, but the classification of edges does not. Thus, having a negative edge  $(u, v) \in E^-$  with  $w(e) \geq 0$  is allowed; that edge is still called a negative edge, and  $u$  is still called negative vertex. In contrast, because the algorithm only produces valid price function, it shall always be the case that  $w(e) \geq 0$  for all  $e \in E^+$ .

Whenever the partition is not provided, e.g., if referring to an auxiliary graph  $H = (V', E', w')$ , then implicitly the term “negative edges” refers to those edges whose weight is negative.

**(Negative)-hop-limited paths and distances.** A path  $p$  is an  **$h$ -hop path** if at most  $h$  of the edges on the path are negative edges. Nonnegative edges do not count towards the number of hops. Paths need not be simple, and each occurrence of a negative edge contributes to the hop count.

The  $h$ -hop distance, denoted

$$dist_G^h(u, v) = \min \{w(p) \mid p \text{ is an } h\text{-hop path from } u \text{ to } v \text{ in } G\} ,$$

is the weight of a shortest  $h$ -hop path from  $u$  to  $v$ ; define  $dist_G^h(u, v) = \infty$  if there is no path from  $u$  to  $v$ . We also extend the distance notation to be distance from a set of vertices (as in Section 1). Specifically, for any  $S \subseteq V$ , define  $dist_G^h(S, v) = \min_{u \in S} (dist_G^h(u, v))$ . When  $G$  is clear from context, we often write  $dist^h$  instead of  $dist_G^h$ . Note that unlike regular distance, if  $v$  is reachable from  $u$ , then  $dist_G^h(u, v)$  is always finite, even with negative-weight cycles.

Just as with normal distance, it is easy to see that  $h$ -hop distances obey a form of the triangle inequality, which has been adjusted to incorporate the hop counts.

**Lemma 2.1** (Triangle inequality). *For all integers  $h_1, h_2 \geq 0$  and all vertices  $x, y, z$ , we have*

$$\text{dist}^{h_1+h_2}(x, z) \leq \text{dist}^{h_1}(x, y) + \text{dist}^{h_2}(y, z) .$$

*It follows that for any nonnegative edge  $(y, z)$ ,  $\text{dist}^{h_1}(x, z) \leq \text{dist}^{h_1}(x, y) + w(y, z)$ .*

If  $\text{dist}_G^h(u, v) < 0$  or  $\text{dist}_G^h(v, u) < 0$ , then we say that  $u$  and  $v$  are  ***$h$ -hop related***. The ***negative  $h$ -hop reach*** of a vertex  $u$  is the set of vertices that can be reached by a negative-weight  $h$ -hop path. More generally, for a set subset  $S \subseteq V$  of vertices, the negative  $h$ -hop reach of  $S$  is

$$R_G^h(S) = \left\{ v \in V \mid \text{dist}_G^h(S, v) < 0 \right\} .$$

The ***size*** of the reach is its cardinality. As with distance, the subscript  $G$  may be dropped when  $G$  is clear from context.

**Reweighting and invariance of  $h$ -hop paths.** The algorithm performs several steps that each partially reweight the graph by way of a sequence of price functions  $\phi$ . The notation  $G_\phi = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w_\phi)$  denotes the reweighted graph, i.e., the input graph reweighted by price function  $\phi$ . When  $G$  is clear from context, we use the subscript  $\phi$  as a shorthand for  $G_\phi$  in all notations where the subscript specifies the graph of concern, i.e.,  $\text{dist}_\phi^h$  means  $\text{dist}_{G_\phi}^h$  and  $R_\phi^h$  means  $R_{G_\phi}^h$ .

The classification of edges as negative or nonnegative does not change when the graph is reweighted, and the validity of the price function is defined with respect to the initial classification. Specifically, a price function  $\phi$  is ***valid*** if for all  $e \in E^+$ ,  $w_\phi(e) \geq 0$ . When going from a price function  $\phi$  to a price function  $\phi'$ , the function  $\phi'$  can still be valid even if there exists  $e \in E^-$  with  $w_\phi(e) \geq 0$  and  $w_{\phi'}(e) < 0$ .

Importantly, since the classification of edges does not change,  $h$ -hop paths in the input graph are invariant across reweighting. That is, a path  $p$  is an  $h$ -hop path in  $G_\phi = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w_\phi)$  if and only if it is an  $h$ -hop path in  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$ . Ensuring this invariant is the primary reason negative edges were defined in the specific manner above. This invariant shall allow us to more-cleanly reason about paths and distances when the algorithm performs several reweighting steps. Specifically, we immediately have the following.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Consider the input graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$ , and let  $\phi$  be a price function. Then for all  $u, v \in V$ , we have*

$$\text{dist}_\phi^h(u, v) = \text{dist}^h(u, v) + \phi(u) - \phi(v) .$$

**Computing  $h$ -hop distances.** Given a source vertex  $s$ , the problem of computing  $h$ -hop distances from  $s$  to all other vertices is called the  ***$h$ -limited SSSP problem***. There is a natural solution for  $h$ -limited SSSP that combines Bellman-Ford and Dijkstra’s algorithm, called BFD here.<sup>6</sup> BFD interleaves  $(h + 1)$  full executions of Dijkstra’s algorithm (but without reinitializing distances) on the nonnegative edges and  $h$  “rounds” of Bellman-Ford on the negative edges.<sup>7</sup> The running time of BFD is thus  $O(hm \log n)$  when  $h \geq 1$ .

<sup>6</sup>See, e.g., [7], for a deeper discussion of one variant of this algorithm. Bernstein et al. [3] apply an optimized version of BFD that does not reconsider a vertex in the next round unless its distance has improved; their algorithm for integer-weight SSSP leverages a tighter bound for the case that most shortest paths have few hops.

<sup>7</sup>A “round” of Bellman-Ford means “relaxing” all the edges once. A full execution of Bellman-Ford is  $n$  rounds.

**Lemma 2.3** (Follows from, e.g., [3, 7]). *Consider a graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$  with  $w(e) \geq 0$  for all  $e \in E^+$ , and let  $n = |V|$ ,  $m = |V|$ , and  $k = |E^-|$ . BFD solves the  $h$ -limited SSSP problem in time  $O((h + 1)(m + n \log n))$ . That is, given source vertex  $s$  and integer  $h \geq 0$ , it returns  $d_h(v) = \text{dist}_G^h(s, v)$  for all  $v \in V$ . Moreover, the algorithm can also return all smaller-hop distances  $d_{h'}(v) = \text{dist}_G^{h'}(s, v)$  for all  $h' \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, h\}$  with the same running time.*

*When  $h = k \geq 1$ , BFD solves the regular SSSP problem in  $O(k(m + n \log n))$  time.*

*More generally, given a set  $S \subseteq V$  instead of a source vertex, it is also possible to compute the distances  $d_{h'}(v) = \text{dist}_G^{h'}(S, v)$  for all  $v \in V$  and  $h' \leq h$  with the same time complexity. In addition, for all  $v \in V$ , the algorithm can be augmented to return  $s(v) \in S$  such that  $d_h(v) = \text{dist}_G^h(s(v), v)$ .*

Note that many textbook descriptions of Bellman-Ford (e.g., CLRS [6]) update distance estimates in place, which when extended to BFD would only guarantee  $d_h(v) \leq \text{dist}_G^h(s, v)$ . The inequality may be problematic when reasoning about hop-limited paths. We instead want the return values to be exactly equal to the  $h$ -hop distances. BFD of the lemma thus starts from a version of Bellman-Ford that explicitly stores distances for each round (e.g., Kleinberg-Tardos [13]).

**Subgraphs of negative edges.** For a subset  $N \subseteq E^-$  of negative edges on the input graph, we use  $G^N$  to denote the subgraph  $G^N = (V, E^+ \cup N, w)$ . Moreover,  $G_\phi^N$  denotes the reweighted subgraph  $G_\phi^N = (V, E^+ \cup N, w_\phi)$ . Vertices are classified as negative vertices in  $G^N$  only if their corresponding negative edge is included in  $N$ .

Because all of the nonnegative edges are included in  $G^N$ , it should be obvious that for any price function  $\phi$ , if  $w_\phi$  is a valid reweighting of  $G^N$  then it is also a valid reweighting of  $G$ . Moreover, if  $w_\phi$  eliminates negative edges from  $G^N$ , it also eliminates those same edges from  $G$ . Working with subgraphs  $G^N$  thus suffices to solve the problem. Specifically, the algorithm shall eventually reach a subgraph  $G^N$  with  $|N| = \Theta(k^{1/3})$  and find a reweighting that eliminates all the edges  $N$ .

### 3 Algorithm Overview

This sections provides an overview of the algorithm for  $\Theta(k^{1/3})$  elimination. This section includes some intuition of correctness for each of the main components of the algorithm, but the full details and most of the proofs are deferred to Sections 4–7.

The main goal of the algorithm is to find a large (i.e., size- $\Theta(k^{1/3})$ )  $r$ -remote set or a large 1-hop independent set, both defined next, and then to eliminate the corresponding negative edges. (We shall eventually set  $r = \Theta(k^{1/9})$ ).

**Definition 3.1.** *Consider a graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$ , let  $n = |V|$ , and let  $X$  be a subset of negative vertices. If the negative  $r$ -hop reach of  $X$  has size at most  $n/r$ , i.e.,  $|R^r(X)| \leq n/r$ , then  $X$  is an  **$r$ -remote set**. We also call out( $X$ ) a set of  **$r$ -remote edges**, and we call the subgraph induced by the negative  $r$ -hop reach of  $X$  an  **$r$ -remote subgraph**.*

**Definition 3.2.** *Consider a graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$ . Let  $I$  be a subset of negative vertices. We say that  $I$  is a **1-hop independent set** if  $\forall x, y \in I$ ,  $x$  and  $y$  are not 1-hop related in  $G$ .*

Algorithm 1 outlines the algorithm. Note that some of the terminology will be revealed later in this section. Nevertheless, the reader may wish to refer to this psuedocode to see how the steps fit together. Each of the main steps is marked with the corresponding sections that explain them. For expository reasons, the steps of the algorithm are presented out of order in this overview section (but in order later in the paper). The algorithm produces a sequence of price functions through

---

**Algorithm 1:** Algorithm for eliminating  $\Theta(k^{1/3})$  negative edges. Negative-weight cycles may be discovered inside steps (1), (2), or (4); when a cycle is discovered, the entire algorithm is terminated.

---

**input:** A graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$  with  $w(e) \geq 0$  for  $e \in E^+$  and  $w(e) < 0$  for  $e \in E^-$

let  $k = |E^-|$  and  $r = \Theta(k^{1/9})$

- 1 (Section 3.2, 4) perform betweenness reduction on  $G$  with  $\beta = r + 1$  and  $\tau = r$   
let  $\phi_1$  be the price function computed by this step
  - 2 (Section 3.4, 5) find a size- $\Omega(k^{1/3})$  negative sandwich  $(x, U, y)$  or independent set  $I$  in  $G_{\phi_1}$   
**if this step discovers an independent set then**  

|  |
|--|
| (Section 3.5) find a price function $\phi$ that eliminates all negative edges in $G_{\phi_1}^{out(I)}$ |
| <b>return</b> $\phi + \phi_1$  |

  
**else** arbitrarily remove vertices from  $U$  until  $|U| = \Theta(k^{1/3})$
  - 3 (Section 3.3, 6) reweight the graph  $G_{\phi_1}$  to try to make  $U$  become  $r$ -remote  
let  $\phi_2$  be the price function computed by this step  
**if**  $|R_{\phi_1 + \phi_2}^r(U)| > n/r$  (i.e., not  $r$ -remote) **then** restart Algorithm 1
  - 4 (Section 3.1, 7) use the hop-reduction technique on graph  $G_{\phi_1 + \phi_2}^{out(U)}$  to eliminate  $out(U)$   
let  $\phi$  be the price function computed by this step  
**return**  $\phi + \phi_1 + \phi_2$
- 

several steps. Each step computes the next price function relative to the current weighting of the graph. Thus, the actual weight is obtained by composing (adding) all of the price functions.

Roughly speaking, there are two main components in the algorithm. The first component is an efficient algorithm to either find a large  $r$ -remote set (also with large  $r$ ) or, failing that, to find a large 1-hop independent set. Unfortunately, neither may exist with the original weight function of the graph—it is not hard to construct graphs where (1) every pair of negative vertices is 1-hop related, and (2) every negative vertex has large 1-hop reach, i.e.,  $|R^1(\{u\})| = \Omega(n)$ . The first component of the algorithm thus entails not simply finding such a set, but also adjusting the weight function to ensure that such a set exists. This component spans all but the last numbered step in the pseudocode.

The second component is an efficient algorithm that eliminates all of outgoing edges from the  $r$ -remote or 1-hop-independent set. The second problem is easier, and it also helps to motivate why  $r$ -remote sets are useful. Thus, this section addresses the second component first. (Efficiently eliminating a 1-hop independent set is almost trivial, so that is deferred to Section 3.5.)

### 3.1 Eliminating $r$ -remote edges by hop reduction

Recall that Johnson’s strategy [12] for eliminating negative edges entails solving SSSP. If there are  $\hat{k}$  negative edges, then the running time is  $\tilde{O}(m\hat{k})$  using BFD. The goal here is to accelerate this SSSP computation for the case that the edges being eliminated are remote. (Notationally, the use of  $\hat{k}$  here is to emphasize that this step is applied to a subgraph.)

To illustrate the approach, consider first an arbitrary graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup N, w)$  without a known remote set. The goal is to produce a new auxiliary graph  $H = (V_H, E_H, w_H)$  such (1)  $V \subseteq V_H$ , and (2) for all hop counts  $h \geq 0$  and  $u, v \in V$ ,  $dist_G^h(u, v) \geq dist_H^{[h/r]}(u, v) \geq dist_G(u, v)$ . That is to say, all  $h$ -hop paths in  $G$  correspond to  $[h/r]$ -hop paths in  $H$ . We say that  $H$  is an



***r*-hop reduction of  $G$ .** Thus, we can compute SSSP for  $G$  by instead computing SSSP in  $H$  with a cost of  $\tilde{O}((\hat{k}/r) \cdot m_H)$ , where  $\hat{k} = |N|$  is the number of negative edges in  $G$ , and  $m_H = |E_H|$  is the size of  $H$ . As we shall see next, there is a fairly straightforward construction of an  $O(rm)$ -size  $r$ -hop reduction of  $G$ . Unfortunately, the running time of SSSP remains  $\tilde{O}((\hat{k}/r) \cdot (rm)) = \tilde{O}(\hat{k}m)$ . But given an  $r$ -remote set, it is possible to improve this construction to achieve a better running time.

The construction of  $H$  is roughly as follows. First, for each vertex  $v \in V$ , add  $r + 1$  copies  $v = v_0, v_1, \dots, v_r$  to  $V_H$ . Add the nonnegative edges to each layer of the graph, i.e., for each edge  $(u, v) \in E^+$  and each  $0 \leq i \leq r$ , add the edge  $(u_i, v_i)$  to  $E_H$ . As for the negative edges  $(u, v) \in N$ , create the edges  $(u_i, v_{i+1})$  for  $0 \leq i < r$  to  $E_H$ . Each copy of the negative edge thus moves from the  $i$ -th layer of the graph to the  $(i + 1)$ th layer. Finally, add edges  $(v_i, v_0)$  for all  $v$  and  $i$  to allow a way to get back to the 0th layer.

It remains to specify the weight function  $w_H$ . The goal is to ensure that only the edges  $(v_i, v_0)$  have negative weight, and thus an  $r$ -hop subpath in  $G$  can be simulated by a 1-hop path in  $H$  that moves through copies  $0, 1, 2, \dots, r, 0$ . This goal can be accomplished by roughly running Johnson’s reweighting limited to  $r$  hops, i.e., computing  $i$ -hop SSSP from  $V$  for all  $i \leq r$ , and setting  $w_H(u_i, v_j) = w(u, v) + \text{dist}_G^i(V, u) - \text{dist}_G^j(V, v)$ . For each  $(u, v) \in N$ , it follows that  $w_H(u_i, v_{i+1}) \geq 0$  because  $\text{dist}_G^{i+1}(V, v) \leq \text{dist}_G^i(V, u) + w(u, v)$ .

The graph  $H$  has size  $m_H = O(rm)$  by construction. Moreover, from Lemma 2.3 the SSSP distances and hence weights  $w_H$  can be calculated in  $\tilde{O}(rm)$  time.

Now let us improve the construction if  $N$  is a set of  $r$ -remote edges. Consider a vertex  $u \in V$  that falls outside the  $r$ -remote subgraph. Then  $r$ -remoteness implies that  $\text{dist}_G^i(V, u) = 0$  for all  $i \leq r$  as there is no negative-weight path and there is a 0-weight path (the empty path from  $u$ ). There is thus no reason to include multiple copies of this vertex in  $H$  as each copy’s incident edges would be weighted identically—it suffices to keep the single copy  $u = u_0$ , or equivalently to contract all copies into  $u$  and remove any redundant edges. In summary, when given an  $r$ -remote subgraph,  $H$  comprises  $r$  copies of the remote subgraph plus a single copy of the original graph. Applying the assumption that the maximum degree is  $O(m/n)$ , the total size of  $H$  now becomes  $m_H = O(r \cdot (n/r) \cdot (m/n) + m) = O(m)$ . Moreover,  $H$  still constitutes an  $r$ -hop reduction of  $G$ . We are thus left with the following lemma; (the second term in the runtime is the cost of constructing  $w_H$ ).

**Lemma 3.3.** *Consider a graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup N, w)$ ; let  $\hat{k} = |N|$  and  $m = |E^+ \cup N|$ . Suppose that  $w(e) \geq 0$  for all  $e \in E^+$  and that  $N$  is  $r$ -remote. Then there exists an  $\tilde{O}((\hat{k}/r)m + rm)$ -time deterministic algorithm that either (1) correctly determines that the graph contains a negative-weight cycle, or (2) computes a valid reweighting that eliminates all edges  $N$ .*

### 3.2 Betweenness reduction

We are left with the more difficult problem of uncovering an  $r$ -remote set or 1-hop independent set, which as previously noted entails some reweighting. But it is not clear how to attack this problem directly. Roughly speaking, the challenge is that when the price of a vertex changes, there may be new  $h$ -hop relationships introduced even though no negative edges are created. It thus seems difficult to argue that a particular reweighting of the graph reduces the number of relationships.

The key insight here is to think in terms of “betweenness” instead, which is better behaved. We can then later translate to an  $r$ -remote set, but that transformation is more restricted so easier to reason about.

**Definition 3.4.** *For the following, consider a graph  $G$ , vertices  $u, x$ , and  $v$ , and integer  $\beta \geq 0$ .*

The  $\beta$ -distance from  $u$  to  $v$  through  $x$  is defined as

$$\text{thru}_G^\beta(u, x, v) = \text{dist}_G^\beta(u, x) + \text{dist}_G^\beta(x, v) .$$

We say that  $x$  is  $\beta$ -between  $u$  and  $v$  if  $\text{thru}_G^\beta(u, x, v) < 0$ . The  $\beta$ -betweenness of  $u$  and  $v$ , denoted  $BW_G^\beta(u, v) = \left| \left\{ x \in V \mid \text{thru}_G^\beta(u, x, v) < 0 \right\} \right|$  is the number of vertices  $\beta$ -between  $u$  and  $v$ .

For all of these notations, the  $G$  may be dropped if clear from context, and  $\phi$  is used as shorthand for  $G_\phi$ .

The goal here is to find a price function  $\phi$  so that for given parameter  $\tau$ , all pairs  $u, v \in V$  have  $BW_\phi^\beta(u, v) \leq n/\tau$ . (We will use  $\tau = \beta - 1 = r$ , but the algorithm of this section is described for any  $\beta$  and  $\tau$ .) The algorithm is fairly simple. Sample a size- $\Theta(\tau \log n)$  subset of vertices. Then find any reweighting for which all  $\beta$ -hop distances to or from the sampled vertices are nonnegative, or determine that the graph contains a negative-weight cycle. Roughly speaking, the reweighting entails computing  $\Theta(\beta\tau \log n)$ -limited SSSP (because we want  $\Theta(\beta)$ -hop subpaths between each of the  $\Theta(\tau \log n)$  samples). There are many relatively straightforward ways to achieve the desired reweighting, and the details are deferred to Section 4.

We are left with a question: does reweighting in this way ensure that  $BW_\phi^\beta(u, v) \leq n/\tau$ ? It is easy to see that (by construction) no sampled vertex is  $\beta$ -between any pair of vertices in  $G_\phi$ , but that would only directly tell us that the  $\beta$ -betweenness is at most  $n - \Theta(\tau \log n)$ .

Consider the distance from  $u$  to  $v$  through a vertex  $x$ . It follows from Lemma 2.2 that  $\text{thru}_\phi^\beta(u, x, v) = \text{thru}^\beta(u, x, v) + \phi(u) - \phi(v)$ , which importantly does not depend on  $\phi(x)$ . The  $u$ -to- $v$  distances through other vertices thus compare in the same way before and after reweighting. Therefore, if any sampled vertex  $y$  has  $\text{thru}^\beta(u, y, v) \leq \text{thru}^\beta(u, x, v)$ , then it follows that  $x$  is not  $\beta$ -between  $u$  and  $v$  in  $G_\phi$  because  $y$  is not either. With high probability, there is a sample  $y$  taken from the smallest  $1/\tau$ -fraction of through distances, and hence at most a  $1/\tau$  fraction of vertices is  $\beta$ -between  $u$  and  $v$  in  $G_\phi$ . Thus, we obtain the following, with proof in Section 4:

**Lemma 3.5.** *Consider input graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$ ; let  $m = |E^+ \cup E^-|$ , and suppose that  $w(e) \geq 0$  for all  $e \in E^+$ . Then there exists an  $\tilde{O}(\beta\tau m + \tau^2 n)$ -time (Monte Carlo) randomized algorithm that always satisfies one of the following three cases, and it falls in either of the first two with high probability: (1) it correctly determines the graph contains a negative-weight cycle, (2) it finds valid price function  $\phi$  such that  $BW_\phi^\beta(u, v) \leq n/\tau$  for all  $u, v \in V$ , or (3) it returns a valid price function, but the betweenness goal is not achieved.*

### 3.3 A sandwich with low betweenness gives $r$ -remoteness

Consider a graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$ . The goal is to argue that if  $G$  has low betweenness, then it is not too hard to reweight  $G$  so that there is an  $r$ -remote subset. To do so, we apply a new object called a negative sandwich.

**Definition 3.6.** *A negative sandwich is a triple  $(x, U, y)$  with the following properties.*

- $U$  is a subset of negative vertices,
- $x \in V$  and  $\text{dist}^1(x, u) < 0$  for all  $u \in U$ , and
- $y \in V$  and  $\text{dist}^1(u, y) < 0$  for all  $u \in U$ .

The **size** of the sandwich is the cardinality of  $U$ .

For now, let us ignore the task of finding such a sandwich. The goal here is only to argue that a negative sandwich is useful. Note that restricting  $U$  to negative vertices does not affect the bulk

of the logic here (Lemma 3.7 holds for any set  $U \subseteq V$ ); this restriction is simply because negative vertices are what matter for the transformation to a remote subset.

Given a negative sandwich  $(x, U, y)$  and hop count  $\beta$ , consider the reweighting given by the price function  $\phi(v) = \min(0, \max(\text{dist}^\beta(x, v), -\text{dist}^\beta(v, y)))$ . Roughly speaking, there are two main goals of this price function: (1) for all  $u \in U$ ,  $\phi(u) = 0$ , and (2) for most other vertices  $v$ ,  $\phi(v) \leq 0$  and  $\phi(v) \leq \text{dist}^\beta(x, v)$ . Because the 1-hop distance from  $x$  to  $u$  is negative (by definition of a negative sandwich), these together would imply that the  $(\beta - 1)$ -hop distance from  $u$  to  $v$  in the reweighted graph becomes positive. In general, however, ensuring (1) in a way that also gives a valid reweighting somewhat interferes with (2). This is why the price function here uses  $\text{dist}^\beta(v, y)$  to limit how negative  $\phi(v)$  can get. It is not hard to see that (1) is ensured because in a negative sandwich  $\text{dist}^\beta(u, y) < 0$  for all  $u \in U$ . The price function also ensures (2) because when  $v$  is *not*  $\beta$ -between  $x$  and  $y$ ,  $\text{dist}^\beta(x, v) + \text{dist}^\beta(v, y) \geq 0$  or  $\text{dist}^\beta(x, v) \geq -\text{dist}^\beta(v, y)$ ; the implication is that  $\max(\text{dist}^\beta(x, v), -\text{dist}^\beta(v, y)) = \text{dist}^\beta(x, v)$  as desired. That is to say, the only vertices that remain in the  $(\beta - 1)$ -hop reach of  $U$  in  $G_\phi$  are (a subset of) those vertices that are  $\beta$ -between  $x$  and  $y$  in  $G$ . It follows that if  $x$  and  $y$  have  $\beta$ -betweenness at most  $n/\tau$ , then  $U$  becomes  $\min(\tau, \beta - 1)$ -remote.

The following lemma formalizes these ideas and also proves that the reweighting is valid. That the reweighting is valid may not be obvious, but the proof (in Section 6) essentially amounts to applying the triangle inequality.

**Lemma 3.7.** *Consider a graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$ , and suppose that  $w(e) \geq 0$  for all  $e \in E^+$ . Consider negative sandwich  $(x, U, y)$  and integer  $\beta > 1$ . Let  $\phi$  be the price function defined by*

$$\phi(v) = \min(0, \max(\text{dist}_G^\beta(x, v), -\text{dist}_G^\beta(v, y))) .$$

*Then we have the following:*

1.  $\phi$  is a valid reweighting, i.e.,  $w_\phi(e) \geq 0$  for all  $e \in E^+$ .
2. For every  $v \in V$ : if  $\text{thru}_G^\beta(x, v, y) \geq 0$  (i.e.,  $v$  is not  $\beta$ -between  $x$  and  $y$ ), then  $v \notin R_{G_\phi}^{\beta-1}(U)$ .

We conclude with the following.

**Lemma 3.8.** *Consider a graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$  with  $w(e) \geq 0$  for all  $e \in E^+$ , and let  $m = |E^+ \cup E^-|$  and  $n = |V|$ . Consider also a negative sandwich  $(x, U, y)$  and any integer  $\beta > 1$ . Let  $b = BW^\beta(x, y)$  denote the  $\beta$ -betweenness of  $x$  and  $y$ .*

*Then there exists an  $O(\beta m \log n)$ -time deterministic algorithm that finds a valid reweighting  $\phi$  such that  $U$  is  $\min(\beta - 1, n/b)$ -remote in  $G_\phi$*

*Proof.* The qualities of  $\phi$  follow from Lemma 3.7 and the definition of  $r$ -remote. The price function  $\phi$  can be computed by solving  $\beta$ -limited SSSP from  $x$  and  $\beta$ -limited STSP to  $y$ . Applying the running time for BFD (Lemma 2.3) completes the proof.  $\square$

Choosing  $\beta = r + 1$  and  $\tau = r$  as parameters in the betweenness reduction (i.e., Lemma 3.5), we obtain the following corollary:

**Corollary 3.9.** *Suppose we are given a negative sandwich  $(x, U, y)$  and that  $BW^{r+1}(x, y) \leq n/r$  for integer  $r \geq 1$ . Then there is an  $O(rm \log n)$ -time deterministic algorithm that finds a valid price function  $\phi$  such that  $U$  is  $r$ -remote in  $G_\phi$ .*  $\square$

This step may fail to make  $U$  become  $r$ -remote only if the Monte Carlo betweenness reduction failed to ensure that  $x$  and  $y$  have low betweenness; in this case, the entire algorithm must be restarted.

### 3.4 Finding a negative sandwich or independent set

The final problem is that of finding a negative sandwich or 1-hop independent set. The main tool is given by the following lemma, proved in Section 5.

**Lemma 3.10.** *Consider an input graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$  with  $w(e) \geq 0$  for all  $e \in E^+$ ; let  $n = |V|$ ,  $m = |E^+ \cup E^-|$ . Let  $U_0$  be any subset of negative vertices in  $G$ , let  $\hat{k} = |U_0|$ , and let  $\rho$  be an integer parameter with  $1 \leq \rho \leq \hat{k}$ .*

*There exists a (Las Vegas) randomized algorithm whose running time is  $O(m \log^2 n)$ , with high probability, that takes as input  $G$ ,  $U_0$ , and  $\rho$  and always does one of the following:*

1. *correctly determines that  $G$  contains a negative-weight cycle,*
2. *returns a subset of negative vertices  $U \subseteq U_0$  with  $|U| = \Omega(\hat{k}/\rho)$  and a vertex  $y$  such that for all  $u \in U$ ,  $\text{dist}^1(u, y) < 0$ , or*
3. *returns a 1-hop independent set  $I$  with  $|I| = \Omega(\rho)$ .*

Given Lemma 3.10, we immediately obtain the following lemma by running the algorithm twice.

**Corollary 3.11.** *Consider an input graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$  with  $w(e) \geq 0$  for all  $e \in E^+$ ; let  $n = |V|$ ,  $m = |E^+ \cup E^-|$ , and  $k = |E^-|$ .*

*There exists a (Las Vegas) randomized algorithm whose running time is  $O(m \log^2 n)$ , with high probability, that always does one of the following:*

1. *correctly determines that  $G$  contains a negative-weight cycle,*
2. *returns negative sandwich  $(x, U, y)$  with  $|U| = \Omega(k^{1/3})$ , or*
3. *returns a 1-hop independent set  $I$  with  $|I| = \Omega(k^{1/3})$ .*

*Proof.* First, run the algorithm of Lemma 3.10 on  $G$  with  $U_0 = E^-$  and  $\rho = \lceil k^{1/3} \rceil$ . From Lemma 3.10, the algorithm does one of the following: (i) correctly determines that  $G$  contains a negative-weight cycle, (ii) returns a 1-hop independent set with size  $\Omega(\rho) = \Omega(k^{1/3})$ , or (iii) returns a vertex  $y$  and subset  $U_1 \subseteq U_0$  with  $|U_1| = \Omega(k/\rho) = \Omega(k^{2/3})$  such that  $\text{dist}^1(u, y) < 0$  for all  $u \in U_1$ . In cases (i) and (ii), we are done. Otherwise, run the algorithm of Lemma 3.10 again but in the transpose graph (with all edges reversed) using  $G$ ,  $U_1$ , and  $\rho = \lceil k^{1/3} \rceil$ . The second execution thus either (i) identifies a cycle, (ii) returns an independent set with size  $\Omega(\rho) = \Omega(k^{1/3})$ , or (iii) returns a vertex  $x$  and subset  $U_2 \subseteq U_1$  with  $|U_2| = \Omega(|U_1|/\rho) = \Omega(k^{2/3}/k^{1/3}) = \Omega(k^{1/3})$  such that  $\text{dist}^1(x, u) < 0$  for all  $u \in U_2$ . In cases (i) and (ii), we are again done. In case (iii),  $(x, U_2, y)$  is a negative sandwich with size  $\Omega(k^{1/3})$ .  $\square$

We are left with the problem of constructively proving Lemma 3.10. For the following, let  $C(U_0, v) = |\{u \in U_0 \mid \text{dist}_G^1(u, v) < 0\}|$  denote the number of vertices in  $U_0$  that can reach  $v$  with a negative-weight 1-hop path.

The algorithm for Lemma 3.10 is roughly as follows, with details in Section 5. The first task is to estimate  $C(U_0, v)$  for all  $v \in V$ . More precisely, the goal is to partition  $U_0$  into two subsets  $H$  and  $L$  (for heavy and light, respectively), such that  $\forall v \in H, C(U_0, v) = \Omega(\hat{k}/\rho)$  and  $\forall v \in L, C(U_0, v) = O(\hat{k}/\rho)$ . This task can be accomplished by randomly sampling each vertex  $u \in U$  with probability  $\rho/\hat{k}$  into a subset  $U'$ , then computing  $R^1(U')$ . If  $C(U_0, v) \gg \hat{k}/\rho$ , then it is reasonably likely that  $v \in R^1(U')$ . Conversely, if  $C(U_0, v) \ll \hat{k}/\rho$ , then it is likely that  $v \notin R^1(U')$ . Repeating this process  $\Theta(\log n)$  times and applying a Chernoff bound allows us to correctly partition the vertices, with high probability.

If  $H$  is nonempty, then select any  $y$  in  $H$  and run STSP to compute  $U = \{u \in U_0 \mid \text{dist}^1(u, y) < 0\}$ . Finally, verify that  $|U| = \Omega(\hat{k}/\rho)$  just in case the estimation procedure failed.

If instead  $H$  is empty, then  $L = U_0$ , and all vertices  $v \in U_0$  should have  $C(U_0, v) = O(\hat{k}/\rho)$ . Then it is straightforward to construct a large random independent set. Select a uniformly random subset  $I' \subseteq U_0$  with  $|I'| = \Theta(\rho)$ . Then, set  $I = I' - R^1(I')$ , where “ $-$ ” here denotes set subtraction, which ensures that the set  $I$  is independent. For each vertex in  $v \in I'$ , there is only a constant probability that there is another vertex  $u \in I', u \neq v$  such that  $\text{dist}^1(u, v) < 0$ . Thus, as long as there no negative-weight cycles in the graph, there is at least a constant probability that  $|I| = \Omega(\rho)$ . Repeating  $\Theta(\log n)$  times gives high probability of successfully finding an independent set.

### 3.5 The full algorithm

Assuming all of the lemmas stated in this section, we are almost ready to prove Theorem 1.2. The only remaining pieces are eliminating an independent set and determining the appropriate value for  $r$ .

**Eliminating an independent set.** Let  $I$  be a 1-hop independent set of negative vertices in the graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$ . Then eliminating these edges is straightforward. Consider the subgraph  $G^{\text{out}(I)}$ . Then simply use the price function  $\phi(v) = \text{dist}_{G^{\text{out}(I)}}^1(V, v)$ , which can be computed by running 1-hop BFD in  $O(m \log n)$  time. It is not too hard to see that this price function accomplishes the task.

**Lemma 3.12.** *Let  $G = (V, E^+ \cup \text{out}(I), w)$  be a subgraph of the input graph, where  $I$  is a 1-hop independent set of the negative vertices. Suppose that  $w(e) \geq 0$  for all  $e \in E^+$ . Then the price function given by  $\phi(v) = \text{dist}_G^1(V, v)$  is a valid price function that eliminates all negative-weight edges from  $G$ .*

*Proof.* The claim is that  $\text{dist}^1(V, v) = \text{dist}(V, v)$ . If this claim is true, then  $\phi(v)$  matches Johnson’s price function [12], and hence it eliminates all negative-weight edges. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there exists some  $u$ -to- $v$  path  $p$  with  $w(p) < \text{dist}^1(V, v)$ . Split  $p$  into subpaths at each vertex in  $I$ , giving rise to a sequence of nonempty subpaths  $p_0, p_1, \dots, p_\ell$ . Each subpath  $p_i$  for  $0 < i < \ell$  starts and ends at negative vertices and includes exactly one negative-weight edge. Thus, because  $I$  is a 1-hop independent set,  $w(p_i) \geq 0$  for  $0 < i < \ell$ . If  $u \in I$ , then the subpath  $p_0$  follows the same logic; if  $u \notin I$ , then  $p_0$  contains no negative edges. Either way,  $w(p_0) \geq 0$ . We therefore have  $w(p) = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} w(p_i) \geq w(p_\ell)$ , which contradicts the assumption that  $p$  is a shorter path to  $v$  than the 1-hop path  $w(p_\ell)$ .  $\square$

**Choosing  $r$  to minimize runtime.** Fixing  $\beta - 1 = \tau = r$ , there are two components that dominate the running time of the algorithm: the betweenness reduction, with a running time of  $\tilde{O}(r^2 m)$  (Lemma 3.5), and eliminating the  $r$ -remote subset using hop reduction, with a running time of  $\tilde{O}((k^{1/3}/r)m + rm)$  (Lemma 3.3). The total running time is thus  $\tilde{O}(m \cdot (r^2 + k^{1/3}/r))$ , which is minimized by setting  $r = \Theta(k^{1/9})$ , yielding  $\tilde{O}(k^{2/9} m)$ , as per Theorem 1.2.

**Proof of Theorem 1.2.** Consider the steps of Algorithm 1. The first step is betweenness reduction. By Lemma 3.5, this step always either correctly determines the graph contains a negative-weight cycle, or it finds a valid price function  $\phi_1$ . In the former case, the algorithm terminates. Otherwise,  $\phi_1$  is valid so  $w_{\phi_1}(e) \geq 0$  for all  $e \in E^+$  (which is a precondition of the subsequent steps). This step always takes  $\tilde{O}(k^{2/9} m)$  time (Lemma 3.5).

The next step is to find a negative sandwich or 1-hop independent set. By Corollary 3.11, there is an algorithm that always correctly determine that the graph contains a negative-weight cycle,

---

**Algorithm 2:** Algorithm for betweenness reduction

---

**input:** A graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$  with  $w(e) \geq 0$  for  $e \in E^+$

**input:** Parameters  $\tau$  and  $\beta$  and constant  $c > 1$ , with  $\beta \geq 1$  and  $1 \leq \tau \leq |V|$

- 1 let  $n = |V|$
  - 2 let  $T \subseteq V$  be a uniformly random subset of  $c\tau \lceil \ln n \rceil$  vertices
  - 3 **foreach**  $x \in T$  **do**
  - 4     run  $\beta$ -hop SSSP and STSP, computing  $\beta$ -hop distances from and to  $x$ , respectively
  - 5 construct a new graph  $H = (V, E_H, w_H)$  as follows:  
     $E_H = (T \times V) \cup (V \times T)$   
     $w_H(u, v) = \text{dist}_G^\beta(u, v)$  using precomputed distances to/from vertices in  $T$
  - 6 let  $\ell = 2|T|$  (which equals  $2c\tau \lceil \ln n \rceil$ )
  - 7 compute super-source distances  $d(v) = \text{dist}_H^\ell(V, v)$  and  $d'(v) = \text{dist}_H^{\ell+1}(V, v)$  for all  $v \in V$
  - 8 **if**  $\exists v$  such that  $d'(v) < d(v)$  **then** terminate algorithm and report “cycle”
  - 9 **else return** price function  $\phi = d$
- 

returns a size  $\Omega(k^{1/3})$  negative sandwich, or returns a size- $\Omega(k^{1/3})$  1-hop independent set. This algorithm runs in  $\tilde{O}(m)$  time, with high probability. Again, in the case of a cycle, the algorithm terminates with a correct output. In the case of a 1-hop independent set, Lemma 3.12 gives a way of finding a valid price function that eliminates the independent set. Thus, the algorithm correctly eliminates  $\Omega(k^{1/3})$  negative edges. In the last case, the algorithm continues to the next step.

The third step is to reweight the graph  $G_\phi$  again to attempt to establish remoteness. From Lemma 3.7, the reweighting step here always produces a valid price function  $\phi_2$ . Moreover, Corollary 3.9 states that if the betweenness reduction was successful in reducing the  $\beta$ -betweenness of all pairs of vertices, then  $U$  is  $r$ -remote in  $(G_{\phi_1})_{\phi_2} = G_{\phi_1 + \phi_2}$ . By Lemma 3.5, the betweenness reduction succeeds with high probability, and thus this step also succeeds with high probability. (Otherwise, the entire algorithm restarts.) When proceeding past this point,  $U$  is always an  $r$ -remote subset with size  $\Omega(k^{1/3})$  carrying over from the previous step, and  $\phi_1 + \phi_2$  is always a valid price function. This step takes  $\tilde{O}(k^{1/9}m)$  time from Corollary 3.9.

The final step is to apply the hop-reduction technique on the graph  $G_{\phi_1 + \phi_2}^{\text{out}(U)}$ , where  $|U| = \Theta(k^{1/3})$ . Because  $U$  is  $r$ -remote, Lemma 3.3 applies, indicating that the  $\Theta(k^{1/3})$  negative edges can be eliminated deterministically in  $\tilde{O}(k^{2/9}m)$  time.

Summing the running time of all steps gives  $\tilde{O}(k^{2/9}m)$ . □

## 4 Betweenness Reduction

This section expands on the problem of betweenness reduction, introduced in Section 3.2, with the goal of proving Lemma 3.5. Throughout this section, let  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$  denote the input graph and let  $n = |V|$  and  $m = |E^+ \cup E^-|$ . The variables  $\beta$  and  $\tau$  denote the parameters for betweenness reduction, with  $\beta \geq 1$  and  $1 \leq \tau \leq |V|$ . Recall that the goal is to find a price function  $\phi$  such that for all vertices  $u, v$ , we have  $BW_\phi^\beta(u, v) \leq n/\tau$ . The algorithm is parameterized by a constant  $c \geq 3$  used to adjust the probability of success.

Algorithm 2 presents the algorithm for betweenness reduction. The algorithm begins by sampling a subset  $T$  of vertices with  $|T| = c\tau \lceil \ln n \rceil$  vertices. The remainder of the algorithm is devoted to reweighting the graph so that all  $\beta$ -hop distances to or from vertices in  $T$  become nonnegative.

There are many straightforward ways to accomplish the goal of nonnegative  $\beta$ -hop distances to/from  $T$ ; Algorithm 2 is just one concrete example. Algorithm 2 proceeds by computing all  $\beta$ -hop distances from each vertex in  $T$  and all  $\beta$ -hop distances to each vertex in  $T$ , using SSSP and STSP, respectively. Then, an auxiliary graph  $H$  is constructed. The graph  $H$  contains all edges of the form  $(x, v)$  and  $(v, x)$  where  $x \in T$  and  $v \in V$ . Thus, all edges in  $H$  are, by construction, incident on a vertex in  $T$ . The weights of these edges are the corresponding  $\beta$ -hop distances in  $G$  that have already been computed. The final step of the algorithm is to apply Johnson's strategy [12] to  $H$ . That is, compute distances to each vertex using super-source shortest paths. Because all edges are incident on a vertex in  $T$ , the computation stops at  $2|T| + 1$  hops, at which point either the algorithm has discovered a negative-weight cycle, or the  $2|T|$ -hop distances are the actual shortest path distances in  $H$ . Finally, these distances are returned as a price function for  $G$ .

There are two main aspects of correctness to prove. (1) The algorithm finds a price function  $\phi$  such that all  $\beta$ -hop distances to/from  $x \in T$  in  $G_\phi$  are nonnegative. The idea here is that from Johnson's strategy [12], the shortest-path distances in  $H$  constitute a valid price function  $\phi$  that eliminates all negative edges in  $H$ . These edges in  $H$  correspond to  $\beta$ -hop paths in  $G$  to/from vertices in  $T$ . Thus, applying  $\phi$  to  $G$  ensures that these  $\beta$ -hop paths have nonnegative weight. (2) The algorithm reduces the betweenness of all pairs to at most  $n/\tau$ , as discussed in Section 3.2. The claims, along with running time, are proved next.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Consider an execution of Algorithm 2 on input graph  $G(V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$  starting from line 3 with any arbitrary subset  $T \subseteq V$ . (That is, this claim does not rely on any randomness of the sample.) Then we have the following:*

- *If the algorithm reports a negative-weight cycle, then  $G$  contains a negative-weight cycle.*
- *Otherwise, the algorithm returns a price function  $\phi$  such that for all  $v \in V$  and  $x \in T$ :  $\text{dist}_{G_\phi}^\beta(x, v) \geq 0$  and  $\text{dist}_{G_\phi}^\beta(v, x) \geq 0$ . Moreover, if the initial weight satisfies  $w(e) \geq 0$  for all  $e \in E^+$ , then the price function is valid.*

*Proof.* Let us start with the following observation: all simple paths in  $H$  have size at most  $2|T|$ , which follows from the fact that all edges in  $H$  are incident on vertices in  $T$ . (If the path is larger, some vertex in  $T$  has at least 2 incoming or outgoing edges, and hence the path is not simple.) Simple paths therefore also have at most  $2|T|$  negative-weight edges. Thus,  $H$  has a negative-weight cycle if and only if there exists a vertex  $v$  such that  $\text{dist}_H^{\ell+1}(V, v) < \text{dist}_H^\ell(V, v)$ , where  $\ell = 2|T|$ . We have thus established that a cycle is reported if and only if  $H$  has a negative-weight cycle. Moreover, if no cycle is reported, then  $d(v)$  is the actual super-source distance in  $H$ , so the standard (not hop-limited) triangle inequality applies to  $d$ .

Next, suppose that  $H$  has a negative-weight cycle  $C$ . Then it is easy to see that  $G$  does as well: replace each edge in  $C$  with the corresponding  $h$ -hop path in  $G$ , which by construction has the same weight. Therefore, when the algorithm reports a negative-weight cycle, that result is correct.

For the remainder, suppose that there is no negative-weight cycle in  $H$ , so a price function is returned. Here we prove the claim that the distance to/from each sample is nonnegative. By the standard triangle inequality, for all  $x \in T$  and  $v \in V$  (and hence  $(x, v) \in E_H$ ), we have  $d(v) \leq d(x) + w_H(x, v) = d(x) + \text{dist}_G^\beta(x, v)$ , or  $\text{dist}_G^\beta(x, v) + d(x) - d(v) \geq 0$ . Setting  $\phi = d$  and using Lemma 2.2, we thus have  $\text{dist}_{G_\phi}^\beta(x, v) = \text{dist}_G^\beta(x, v) + \phi(x) - \phi(v) = \text{dist}_G^\beta(x, v) + d(x) - d(v) \geq 0$ . Similarly, by the symmetric argument now considering the edge  $(v, x) \in E_H$ , we have  $d(x) \leq d(v) + w_H(v, x) = d(v) + \text{dist}_G^\beta(v, x)$ , or  $\text{dist}_G^\beta(v, x) + d(v) - d(x) \geq 0$ . Thus  $\text{dist}_{G_\phi}^\beta(v, x) = \text{dist}_G^\beta(v, x) + \phi(v) - \phi(x) \geq 0$ .

Finally, let us address the validity of the price function  $\phi = d$ . We shall again prove this using the triangle inequality. The only issue here is that  $H$  does not include all edges in  $E^+$ , so

we cannot directly apply the triangle inequality on computed distances to these edges. Start by noting that  $d(v) \leq 0$  for all  $v \in V$  from the empty path. Now consider any edge  $(u, v) \in E^+$  and suppose  $w(u, v) \geq 0$ . If  $d(u) = 0$  then trivially  $w_\phi(u, v) = w(u, v) - d(v) \geq w(u, v) \geq 0$ . Suppose instead that  $d(u) < 0$ . Then a shortest path to  $u$  in  $H$  is nonempty and must end with a last edge  $(x, u) \in E_H$  for some  $x \in T$ ; that is,  $d(u) = d(x) + w_H(x, u)$ . By Lemma 2.1 on  $G$ , for  $(u, v) \in E^+$  we have  $\text{dist}_G^\beta(x, v) \leq \text{dist}_G^\beta(x, u) + w(u, v)$ , and hence  $w_H(x, v) \leq w_H(x, u) + w(u, v)$ . Thus, using the triangle inequality in  $H$  we have  $d(v) \leq d(x) + w_H(x, v) \leq d(x) + w_H(x, u) + w(u, v) = d(u) + w(u, v)$ , or  $w_\phi(u, v) = w(u, v) + d(u) - d(v) \geq 0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.** *Suppose that the input graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$  satisfies  $w(e) \geq 0$  for all  $e \in E^+$ . Let  $m = |E^+ \cup E^-|$  and  $n = |V|$ . Then there is a realization of Algorithm 2 that runs in  $O(\beta\tau \log n(m + n \log n) + \tau^2 n \log^2 n)$  time.*

*Proof.* The two dominant costs of the algorithm are the hop-limited SSSP computations.

Since  $w(e) \geq 0$  for all  $e \in E^+$ , we can apply Lemma 2.3 to compute  $\beta$ -hop distances in  $G$ , giving a running time of  $O(\beta(m + n \log n))$  per such computation. The cost of computing  $\beta$ -hop distances to and from vertices in  $T$  is thus  $|T| \cdot O(\beta(m + n \log n)) = O((\tau \log n) \cdot \beta(m + n \log n))$

Next, consider the single super-source computation in  $H$ . By construction,  $|E_H| \leq 2|T \times V| = \Theta(\tau n \log n)$ . Applying BFD to the  $\Theta(\tau \log n)$ -hop SSSP in  $H$  gives a running time of  $O((\tau \log n) \cdot (\tau n \log n + n \log n))$ .<sup>8</sup>  $\square$

When  $\beta - 1 = \tau = \Theta(r)$ , this bound simplifies to  $O((r^2 \log n) \cdot (m + n \log n)) = \tilde{O}(r^2 m)$ .

**Lemma 4.3.** *Consider an execution of Algorithm 2 on input graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$  and let  $n = |V|$ . Then with probability at least  $1 - 1/n^{c-2}$ , the algorithm either*

- *correctly reports a negative-weight cycle, or*
- *returns a price function  $\phi$  such that for all  $u, v \in V$ ,  $BW_\phi^\beta \leq n/\tau$ .*

*Proof.* Consider a particular pair  $u, v \in V$ . The proof focuses on showing that the claim holds with high probability for this pair. Then taking a union bound across all  $n^2$  pairs proves the lemma. All distances in this proof are distance in  $G$  or  $G_\phi$ , so the subscript  $G$  is omitted.

Number all the vertices in  $V$  as  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$  such that  $\text{thru}^\beta(u, x_1, v) \leq \text{thru}^\beta(u, x_2, v) \leq \dots \leq \text{thru}^\beta(u, x_n, v)$ . Now let  $y = x_j$  be the sampled vertex with lowest index/rank in the numbering. If the algorithm reports a cycle, then by Lemma 4.1 this reporting is correct. For the remainder, suppose instead that the algorithm returns a price function  $\phi$ .

By Lemma 4.1,  $\phi$  is such that  $\text{dist}_\phi^\beta(u, y) \geq 0$  and  $\text{dist}_\phi^\beta(y, v) \geq 0$  and hence  $\text{thru}_\phi^\beta(u, y, v) \geq 0$ . From Lemma 2.2, for all  $x \in V$ , we have  $\text{thru}_\phi^\beta(u, x, v) = \text{dist}^\beta(u, x) + \phi(u) - \phi(x) + \text{dist}^\beta(x, v) + \phi(x) - \phi(v) = \text{thru}^\beta(u, x, v) + \phi(u) - \phi(v)$ . Moreover, for all  $x_i$  with  $i \geq j$ , we have  $\text{thru}^\beta(u, x_i, v) \geq \text{thru}^\beta(u, y, v)$ , and hence  $\text{thru}_\phi^\beta(u, x_i, v) = \text{thru}^\beta(u, x_i, v) + \phi(u) - \phi(v) \geq \text{thru}^\beta(u, y, v) + \phi(u) - \phi(v) = \text{thru}_\phi^\beta(u, y, v) \geq 0$ . Thus,  $BW_\phi^\beta(u, v) \leq j - 1$ , where  $x_j$  is the lowest-rank sampled vertex. As long as  $j \leq \lceil n/\tau \rceil$ , we have  $j - 1 < n/\tau$  and hence  $BW_\phi^\beta(u, v) < n/\tau$ .

A failure event (the algorithm neither reports a cycle nor hits the betweenness guarantee) can thus only occur if  $j > \lceil n/\tau \rceil$ . The last step of the proof is to bound this probability. For  $j$  to be this large, each sample must be drawn from the  $b = n - \lceil n/\tau \rceil$  other vertices. If  $b < |T|$ , then there

---

<sup>8</sup>In fact, this bound can be improved to remove the  $n \log n$  term by observing (as in the start of the proof of Lemma 4.1) that we do not actually need BFD here— $\Theta(\tau \log n)$  rounds of Bellman-Ford suffice. But given that we have not established notation for “ $h$  rounds of Bellman-Ford,” the weaker bound is used here.



---

**Algorithm 3:** Algorithm to partition into heavy and light sets

---

**input** : A graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$  with  $w(e) \geq 0$  for  $e \in E^+$

**input** : Subset  $U_0$  of negative vertices and integer  $\rho$  with  $1 \leq \rho \leq |U_0|$

**output**: A partition  $\langle H, L = U_0 - H \rangle$  of  $U_0$

```
HL-Partition( $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$ ,  $U_0$ ,  $\rho$ )
1  | let  $\hat{k} = |U_0|$ 
2  | foreach  $v \in V$  do  $count(v) := 0$ 
3  | for  $c \lceil \ln n \rceil$  times do
4  |   | generate set  $U'$  by sampling each vertex in  $U_0$  with probability  $\rho/\hat{k}$ 
5  |   | compute  $R = R_G^1(U')$ 
6  |   | foreach  $v \in R$  do  $count(v) := count(v) + 1$ 
7  |   |  $H := \{u \in U_0 \mid count(u) \geq (c/2) \lceil \ln n \rceil\}$ 
8  |   |  $L := U_0 - H$ 
9  |   | return  $\langle H, L \rangle$ 
```

---

is never a failure. Otherwise, the failure probability is given by  $\left(\frac{b}{n}\right) \left(\frac{b-1}{n-1}\right) \left(\frac{b-2}{n-2}\right) \cdots \left(\frac{b-|T|+1}{n-|T|+1}\right) \leq \left(\frac{b}{n}\right)^{|T|} = \left(1 - \frac{n-\tau}{n}\right)^{|T|} \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\tau}\right)^{|T|} \leq (1 - 1/\tau)^{c\tau \ln n} \leq (1/n)^c$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma 3.5.** By assumption in the lemma statement,  $w(e) \geq 0$  for all  $e \in E^+$ . Thus Lemma 4.2 can be applied, and the algorithm always meets the promised running time. Moreover, by Lemma 4.1, the algorithm always either correctly reports a cycle or returns a valid price function. Finally, Lemma 4.3 states that algorithm is successful with high probability, in which case it reports a cycle or a price function with the desired  $\beta$ -betweenness guarantee.  $\square$

## 5 Finding a Negative Sandwich or Independent Set

This section expands on the problem of finding a negative sandwich or independent set, as introduced in Section 3.4. The bulk of this section is devoted to proving Lemma 3.10. Recall that the input comprises the graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$ , a subset  $U_0$  of negative vertices with  $\hat{k} = |U_0|$ , and integer parameter  $\rho$  with  $1 \leq \rho \leq \hat{k}$ .

As outlined in Section 3.4, the first task of Lemma 3.10 is to partition the negative vertices in  $U_0$  into a heavy and light set.

The partitioning algorithm is given by Algorithm 3. The algorithm is parameterized by a constant  $c \geq 6$  that controls the probability of failure. The algorithm is straightforward. Sample each vertex in  $U_0$  independently with probability  $\rho/\hat{k}$  to get a random subset  $U'$ . For each vertex in the 1-hop reach of  $U_0$ , increment a counter. Repeat this process  $c \lceil \ln n \rceil$  times. Finally, the set  $H$  is the set of vertices in  $U_0$  with counts at least  $(c/2) \lceil \ln n \rceil$ .

To prove the algorithm works, recall that  $C(U_0, v) = |\{u \in U_0 \mid dist^1(u, v) < 0\}|$ . Define a vertex as **heavy** if  $C(U_0, v) \geq 2\hat{k}/\rho$  and **light** if  $C(U_0, v) \leq (1/8)\hat{k}/\rho$ . (Some vertices are neither heavy nor light.)

**Lemma 5.1.** *Consider an execution of Algorithm 3 with input  $G, U_0, \rho$ . Then with probability at least  $1 - 1/n^{c/3-1}$ , the partition is such that all heavy vertices in  $U$  are in  $H$  and all light vertices*

---

**Algorithm 4:** Algorithm to find a random 1-hop independent set

---

**input** : A graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$  with  $w(e) \geq 0$  for  $e \in E^+$

**input** : Subset  $U_0$  of negative vertices and integer  $\rho$  with  $1 \leq \rho \leq |U_0|$

**output**: A 1-hop independent set  $I \subseteq U_0$

$\text{RandIS}(G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w), U_0, \rho)$

```
1 | let  $I'$  be a uniformly random size- $\lceil \rho/4 \rceil$  subset of  $U_0$ 
2 | solve the super-source problem to compute  $d(v) = \text{dist}_G^1(I', v)$  and also a corresponding
   | starting vertex  $s(v) \in I'$  such that  $d(v) = \text{dist}_G^1(s, v)$ 
3 | foreach  $u \in I'$  do
4 |   if  $d(u) < 0$  and  $s(u) = u$  then terminate algorithm and report “cycle”
5 |    $R := \{v \mid d(v) < 0\}$ 
6 |    $I := I' - R$ 
7 | return  $I$ 
```

---

are in  $L$ . Equivalently, with high probability:  $\forall v \in H, C(U_0, v) > (1/8)\hat{k}/\rho$  and  $\forall v \in L, C(U_0, v) < 2\hat{k}/\rho$ .

*Proof.* Consider a heavy vertex  $v \in U_0$ . Let  $X_i$  be the indicator that  $\text{count}(v)$  increases in the  $i$ th iteration of the loop, and let  $X = \text{count}(v) = \sum_{i=1}^{c \lceil \ln n \rceil} X_i$ . In each iteration of the loop,  $\Pr(X_i = 0)$  is the probability that none of the vertices that can reach  $v$  are sampled, which is  $\Pr(X_i = 0) \leq (1 - \rho/\hat{k})^{C(U_0, v)} \leq (1 - \rho/\hat{k})^{2\hat{k}/\rho} \leq 1/e^2$ . Let  $p = E[X_i]$ . Then  $p = \Pr(X_i = 1) \geq (1 - 1/e^2) > 6/7$ . Because the  $X_i$ 's are independent identically distributed indicators, we can apply a Chernoff-Hoeffding bound to get  $\Pr(X \leq (1/2)c \lceil \ln n \rceil)$ . In particular, set  $\epsilon = p - 1/2$  or  $1/2 = p - \epsilon$ . Then we have  $\Pr(X \leq (1/2)c \lceil \ln n \rceil) = \Pr(X \leq (p - \epsilon)c \lceil \ln n \rceil) \leq \left( \left( \frac{p}{1/2} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{1-p}{1/2} \right)^{1/2} \right)^{c \lceil \ln n \rceil} \leq (1/e)^{(1/3)c \ln n} = 1/n^{c/3}$  when  $p \geq 6/7$ .

Consider instead a light vertex  $v$ . Again, let  $X_i$  be the indicator that  $\text{count}(v)$  increases in the  $i$ th iteration and  $X = \sum_{i=1}^{c \lceil \ln n \rceil} X_i$ . Now we have  $E[X_i] \leq (\rho/\hat{k}) \cdot C(U_0, v) \leq 1/8$  by the union bound. Let  $p = E[X_i] \leq 1/8$ . Again, the  $X_i$ 's are i.i.d. indicators, so the Chernoff-Hoeffding bound applies. In particular, set  $\epsilon = 1/2 - p$  or  $p + \epsilon = 1/2$ . Then we have  $\Pr(X \geq (1/2)c \lceil \ln n \rceil) = \Pr(X \geq (p + \epsilon)c \lceil \ln n \rceil) \leq \left( \left( \frac{p}{1/2} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{1-p}{1/2} \right)^{1/2} \right)^{c \lceil \ln n \rceil} \leq (1/e)^{(1/3)c \ln n} = 1/n^{c/3}$  when  $p \leq 1/8$ .

Taking the union bound across all vertices in  $U_0$ , the probability that any heavy or light vertex is misclassified is at most  $1/n^{c/3-1}$ . This bound is only meaningful if  $c$  is strictly larger than 3.  $\square$

Now let us turn to the task of finding an independent set in the event that the returned partition has  $H = \emptyset$ . The algorithm is given by Algorithm 4. The algorithm is simple: sample a uniformly random size- $\lceil \rho/4 \rceil$  subset  $I'$  of  $U_0$ , and then remove from  $I'$  any vertices than can be reached by negative-weight 1-hop paths from any other vertex in  $I'$ . It is easy to see that this set is now a 1-hop independent set.

There is one other issue: if there are negative-weight 1-hop cycles in  $G$ , then we cannot bound the likelihood that the independent set is large. Thus, the algorithm also checks whether any of the shortest paths computed by the black-box subroutine correspond to negative-weight cycles. In particular, recall that for the super-source version of the problem, Lemma 2.3 states that BFD (and indeed any relaxation-based SSSP algorithms) can be augmented to return some vertex  $s(v) \in I'$

such that  $\text{dist}_G^1(I', v) = \text{dist}_G^1(s(v), v)$ . If  $s(v) = v$  and the distance to  $v$  is negative, then a negative-weight cycle is reported. Once a cycle is reported, the entire algorithm terminates.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Consider an execution of Algorithm 4 with input  $G, U_0, \rho$ . The algorithm always correctly reports a negative-weight cycle (i.e., only if  $G$  has a negative-weight cycle) or returns a 1-hop independent set  $I \subseteq U_0$ .*

*Suppose that there are no heavy vertices in  $U_0$ . Then the probability that the algorithm returns an independent set with  $|I| < \rho/16$  is at most  $5/6$ . Conversely, with probability at least  $1/6$ , the algorithm either correctly reports a cycle or returns an independent set with  $|I| \geq \rho/16$ .*

*Proof.* The algorithm only reports a cycle if there is a vertex  $v$  such that  $\text{dist}_G^1(v, v) < 0$ , and thus there is a negative cycle. Now suppose the algorithm returns a set  $I$ , and assume for the sake of contradiction that  $I$  is not a 1-hop independent set. Then there exists a pair  $u, v \in I \subseteq I'$  with  $\text{dist}_G^1(u, v) < 0$ . But in this case,  $v$  would be removed from  $I$ , which contradicts the assumption.

We now turn to the claim about  $|I|$ . Note that if  $\rho \leq 4$ , then  $|I'| = 1$ . Thus, there is either a negative-weight cycle discovered, or  $|I| = |I'| = \lceil \rho/4 \rceil > \rho/16$ ; either way, the claim holds. For the remainder, assume  $\rho > 4$  and hence  $\hat{k} > 4$ .

As per the lemma statement, assume there are no heavy vertices in  $U_0$ . We say that a knockout event occurs for  $v$  if (i)  $v \in I'$  and (ii)  $\exists u \in I'$  with  $u \neq v$  such that  $\text{dist}_G^1(u, v) < 0$ . Let  $X_v$  be the indicator for a knockout event for  $v$ . We can bound  $\Pr(X_v | v \in I')$  as follows. Consider any  $u \neq v, u \in U_0$ . Then  $\Pr(u \in I' | v \in I') = \frac{|I'|-1}{|U_0|-1} = \frac{\lceil \rho/4 \rceil - 1}{\hat{k} - 1}$ . Taking a union bound over all  $u \neq v \in U_0$  with  $\text{dist}_G^1(u, v) < 0$ , we have  $\Pr(X_v | v \in I') \leq C(U_0, v) \frac{\lceil \rho/4 \rceil - 1}{\hat{k} - 1} \leq \frac{2\hat{k}}{\rho} \frac{\rho/4}{\hat{k} - 1} = \frac{\hat{k}}{2(\hat{k} - 1)}$ , or  $E[X_v | v \in I'] \leq \frac{\hat{k}}{2(\hat{k} - 1)}$ . For  $\hat{k} \geq 5$ , this can be simplified to  $E[X_k] \leq 5/8$ . Let  $X$  be the total number of knockout events. Then we have  $E[X] \leq (5/8)|I'|$ . By Markov's inequality, we then have  $\Pr(X \geq (3/4)|I'|) \leq 5/6$ .

Now, let us consider the ramifications of the good outcome:  $X < (3/4)|I'|$  knockout events. If  $|I| = |I'| - X$ , then  $|I| \geq (1/4)|I'| = (1/4)\lceil \rho/4 \rceil \geq \rho/16$ . If instead  $|I| < |I'| - X$ , then there must be some vertex  $v \in I', v \notin I$  that is removed for a reason other than a knockout event. That is to say,  $v \in R_G^1(I')$  but  $v \notin R_G^1(I' - \{v\})$ . Thus,  $\text{dist}_G^1(v, v) < 0$  and  $s(v) = v$ , and a cycle is reported. We conclude that with probability at least  $1/6$ , the number of knockout events is small enough and hence either  $|I| \geq \rho/16$  or a cycle is reported.  $\square$

With all the tools in place, we are ready to complete the algorithm for Lemma 3.10, which is described in Algorithm 5. This algorithm is parameterized by a constant  $c' \geq 4$ , which controls the failure probability. The process matches the outline in Section 3.4. First partition the negative vertices  $U_0$  into subsets  $H$  and  $L$ , where  $H$  should contain the heavy vertices and  $L$  should contain the light vertices, using Algorithm 3. If  $H$  is nonempty, then choose any vertex  $y$  and identify the set of negative vertices  $U = \{u \in U_0 | \text{dist}_G^1(u, y) < 0\}$ . This can be accomplished by computing 1-hop STSP to  $y$  using BFD. As this is supposed to be a Las Vegas algorithm, the next step is to verify that  $U$  is large enough. If so, return  $y$  and  $U$ . If not (some vertex was misclassified), restart the algorithm. If instead  $H$  is empty, then the algorithm instead searches for a large independent set  $I \subseteq U_0$  by calling Algorithm 4 a total of  $c' \lceil \lg n \rceil$  times, stopping when either a cycle is reported or a large independent set is found. This step may also fail either because we are unlucky or because some heavy vertices were misclassified in  $L$ . Thus, after  $c' \lceil \lg n \rceil$  failed attempts, the algorithm is restarted.

**Proof of Lemma 3.10.** First, we consider the return values. By Lemma 5.2, if Algorithm 4 reports a cycle, then that reporting is always correct. Also by Lemma 5.2, the set  $I$  is always a

---

**Algorithm 5:** Algorithm of Lemma 3.10: find a sandwich crust or independent set

---

**input** : A graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup E^-, w)$  with  $w(e) \geq 0$  for  $e \in E^+$   
**input** : Subset  $U_0$  of negative vertices and integer  $\rho$  with  $1 \leq \rho \leq |U_0|$   
**output:** A 1-hop independent set  $I \subseteq U_0$  or a vertex  $y$  and set  $U \subseteq U_0$  such that  $dist_G^1(u, y) < 0$  for all  $u \in U$ . A negative-weight cycle may instead be reported inside a call to **RandIS**, which terminates the entire algorithm

```

1 let  $\hat{k} = |U_0|$ 
2  $\langle H, L \rangle := \text{HL-Partition}(G, U_0, \rho)$ 
3 if  $H \neq \emptyset$  then
4   choose arbitrary  $y \in H$ 
5   run STSP with target  $y$  to compute  $U = \{u \in U_0 \mid dist_G^1(u, y) < 0\}$ 
6   if  $|U| < (1/8)\hat{k}/\rho$  then restart Algorithm 5
7   else return  $y$  and  $U$ 
   /* we now have  $H = \emptyset$  and  $L = U_0$  */
8 for  $c' \lceil \lg n \rceil$  attempts do
9    $I := \text{RandIS}(G, U_0, \rho)$ 
10  if  $|I| \geq \rho/16$  then return  $I$ 
   /* no large independent set found */
11 restart Algorithm 5
```

---

1-hop independent set. Thus, if Algorithm 5 returns  $I$ , then  $I$  is a 1-hop independent set with  $|I| \geq \rho/16$ . Finally, by construction,  $U = \{u \in U_0 \mid dist_G^1(u, y) < 0\}$ , and the algorithm only returns  $U$  and  $y$  if  $|U| \geq (1/8)\hat{k}/\rho$ . There are no other places where Algorithm 5 returns, so it always satisfies the output criteria of this lemma.

We next consider the running time. Because  $w(e) \geq 0$  for all  $e \in E^+$ , we can apply Lemma 2.3 to compute SSSP and STSP. First, let us consider the running time of **HL-Partition** (Algorithm 3). Computing  $R_G^1(U')$  amounts to computing 1-hop SSSP, which takes time  $O(m \log n)$  from Lemma 2.3. The random sampling and set construction can be performed within this time complexity as well, so the time of **HL-Partition** is  $O(m \log^2 n)$  for the  $\Theta(\log n)$  iterations. There is a potential partition failure event: that some vertex is misclassified in  $L$  or  $H$ . By Lemma 5.1, the probability of such a failure is at most  $1/n^{c'/3-1}$ .

Suppose there is no partition failure. Then  $C(U_0, v) > (1/8)\hat{k}/\rho$  for all  $y \in H$ . Thus, if  $H$  is not empty, then the algorithm always returns a  $y$  and  $U$ . This step entails running 1-hop STSP again, which is  $O(m \log n)$  time from Lemma 2.3.

If instead there is no partition failure, but  $H = \emptyset$ , then the algorithm proceeds to finding an independent set. Each call to **RandIS** (Algorithm 4) entails computing 1-hop SSSP and scanning through the vertices once, so  $O(m \log n)$  time. There are  $c' \lceil \lg n \rceil$  such calls, so the running time is again  $O(m \log^2 n)$ . By Lemma 5.2, which also assumes no partition failure, each call to **RandIS** leads to a probability of  $5/6$  that Algorithm 5 completes, either finding a large-enough independent set or reporting a cycle and terminating. Thus, the probability that the algorithm *does not* complete by the end of the loop is at most  $(5/6)^{c' \lceil \lg n \rceil} = 1/n^{c' \lg(6/5)} < 1/n^{c'/4}$ .

To conclude, the Algorithm 5 completes in  $O(m \log^2 n)$  time unless there is a partition failure or there is an unlucky outcome with independent sets, either of which may result in the algorithm restarting. Adding up the failure probabilities gives a failure probability of at most  $1/n^{c'/4} +$

$1/n^{c/3-1}$ . Choosing, for example,  $c = 9$  and  $c' = 8$  gives a failure probability of at most  $2/n^2$ .  $\square$

## 6 Reweighting a Negative Sandwich

This section provides a proof of Lemma 3.7. Recall that the lemma states that given input graph  $G$  and negative sandwich  $(x, U, y)$ , (1) the specific reweighting  $\phi$  is valid, and (2) that the only vertices in  $R_\phi^{\beta-1}(U)$  after reweighting are those vertices  $v$  for which  $\text{thru}^\beta(x, v, y) < 0$  before.

**Proof of Lemma 3.7.** Throughout the proof, we use  $\text{dist}$  for the distance in  $G$ , i.e., with weight function  $w$ , and  $\text{dist}_\phi$  for the distance in  $G_\phi$ , i.e., with weight function  $w_\phi$ . The latter only occurs at one point in the proof of (2).

To prove (1), consider any nonnegative edge  $(u, v) \in E^+$ . We then have three cases.

Case 1:  $\phi(u) = 0$ . We always have  $\phi(v) \leq 0$ . So  $w_\phi(u, v) = w(u, v) + \phi(u) - \phi(v) = w(u, v) + 0 - \phi(v) \geq w(u, v) \geq 0$ .

For the remaining two cases, observe first the following

$$\max(\text{dist}^\beta(x, v), -\text{dist}^\beta(v, y)) \geq \phi(v) \quad (1)$$

$$(\phi(u) \neq 0) \implies ((\phi(u) \geq \text{dist}^\beta(x, u)) \wedge (\phi(u) \geq -\text{dist}^\beta(u, y))) \quad (2)$$

Case 2:  $\phi(u) \neq 0$  and  $\text{dist}^\beta(x, v) \geq -\text{dist}^\beta(v, y)$ . By the triangle inequality (Lemma 2.1),  $\text{dist}^\beta(x, v) \leq \text{dist}^\beta(x, u) + w(u, v)$  or equivalently  $\text{dist}^\beta(x, u) \geq \text{dist}^\beta(x, v) - w(u, v)$ . Putting everything together

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(u) &\geq \text{dist}^\beta(x, u) && \text{Equation 2} \\ &\geq \text{dist}^\beta(x, v) - w(u, v) && \text{triangle inequality} \\ &\geq \phi(v) - w(u, v) && \text{Equation 1 with } \text{dist}^\beta(x, v) \geq -\text{dist}^\beta(v, y) \end{aligned}$$

$$\therefore w(u, v) + \phi(u) - \phi(v) \geq 0 .$$

Case 3:  $\phi(u) \neq 0$  and  $-\text{dist}^\beta(v, y) > \text{dist}^\beta(x, v)$ . By the triangle inequality (Lemma 2.1),  $\text{dist}^\beta(u, y) \leq w(u, v) + \text{dist}^\beta(v, y)$  or equivalently  $-\text{dist}^\beta(u, y) \geq -w(u, v) - \text{dist}^\beta(v, y)$ . Putting everything together

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(u) &\geq -\text{dist}^\beta(u, y) && \text{Equation 2} \\ &\geq -w(u, v) - \text{dist}^\beta(v, y) && \text{triangle inequality} \\ &\geq -w(u, v) + \phi(v) && \text{Equation 1 with } -\text{dist}^\beta(v, y) > \text{dist}^\beta(x, v) \end{aligned}$$

$$\therefore w(u, v) + \phi(u) - \phi(v) \geq 0 .$$

Finally, let us prove (2). Consider any  $u \in U$  and  $v$  that is not  $\beta$ -between  $x$  and  $y$ . The goal is to argue that  $\text{dist}_\phi^{\beta-1}(u, v) \geq 0$ . We proceed by breaking the proof into two smaller claims, namely (i)  $\phi(u) = 0$  and (ii)  $-\phi(v) > -\text{dist}^{\beta-1}(u, v)$ . Assuming these claims hold, we have  $\text{dist}_\phi^{\beta-1}(u, v) = \text{dist}^{\beta-1}(u, v) + \phi(u) - \phi(v) > \text{dist}^{\beta-1}(u, v) + 0 - \text{dist}^{\beta-1}(u, v) = 0$  as desired.

Claim (i) follows from definition of a negative sandwich and  $\phi$ . That is,  $\text{dist}^\beta(u, y) \leq \text{dist}^1(u, y) < 0$ . Therefore,  $\max(\text{dist}^\beta(x, u), -\text{dist}^\beta(u, y)) \geq -\text{dist}^\beta(u, y) > 0$ , and hence  $\phi(u) = 0$ .

For claim (ii), start with the definition of  $\beta$ -betweenness. By assumption,  $v$  is not  $\beta$ -between  $x$  and  $y$ , so  $\text{dist}^\beta(x, v) + \text{dist}^\beta(v, y) \geq 0$ . Therefore,  $\phi(v) = \min(0, \text{dist}^\beta(x, v)) \leq \text{dist}^\beta(x, v)$ . By the triangle inequality,  $\phi(v) \leq \text{dist}^\beta(x, v) \leq \text{dist}^1(x, u) + \text{dist}^{\beta-1}(u, v)$ . Because of the negative sandwich  $\text{dist}^1(x, u) < 0$ , and hence  $\phi(v) < \text{dist}^{\beta-1}(u, v)$ , which completes the proof of (ii).  $\square$

---

**Algorithm 6:** Algorithm of Lemma 3.3: eliminate a remote subset by hop reduction

---

- input** : Integer  $r \geq 1$   
**input** : A graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup N, w)$  with  $w(e) \geq 0$  for  $e \in E^+$   
**output**: A valid price function  $\phi$  that eliminates all edges  $N$ . The algorithm may instead terminate by reporting a negative-weight cycle.
- 1 let  $\hat{k} = |N|$
  - 2 compute super-source distances  $\delta_j(v) = \text{dist}_G^j(V, v)$  for all vertices  $v$  and all  $j$ ,  $0 \leq j \leq r$
  - 3  $R := \{v \mid \delta_r(v) < 0\}$
  - 4 construct a new graph  $H = (V_H, E_H, w_H)$  as follows:  
     $V_H = V \cup \{v_j \mid v \in R, 1 \leq j \leq r\}$ .  
    define  $v_0 = v$  as an alias for  $v$ , for all  $v \in V$   
     $E_H = \{(u_j, v_j) \mid (u, v) \in E^+, u, v \in R, 0 \leq j \leq r\} \cup \{(u_j, v_{j+1}) \mid (u, v) \in N, u, v \in R, 0 \leq j < r\}$   
     $\cup \{(u_j, v_0) \mid (u, v) \in E^+, u \in R, v \notin R, 0 \leq j \leq r\} \cup \{(u_j, v_0) \mid (u, v) \in N, u \in R, v \notin R, 0 \leq j < r\}$   
     $\cup \{(u_0, v_0) \mid (u, v) \in E^+, u \notin R, v \in R\} \cup \{(u_0, v_1) \mid (u, v) \in N, u \notin R, v \in R\}$   
     $\cup \{(u_0, v_0) \mid (u, v) \in E^+, u, v \notin R\} \cup \{(u_0, v_0) \mid (u, v) \in N, u, v \notin R\}$   
     $\cup \{(u_0, u_1), (u_1, u_2), \dots, (u_{r-1}, u_r), (u_r, u_0) \mid u \in R\}$   
     $w_H(u_i, v_j) = w(u, v) + \delta_i(u) - \delta_j(v)$  for  $(u_i, v_j) \in E_H$
  - 5 let  $\kappa = \lceil \hat{k}/r \rceil$
  - 6 compute super-source distances  $d(v) = \text{dist}_H^\kappa(V, v)$  and  $d'(v) = \text{dist}_H^{\kappa+1}(V, v)$  for all  $v \in V_H$
  - 7 **if**  $\exists v \in V_H$  such that  $d'(v) < d(v)$  **then** terminate algorithm and report “cycle”
  - 8 **else return** price function  $\phi : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\phi(v) = d(v)$  (i.e.,  $d$  restricted to subdomain  $V$ )
- 

## 7 Eliminating $r$ -Remote Edges by Hop Reduction

This section proves Lemma 3.3, expanding on the hop-reduction technique of Section 3.1. Algorithm 6 provides pseudocode of the algorithm. Recall that the crux of the algorithm is building a new graph  $H = (V_H, E_H, w_H)$  so that  $h$ -hop paths in  $G$  correspond to  $\leq \lceil h/r \rceil$ -hop paths in  $H$ . This section proves that the graph construction has this feature, and hence that SSSP distances can be computed efficiently by instead computing distances in  $H$ .

Aside from the graph construction, the algorithm is straightforward. Algorithm 6 begins by computing distances  $\delta_j(v) = \text{dist}_G^j(V, v)$  in  $G$  for  $0 \leq j \leq r$ , which by Lemma 2.3 corresponds to one  $r$ -limited SSSP computation. These distances are used to construct  $H$ . Next, the graph  $H$  is constructed, discussed more below. Finally, the algorithm computes  $\lceil \hat{k}/r \rceil$  and  $(\lceil \hat{k}/r \rceil + 1)$ -hop distances in  $H$ . If these are different, the algorithm terminates by reporting a cycle. If these are the same, then the price function for  $v \in V$  is given by  $\phi(v) = \text{dist}_H^{\lceil \hat{k}/r \rceil}(V, v)$ .

**Vertices  $V_H$ .** For all of the following, let  $R = \{v \mid \delta_r(v) < 0\}$ . All of the vertices in  $V$  are also in  $V_H$ ; define  $v_0 = v$ , so when referring to a vertex  $v \in V$  in the context of the graph  $H$ , we may use either  $v_0$  or  $v$ .<sup>9</sup> In addition, for each vertex  $v \in R$ ,  $V_H$  contains  $r$  additional copies  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_r$  of the vertex. The subscript  $\ell$  in  $v_\ell$  is called the **layer** of the vertex. Layer 0 is the original vertices.

---

<sup>9</sup>The notation  $v_0$  is generally used when considering distances or weights of edges in  $H$ , and the notation  $v$  is generally used when relating the distances back to  $G$ .

**Edges  $E_H$ .** For the edges, there are several cases depending on whether the endpoints are in  $R$  or not, i.e., whether the endpoints occur in more than one layer. The cases are grouped in the pseudocode by endpoint classifications across four rows and edge type ( $E^+$  or  $N$ ) across the two columns. Let us consider the nonnegative edges  $(u, v) \in E^+$  first. The number of corresponding edges in  $H$  is determined by whether  $u \in R$ , and the target of the edges depends on whether  $v \in R$ . If  $u, v \in R$ , then there are  $r + 1$  copies of each endpoint, and there are  $r + 1$  corresponding copies  $(u_0, v_0), (u_1, v_1), \dots, (u_r, v_r)$  of the edge included in  $E_H$ . These edges are each within a single layer. If  $u \in R$  but  $v \notin R$ , then there are still  $r + 1$  copies of the edge, but they are all directed at  $v_0$  in layer 0, i.e., the edges have the form  $(u_j, v_0)$  for  $0 \leq j \leq r$ . If instead  $u \notin R$  then  $u$  only occurs in layer 0, and hence there is only a single copy of the edge  $(u_0, v_0)$  in  $E_H$ . Notice that for all edges  $(u, v) \in E^+$ , the corresponding edges in  $E_H$  have the form  $(u_j, v_j)$  or  $(u_j, v_0)$ —that is, these edges are never directed toward a higher layer. Moreover, for each  $(u, v) \in E^+$ , each  $u_i \in V_H$  has exactly one such outgoing edge.

Now consider the negative edges  $(u, v) \in N$ . Again, the number of edges is dictated by whether  $u \in R$ , and the target depends on whether  $v \in R$ . If  $u, v \in R$ , then there are  $r$  corresponding copies  $(u_0, v_1), (u_1, v_2), \dots, (u_{r-1}, v_r)$  of the edge in  $E_H$ ; here, each  $(u_j, v_{j+1})$  progresses from layer  $j$  to layer  $j + 1$ , which is the key difference in the construction for negative edges and nonnegative edges. If  $u \in R$  but  $v \notin R$ , then there are still  $r$  copies of the edge, but they all directed at layer-0 vertex  $v_0$ , i.e., the edges have the form  $(u_j, v_0)$  for  $0 \leq j < r$ . If instead  $u \notin R$ , then there is only one copy of the edge in  $E_H$ : if  $v \in R$ , then the edge is  $(u_0, v_1)$ ; if  $v \notin R$ , then the edge is  $(u_0, v_0)$ . Unlike the nonnegative case, these edges may be directed toward a higher layer, but it is always at most one higher. Specifically, for  $(u, v) \in N$ , the corresponding edges all have the form  $(u_j, v_{j+1})$  or  $(u_j, v_0)$ . Moreover, for  $(u, v) \in N$ , each  $u_i \in V_H$  with  $i < r$  has exactly one outgoing edge of the form  $(u_i, v_j)$  (and moreover  $j \in \{0, i + 1\}$ ). The copy of  $u_r$  in the  $r$ -th layer has no corresponding outgoing edge as there is no layer  $r + 1$  to move to. An astute reader may notice that as described so far, a layer- $r$  copy of a negative vertex (whose only outgoing edge in  $G$  is a negative edge) would be a dead end in  $H$ . The self edges, discussed next, provide an outgoing edge.

For  $u \in R$ ,  $E_H$  also includes the self edges  $(u_j, u_{j+1})$  for  $0 \leq j < r$  and  $(u_r, u_0)$ . These edges form a cycle on copies of  $u$ , and the weights will be set so that this is a 0-weight cycle. These edges serve two purposes. First, the edges  $(u_r, u_0)$  provide routes from layer- $r$  to layer-0. Second, the other edges in the cycle simplify the reasoning about distances in  $H$ .

**Weights  $w_H$ .** For each edge  $(u_i, v_j) \in E_H$ , the weight is simply  $w_H = w(u, v) + \delta_i(u) - \delta_j(v)$ , where for notational convenience we define  $w(u, u) = 0$  for all  $u \in V$ .

## 7.1 Analysis

This section proves Lemma 3.3. Let us begin by observing that most edges in  $H$  have nonnegative weight. In particular, the negative edges in  $H$  are limited to the self edges  $(u_r, u_0)$  from layer  $r$  to layer 0. The proof amounts to applying the triangle inequality (Lemma 2.1) for each of several cases.

**Lemma 7.1.** *Consider the input graph  $G = (V, E^+ \cup N, w)$  and auxiliary graph  $H = (V_H, E_H, w_H)$  as constructed by Algorithm 6. The only edges  $e \in E_H$  with  $w_H(e) < 0$  are the edges  $e \in \{(u_r, u_0)\}$*

*Proof.* Consider any edge  $(u_i, v_j) \in E_H$ . Showing  $w_H(u_i, v_j) \geq 0$  amounts to showing  $w(u, v) + \delta_i(u) - \delta_j(v) \geq 0$ , or  $\delta_j(v) \leq \delta_i(u) + w(u, v)$ , i.e., the triangle inequality but possibly with different numbers of hops. It is easy to verify the claim by considering the cases separately: (1) edges

$(u_i, u_{i+1})$ , (2) edges  $(u_i, v_0)$  for  $v \notin R$ , (3) edges  $(u_i, v_i)$  for  $(u, v) \in E^+$ , and (4) edges  $(u_i, v_{i+1})$  for  $(u, v) \in N$ .

Case 1. Consider an edge  $(u_i, u_{i+1}) \in E_H$ . Because  $i$ -hop paths are a subset of  $(i+1)$ -hop paths,  $\delta_{i+1}(u) \leq \delta_i(u) = \delta_i(u) + 0 = \delta_i(u) + w(u, u)$ .

Case 2. Consider an edge  $(u_i, v_0) \in E_H$  for  $v \notin R$ . First, suppose  $i < r$ . By Lemma 2.1,  $\text{dist}_G^r(V, v) \leq \text{dist}_G^i(V, u) + w(u, v) = \delta_i(u) + w(u, v)$ . Because  $v \notin R$ ,  $\text{dist}_G^r(V, v) \geq 0$  (which means it equals 0), and hence  $\delta_i(v) = 0$  for all  $i$ . Thus, we have  $\delta_0(v) = \delta_r(v) \leq \delta_i(u) + w(u, v)$ . The case that  $i = r$  only occurs for  $(u, v) \in E^+$ . Then by Lemma 2.1, again  $\text{dist}_G^r(V, v) \leq \text{dist}_G^r(V, u) + w(u, v)$ , and hence  $\delta_0(v) = \delta_r(v) \leq \delta_r(u) + w(u, v)$ .

Case 3. Consider an edge  $(u_i, v_i)$  for  $(u, v) \in E^+$ . Then by Lemma 2.1,  $\text{dist}_G^i(V, v) \leq \text{dist}_G^i(V, u) + w(u, v)$  or  $\delta_i(v) \leq \delta_i(u) + w(u, v)$ .

Case 4. Consider an edge  $(u_i, v_{i+1})$  for  $(u, v) \in N$ . Then by Lemma 2.1,  $\text{dist}_G^{i+1}(V, v) \leq \text{dist}_G^i(V, u) + w(u, v)$  and  $\delta_{i+1}(v) \leq \delta_i(u) + w(u, v)$ .  $\square$

The next lemmas show a correspondence between paths in  $H$  and paths in  $G$ . The first, which is simpler, shows that paths between vertices in  $V$  in the graph  $H$  correspond to paths in  $G$ , and moreover those paths have the same weight. The second roughly shows the converse, but it also bounds the number of hops. That is, the second lemma (or rather its corollary) states that if there is an  $h$ -hop path in  $G$ , then there is a corresponding  $\lceil h/r \rceil$ -hop path in  $H$  with the same weight. Together, these imply that the distances computed in  $H$  can be used to compute distances in  $G$ .

**Lemma 7.2.** *Consider any  $s_i, v_j \in V_H$ . Let  $p_H$  be any  $s_i$ -to- $v_j$  path in  $H$ . Then there is an  $s$ -to- $v$  path  $p$  in  $G$  with  $w(p) = w_H(p_H) - \delta_i(s) + \delta_j(v)$ .*

*If  $w(e) \geq 0$  for all  $e \in E^+$  and we consider  $s, v \in V$ , then the statement simplifies to: let  $p_H$  be any  $s$ -to- $v$  path in  $H$ ; then there is an  $s$ -to- $v$  path  $p$  in  $G$  with  $w(p) = w_H(p_H)$ .*

*Proof.* The simplification follows from the main claim by observing that if  $w(e) \geq 0$  for all  $e \in E^+$ , then  $\delta_0(v) = 0$  for all  $V$ . Thus, for  $i = 0$  and  $j = 0$ , the simplification follows.

The proof of the main claim is by induction on  $|p_H|$ , the size of the path.

The base case is an empty path from  $s_i$  to  $s_i$  in  $H$  and the corresponding empty path from  $s$  to  $s$  in  $G$ . Indeed  $0 = 0 - \delta_i(s) + \delta_i(s)$ .

For the inductive step, consider a nonempty path  $p_H$ . Decompose  $p_H$  into its last edge  $(u_\ell, v_j)$  and the remaining subpath  $p'_H$  from  $s_i$  to  $u_\ell$ . By inductive assumption, there is an  $s$ -to- $u$  path  $p'$  in  $G$  with  $w(p') = w_H(p'_H) - \delta_i(s) + \delta_\ell(u)$ . By definition of  $w_H$ , we also have  $w(u, v) = w_H(u_\ell, v_j) - \delta_\ell(u) + \delta_j(v)$ . We now have two cases depending on whether the edge is a self edge or not.

If  $u \neq v$ , then  $(u, v) \in E^+ \cup N$  and  $p$  is formed by appending  $(u, v)$  to  $p'$ . In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w(p) &= w(p') + w(u, v) \\ &= (w_H(p'_H) - \delta_i(s) + \delta_\ell(u)) + (w_H(u_\ell, v_j) - \delta_\ell(u) + \delta_j(v)) \\ &= w_H(p'_H) + w_H(u_\ell, v_j) - \delta_i(s) + \delta_j(v) \\ &= w_H(p_H) - \delta_i(s) + \delta_j(v) . \end{aligned}$$

If instead  $u = v$ , and the final edge is  $(v_\ell, v_j)$ , then the path  $p$  is the same as the path  $p'$ . Here we observe that  $w_H(v_\ell, v_j) = 0 + \delta_\ell(v) - \delta_j(v)$ , or  $\delta_\ell(v) = w_H(v_\ell, v_j) + \delta_j(v)$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} w(p) &= w(p') = w_H(p'_H) - \delta_i(s) + \delta_\ell(v) \\ &= w_H(p'_H) - \delta_i(s) + w_H(v_\ell, v_j) + \delta_j(v) \\ &= w_H(p_H) - \delta_i(s) + \delta_j(v) \end{aligned}$$

$\square$



**Lemma 7.3.** *Let  $p$  be any  $h$ -hop  $s$ -to- $v$  path in  $G$ , for any  $s, v \in V$ . Then there is an  $h_H$ -hop  $s_0$ -to- $v_j$  path  $p_H$  in  $H$ , for some layer  $0 \leq j \leq r$ , with the following two properties: (1)  $w_H(p_H) = w(p) + \delta_0(s) - \delta_j(v)$ , and (2)  $rh_H + j \leq h$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is by induction on  $|p|$ . The base case is an empty path from  $s$  to itself in  $G$  and the corresponding empty path  $s_0$  to  $s_0$  in  $H$ .

For the inductive step, consider a path  $p$ , which we can decompose into a subpath  $p'$  from  $s$  to  $u$  and the edge  $(u, v)$ . By inductive assumption, there is a corresponding  $h'_H$ -hop path  $p'_H$  in  $H$  from  $s_0$  to some  $u_\ell$  with  $w_H(p'_H) = w(p') + \delta_0(s) - \delta_\ell(u)$ . There are several cases.

Case 1:  $(u, v) \in E^+$ . Then  $p'$  is an  $h$ -hop path, and thus the inductive assumption on the hops for  $p'_H$  is  $rh'_H + \ell \leq h$ . The path  $p_H$  is formed by appending  $(u_\ell, v_j)$ , where  $j \in \{0, \ell\}$  depends on whether  $v \in R$ , to the path  $p'_H$ . We thus get

$$\begin{aligned} w_H(p_H) &= w_H(p'_H) + w_H(u_\ell, v_j) \\ &= (w(p') + \delta_0(s) - \delta_\ell(u)) + (w(u, v) + \delta_\ell(u) - \delta_j(v)) \\ &= w(p) + \delta_0(s) - \delta_j(v). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $w(u_\ell, v_j) \geq 0$  by Lemma 7.1, the number of hops in  $p_H$  is the same as  $p'_H$ . Moreover,  $j \leq \ell$ . So  $rh_H + j \leq rh'_H + \ell \leq h$  as required.

Case 2:  $(u, v) \in E^-$ . Then  $p'$  is an  $(h-1)$ -hop path, and thus the inductive assumption on the hops for  $p'_H$  is  $rh'_H + \ell \leq h-1$ .

Case 2a: If  $\ell < r$ , then the path  $p_H$  is formed by appending  $(u_\ell, v_j)$ , where  $j \in \{0, \ell+1\}$  depends on whether  $v \in R$ , to the path  $p'_H$ . The formula for  $w_H(p_H)$  is the same as for Case 1. Moreover, by Lemma 7.1, we again have  $h'_H = h_H$ , but now  $j \leq \ell+1$ . We thus have  $rh_H + j \leq rh'_H + \ell + 1 \leq (h-1) + 1 = h$ .

Case 2b: If  $\ell = r$ , then the path  $p_H$  is formed by appending two edges  $(u_\ell, u_0)$  and  $(u_0, v_j)$  to the path  $p'_H$ , where  $j \in \{0, 1\}$  depends on whether  $v \in R$ . Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_H(p_H) &= w_H(p'_H) + w_H(u_r, u_0) + w_H(u_0, v_j) \\ &= (w(p') + \delta_0(s) - \delta_r(u)) + (0 + \delta_r(u) - \delta_0(u)) + (w(u, v) + \delta_0(u) - \delta_j(v)) \\ &= w(p) + \delta_0(s) - \delta_j(v). \end{aligned}$$

Here, the edge  $(u_r, u_0)$  may be a negative-weight edge, but by Lemma 7.1 the other edge is not. Thus, we can only conclude that  $h_H \leq h'_H + 1$ . Nevertheless, because  $j \leq 1$  and  $\ell = r$ , we have  $rh_H + j \leq r(h'_H + 1) + 1 = (rh'_H + \ell) + 1 \leq (h-1) + 1 = h$ , or  $rh_H + j \leq h$  as claimed.  $\square$

**Corollary 7.4.** *Let  $p$  be any  $h$ -hop  $s$ -to- $v$  path in  $G$ , for any  $s, v \in V$ . Then for all layers  $i$  with  $v_i \in V_H$ , there is an  $\lceil h/r \rceil$ -hop path  $p_H$  in  $H$  from  $s_0$  to every  $v_i$  with weight  $w_H(p_H) = w(p) + \delta_0(s) - \delta_i(v)$ .*

*If  $w(e) \geq 0$  for all  $e \in E^+$ , and we consider  $i = 0$ , then a special case of the claim is: let  $p$  be any  $h$ -hop  $s$ -to- $v$  path in  $G$ . Then there is an  $\lceil h/r \rceil$ -hop path  $p_h$  in  $H$  with  $w_H(p_H) = w(p)$ .*

*Proof.* Lemma 7.3 states that there exists a layer  $j$  and a path  $p_H$  from  $s_0$  to  $v_j$  in  $H$  with (1) weight  $w_H(p_H) = w(p) + \delta_0(s) - \delta_j(v)$ , and (2) a number of hops  $h_H$  with  $rh_H + j \leq h$ .

Case 1:  $j = 0$ . Then we have  $h_H \leq h/r \leq \lceil h/r \rceil$ . The claim can be achieved for all  $i$  by appending edges  $(v_0, v_1), (v_1, v_2), \dots, (v_{i-1}, v_i)$  to the path  $p_H$ . By Lemma 7.1, the edges all have nonnegative weight, and hence the number of hops does not change. Moreover, the  $\delta$ 's telescope, giving total weight  $w(p) + \delta_0(s) - \delta_0(v) + (\delta_0(v) - \delta_1(v)) + (\delta_1(v) - \delta_2(v)) + \dots + (\delta_{i-1}(v) - \delta_i(v)) = w(p) - \delta_0(s) - \delta_i(v)$ .

Case 2:  $j \geq 1$ . Then we have  $rh_H + 1 \leq rh_H + j \leq h$ , or  $h_H < h/r \leq \lceil h/r \rceil$ . Since the inequality is strict, and  $h_H$  is an integer, we have  $h_H \leq \lceil h/r \rceil - 1$ . To achieve the claim, we can therefore afford to use one more negative edge in  $H$ . Thus, the paths to  $v_i$  are formed by first appending  $(v_j, v_{j+1}), (v_{j+1}, v_{j+2}), \dots, (v_{r-1}, v_r), (v_r, v_0)$  to the path; by Lemma 7.1, only the last edge here has negative weight, increasing the number of hops to at most  $\lceil h/r \rceil$ . As in case 1, the  $\delta$ 's telescope, giving a total weight of  $w(p) + \delta_0(s) - \delta_0(v)$  to  $v_0$ . To finish out, apply case 1 to this augmented path.

Finally, if  $w(e) \geq 0$  for all  $e \in E^+$ , then  $\delta_0(v) = 0$  for all  $v \in V$ , which gives the simplified statement.  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma 3.3.** Let us start by considering the correctness. Suppose that there are no negative-weight cycles in  $G$ ; show that Algorithm 6 returns a price function, and moreover that the price function is correct. (The contrapositive says that if the algorithm reports a negative-weight cycle, then that reporting is correct.) If there is no negative-weight cycle, then there exist shortest paths that are simple paths, and hence  $\text{dist}_G(V, v) = \text{dist}_G^{\hat{k}}(V, v)$ . Let  $\kappa = \lceil \hat{k}/r \rceil$ . Then applying Corollary 7.4, we therefore have that for all  $v_i \in V$ ,  $\text{dist}_H^{\kappa}(V, v_i) \leq \text{dist}_G^{\hat{k}}(V, v) - \delta_i(v) = \text{dist}_G(V, v) - \delta_i(v)$ . From Lemma 7.2, we also have  $\text{dist}_G(V, v) \leq \text{dist}_H^{\kappa+1}(V, v_i) + \delta_i(v) \leq \text{dist}_H^{\kappa}(V, v_i) + \delta_i(v)$ . Thus, the distances must be the same. That is,  $\text{dist}_H^{\kappa+1}(V, v_i) = \text{dist}_H^{\kappa}(V, v_i) = \text{dist}_G(V, v) - \delta_i(v)$ . Therefore, (1) the algorithm does not report a cycle, and (2) for all  $v \in V$ ,  $\phi(v) = d(v) = \text{dist}_H^{\kappa}(V, v) = \text{dist}_G(V, v)$  is the same price function from Johnson's strategy [12], and hence  $\phi$  is a valid price function that eliminates all negative edges  $N$ .

Next consider the case that  $G$  does contain a negative-weight cycle. Then by Lemma 7.3, there is a negative-weight cycle in  $H$ , and moreover there is such a cycle that includes some layer-0 vertex  $v_0$ . Observe that if  $\text{dist}_H^{\kappa+1}(V, u_j) = \text{dist}_H^{\kappa}(V, u_j)$  for all  $u_j \in V_H$ , then it must be the case that these are the actual shortest-path distances, i.e.,  $\text{dist}_H^{\kappa}(V, u_j) = \text{dist}_H(V, u_j)$ . Given the presence of a negative-weight cycle, however, we know that  $\text{dist}_H^{\kappa}(V, v_0) \neq \text{dist}_H(V, v_0)$ . Thus, there must exist some  $u_j \in V_H$  with  $\text{dist}_H^{\kappa+1}(V, u_j) < \text{dist}_H^{\kappa}(V, u_j)$ , and Algorithm 6 reports a cycle.

Now let us consider the running time, which is dominated by two super-source shortest path computations. The first computation is the  $\leq r$ -hop distances  $\delta_i$  in  $G$ . Because  $w(e) \geq 0$ , Lemma 2.3 states that these can all be computed in a total of  $O(rm \log n)$  time.

The shortest-path computation in  $H$  has a running time that depends on the size of  $H$ . Let  $X$  be the set of negative vertices, i.e.,  $N = \text{out}(X)$ . Moreover, because the only negative-weight edges are in  $N$ , it follows that  $R = R_G^r(V) = R_G^r(N)$ . Thus, by assumption that  $X$  is  $r$ -remote, we have  $|R| \leq n/r$ , where  $n = |V|$ . Now consider the construction of  $H$ . We directly get  $|V_H| = r \cdot |R| + n \leq r \cdot n/r + n = 2n$ . As for the edges, by construction each vertex  $u_j \in V_H$  has at most one outgoing edge  $(u_j, v_j)$  corresponding to the edge  $(u, v) \in E^+ \cup N$ , plus one self edge. Applying the simplifying assumptions that all vertices have degree at most  $O(m/n)$  and  $m \geq 2n$ ,<sup>10</sup> we have  $|E_H| \leq |V_H| \cdot O(m/n) = O(m)$ .

We conclude by applying Lemma 2.3 for the cost of computing  $\lceil \hat{k}/r \rceil$ -hop distances in  $H$ . Because  $H$  has  $O(n)$  vertices and  $O(m)$  edges, the running time of this step is  $O(\lceil \hat{k}/r \rceil m \log n)$ . Adding the running time of the shortest paths in  $G$ , we get  $O(\lceil \hat{k}/r \rceil m \log n + rm \log n)$ ; the ceiling can be dropped because the second term subsumes the first when  $\hat{k}$  is small.  $\square$

<sup>10</sup>Specifically, that the number of nonnegative outgoing edges is  $O(m/n)$

## References

- [1] Kyriakos Axiotis, Aleksander Madry, and Adrian Vladu. Circulation control for faster minimum cost flow in unit-capacity graphs. In *61st IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 93–104, 2020.
- [2] Richard Bellman. On a routing problem. *Quarterly of Applied Mathematics*, 16(1):87–90, 1958.
- [3] Aaron Bernstein, Danupon Nanongkai, and Christian Wulff-Nilsen. Negative-weight single-source shortest paths in near-linear time. In *63rd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 600–611, 2022.
- [4] Li Chen, Rasmus Kyng, Yang P. Liu, Richard Peng, Maximilian Probst Gutenberg, and Sushant Sachdeva. Maximum flow and minimum-cost flow in almost-linear time. In *63rd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 612–623, 2022.
- [5] Michael B. Cohen, Aleksander Madry, Piotr Sankowski, and Adrian Vladu. Negative-weight shortest paths and unit capacity minimum cost flow in  $O(m^{10/7} \log W)$  time. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 752–771, 2017.
- [6] Thomas H. Cormen, Charles E. Leiserson, Ronald L. Rivest, and Clifford Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms, 3rd Edition*. MIT Press, 2009.
- [7] Yefim Dinitz and Rotem Itzhak. Hybrid Bellman-Ford-Dijkstra algorithm. *J. of Discrete Algorithms*, 42(C):35–44, jan 2017.
- [8] Lester R. Ford. Paper P-923. *Network Flow Theory*, 1956.
- [9] Michael L. Fredman and Robert Endre Tarjan. Fibonacci heaps and their uses in improved network optimization algorithms. *J. ACM*, 34(3):596–615, 1987.
- [10] Harold N. Gabow and Robert Endre Tarjan. Faster scaling algorithms for network problems. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 18(5):1013–1036, 1989.
- [11] Andrew V. Goldberg. Scaling algorithms for the shortest path problem. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 24(3):494–504, 1995.
- [12] Donald B. Johnson. Efficient algorithms for shortest paths in sparse networks. *J. ACM*, 24(1):1–13, jan 1977.
- [13] Jon M. Kleinberg and Éva Tardos. *Algorithm design*. Addison-Wesley, 2006.
- [14] Edward F. Moore. The shortest path through a maze. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Theory of Switching*, pages 285–292, 1959.
- [15] Alfonso Shimbel. Structure in communication nets. In *Proceedings of the Symposium on Information Networks*, pages 199–203, 1955.
- [16] Jan van den Brand, Yin Tat Lee, Danupon Nanongkai, Richard Peng, Thatchaphol Saranurak, Aaron Sidford, Zhao Song, and Di Wang. Bipartite matching in nearly-linear time on moderately dense graphs. In *61st IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 919–930, 2020.