Mathematics for Decision Making: An Introduction

Lecture 12

Matthias Köppe

UC Davis, Mathematics

February 12, 2009

Dijkstra's Algorithm: Efficiency, IV

We now determine the precise number of elementary operations.

- We use the constants *c_i* associated with the data structures, which appeared to the previous slide.
- We use additional constants *d_i* to denote the number of elementary operations in other parts of the program.

Dijkstra's Algorithm

Input: A digraph G = (V, A) with nonnegative arc costs, starting node *r* **Output:** A predecessor vector **p**, encoding minimum-cost paths from *r* to all nodes.

Dijkstra's Algorithm: Efficiency, V

Adding up everything:

• The minimum-finding operation takes $d_6 + |S|(c_4 + c_6 + d_7)$ operations, where |S| starts with |V| and is decreased until it reaches 1. Thus its total time is:

$$\sum_{s=1}^{|V|} \left(d_6 + |S|(c_4 + c_6 + d_7) \right) = |V|d_6 + \frac{|V|(|V|+1)}{2}(c_4 + c_6 + d_7)$$

• All node-scanning operations (verifying all outgoing arcs) together take

$$\sum_{\nu \in V} (c_2 + \delta^+(\nu)(c_3 + 4c_4 + d_8)) = |V|c_2 + |A|(c_3 + 4c_4 + d_8)$$

- The remaining operations are easy to account for
- Together we obtain

$$e_1|V|^2 + e_2|V| + e_3|A| + e_4$$

elementary operations, for some (complicated) constants e_i.

• For sparse graphs, where $|A| \ll |V|^2$, the term $e_1 |V|^2$ is the largest summand. It comes from the minimum-finding operation!

Dijkstra's Algorithm: Efficiency, VI

- We are not happy with the complicated analysis (counting of operations, lots of constants, ...) we had to do to obtain this result.
- Moreover, the constants *e_i* we obtained still depend on the specific RAM we are using. For instance, on a version of a RAM with few registers, we might need more elementary operations to do the same thing.
- For these reasons, it is useful and convenient to **ignore the specific constants** and just ask **how does the running time grow for large problems** (i.e., asymptotically)
- We will use the Landau notation for asymptotic growth. Fix a function $g(n) \ge 0$.
 - A function f(n) ≥ 0 is said to grow (asymptotically) at most with order g(n) if

 $\exists c > 0, n_0 \in \mathbf{N} : \forall n \ge n_0 : f(n) \le cg(n).$

We use the notation $f(n) \in O(g(n))$, this is read as "big oh of g(n)".

A function f(n) ≥ 0 is said to grow (asymptotically) at least with order g(n) if

 $\exists c > 0, n_0 \in \mathbf{N} : \forall n \ge n_0 : f(n) \ge cg(n).$

We use the notation $f(n) \in \Omega(g(n))$, this is read as "big omega of g(n)".

- A function $f(n) \ge 0$ is said to grow (asymptotically) with order g(n) if $f(n) \in O(g(n))$ and $f(n) \in \Omega(g(n))$ (note: different constants are allowed); we write $f(n) \in \Theta(g(n))$ (read: "big theta of g(n)")
- Similarly, for functions of several arguments.

 Using Big-Oh notation, we obtain that the running time of our RAM implementation of Dijkstra's Algorithm is

 $\Theta(|V|^2).$

In particular, the number of arcs (and thus sparsity) is no longer visible.

- A Big-Oh calculus helps to simplify the expressions:
 - For example, any polynomial function $p(n) = \sum_{i=0}^{d} p_i n^i$ (with $p_d \neq 0$) is in $\Theta(n^d)$.
 - In particular, constants get consumed by higher-order terms
 - $\max{f_1(n), f_2(n)} \in O(f_1(n) + f_2(n))$
- By keeping in mind that we are only interested in this kind of asymptotic estimate, we can simplify our counting of elementary operations: We can be "sloppy", in a controlled way.
 - It suffice to determine that some operation is O(1), or Θ(n); we don't need to discuss the precise number of iterations.

Dijkstra's Algorithm: Efficiency, VIIa

We now revisit the analysis of Dijkstra's Algorithm, and use Big-Oh estimates for the number of elementary operations, rather than the precise numbers.

Dijkstra's Algorithm

Input: A digraph G = (V, A) with nonnegative arc costs, starting node *r* **Output:** A predecessor vector **p**, encoding minimum-cost paths from *r* to all nodes.

Initialize y, p	O(V) operations
Set S := V.	O(V) operations
3 While $S \neq \emptyset$:	O(V) iterations and $O(V)$ operations
Choose $v \in S$ with y_v minimum.	$\mathit{O}(\mathit{S}) \subseteq \mathit{O}(\mathit{V})$ operations
Set $S := S \setminus \{v\}$.	O(1) operations
For all arcs $(v, w) \in A$:	$\mathit{O}(\delta^+(v))$ iterations, $\mathit{O}(\delta^+(v))$ operations
If $y_v + c(v, w) \leq y_w$:	O(1) operations
$y_w := y_v + c(v, w)$	O(1) operations
p(w) := v	O(1) operations

Now we immediately see that we have $O(|V|^2 + |A|) = O(|V|^2)$ elementary operations in total.

Dijkstra's Algorithm: Efficiency, VIII

- We are **still not happy** with the performance of Dijkstra's Algorithm for large, sparse graphs
- We have found the reason: Running time is (asymptotically) dominated by the minimum-finding operation.
- A solution is to use **better concrete data structures**. Here it pays off to use a **binary heap** (an implementation of a **priority queue**) to implement the set *S* together with the potential vector **y**.
- A priority queue stores elements v together with a **priority** y_v ; it has **operations**:
 - Empty?
 - Insert and element v with priority y_v
 - Find, remove, and return the element v of smallest priority yv
 - Find a given element v, and change its priority to y'_v.
- The binary heap implementation of this abstract data structure on a RAM has running time of O(log *n*) for all of these operations, where *n* is the number of elements stored.

Dijkstra's Algorithm with Binary Heaps: Efficiency

We now revisit the analysis of Dijkstra's Algorithm, using binary heaps.

Dijkstra's Algorithm

Input: A digraph G = (V, A) with nonnegative arc costs, starting node *r* **Output:** A predecessor vector **p**, encoding minimum-cost paths from *r* to all nodes.

```
Initialize y, p
                                                                           O(|V|) operations
   Initialize a binary heap S := V with priorities y.
                                                                           O(|V|) operations
• While S \neq \emptyset:
                                                   O(|V|) iterations and O(|V|) operations
         Choose v \in S with y_v minimum
                                                         O(\log |S|) \subseteq O(\log |V|) operations
              and S := S \setminus \{v\}.
         For all arcs (v, w) \in A:
                                                O(\delta^+(v)) iterations, O(\delta^+(v)) operations
              If v_v + c(v, w) < v_w:
                                                                             O(1) operations
                  y_w := y_v + c(v, w)
                                                         O(\log |S|) \subseteq O(\log |V|) operations
                        and update the priority of w in S
                   p(w) := v
                                                                             O(1) operations
```

In total: $O(|V| \log |V| + |A| \log |V|)$ elementary operations.

In total: $O(|V| \log |V| + |A| \log |V|)$ elementary operations.

Under the natural assumption that $|A| \ge |V| = 1$ (no isolated vertices), we can write this as: $O(|A| \log |V|)$.

- For a very dense graph with |A| ∈ Θ(|V|²), we would get a running time estimate of O(|V|² log |V|) this is worse than the old implementation without binary heaps!
- However, already for slightly sparser graphs with $|A| \in O(|V|^2/\log|V|)$, the running time estimate is $O(|V|^2)$, which is the same as the old implementation.
- The sparser the graph, the better! In particular, for very sparse graphs with $|A| \in O(|V|)$, the running time estimate is $O(|V|\log|V|)$, which is **much better** than the old implementation.

A straight-forward implementation of Dijkstra's Algorithm with binary heaps easily solves problems examples such as with 70,000 vertices and 300,000 arcs in less than 10 seconds.