## Depth-First Search

## Summary of BFS

$\square$ Graph and representations
$\square$ BFS, and BFS tree

- Complexity of BFS


## Adjacency List vs. Matrix

[ Two sizes: $\mathbf{n}=|\mathbf{V}|$ and $\mathbf{m}=\mid$ 티,

- $\mathrm{m}=\mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{n}^{\wedge} 2\right)$

〕 Adjacency List

- More compact than adjacency matrices if graph has few edges
- Requires a scan of adjacency list to check if an edge exists
- Requires a scan to obtain all edges!

〕 Adjacency Matrix

- Always require $\mathrm{n}^{2}$ space
$\square$ This can waste a lot of space if the number of edges are sparse
$\square$ find if an edge exists in $\mathrm{O}(1)$
- Obtain all edges in O(n)


## BFS Tree

BFS tree for vertex $\mathrm{s}=2$.


## Time Complexity of BFS (Using Adjacency List)

Algorithm BFS(s)
Input: $s$ is the source vertex
Output: Mark all vertices that can be visited from $s$.

1. for each vertex $v$
2. do flag $[v]:=$ false;
3. $\quad Q=$ empty queue;
4. flag $[s]:=$ true;
5. enqueue $(Q, s)$;
6. while $Q$ is not empty
7. do $v:=\operatorname{dequeue}(Q)$;
8. for each $w$ adjacent to $v$
9. $\quad$ do if $f l a g[w]=$ false
10. 
11. then $\operatorname{flag}[w]:=$ true; enqueue $(Q, w)$

## O(n + m)

## Each vertex will enter Q

 at most once.Each iteration takes time proportional to $\operatorname{deg}(\mathrm{v})+1$ (the number 1 is to account for the case where $\operatorname{deg}(v)=0$--- the work required is 1 , not 0 ).

## Time Complexity of BFS (Using Adjacency Matrix)

```
Algorithm BFS(s)
Input: s is the source vertex
Output: Mark all vertices that can be visited from s.
1. for each vertex v
2. do flag[v] := false;
3. Q = empty queue;
4. flag[s]:= true;
5. enqueue( }Q,s)\mathrm{ ;
6. while Q is not empty
7. do v}:=\mathrm{ dequeue (Q);
8. for each w adjacent to v
9. do if flag[w] = false
10. then flag[w] := true;
11.
enqueue(Q,w)
```


## $O\left(n^{2}\right)$

Finding the adjacent vertices of $v$ requires checking all elements in the row. This takes linear time $O(n)$.

Summing over all the n iterations, the total running time is $\mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{n}^{2}\right)$.
So, with adjacency matrix, BFS is $\mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{n}^{2}\right)$ independent of the number of edges $m$. With adjacent lists, BFS is $\mathrm{O}(\mathrm{n}+\mathrm{m})$; if $\mathrm{m}=\mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{n}^{2}\right)$ like in a dense graph, $\mathrm{O}(\mathrm{n}+\mathrm{m})=\mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{n}^{2}\right)$.

## Depth-First Search (DFS)

[ DFS is another popular graph search strategy
] Idea is similar to pre-order traversal (visit node, then visit children recursively)

- DFS can provide certain information about the graph that BFS cannot
- It can tell whether we have encountered a cycle or not


## DFS Algorithm

( DFS will continue to visit neighbors in a recursive pattern
[ Whenever we visit v from u, we recursively visit all unvisited neighbors of v . Then we backtrack (return) to u.
( Note: it is possible that w2 was unvisited when we recursively visit w1, but became visited by the time we return from the recursive call.

## DFS Algorithm

Algorithm $D F S(s)$

1. for each vertex $v$
2. $\quad$ do flag $[v]:=$ false;
3. $R D F S(s) ;$

Algorithm RDFS(v)

1. flag[v] := true;
2. for each neighbor $w$ of $v$
3. 
4. do if $\operatorname{flag}[w]=$ false then RDFS $(w)$;

Flag all vertices as not visited

Flag yourself as visited

For unvisited neighbors, call RDFS(w) recursively

We can also record the paths using pred[ ].

## Example



Adjacency List Visited Table (T/F)


| 0 | $F$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | $F$ |
| 2 | $F$ |
| 3 | $F$ |
| 4 | $F$ |
| 5 | $F$ |
| 6 | $F$ |
| 7 | $F$ |
| 8 | $F$ |
| 9 | $F$ |

Initialize visited table (all False)

Initialize Pred to -1


RDFS( 2 ) Now visit RDFS(8)




## Recursive RDFS( 2 ) calls RDFS(8) <br> Now visit 9 -> RDFS(9)






Adjacency List Visited Table (T/F)


| 0 | T |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | T |
| 2 | T |
| 3 | T |
| 4 | T |
| 5 | F |
| 6 | F |
| 7 | F |
| 8 | T |
| 9 | T |


| 8 |
| :---: |
| 9 |
| - |
| 1 |
| 3 |
| - |
| - |
| - |
| 2 |
| 8 |
| Pred |

Mark 4 as visited
Mark Pred[4]

| Recursive | RDFS(8) |
| :--- | :---: |
| calls | RDFS(9) |
|  | RDFS(1) | RDFS(3) RDFS(4) $\rightarrow$ STOP all of 4's neighbors have been visited return back to call RDFS(3)




RDFS 2 )

| Recursive | RDFS(8) |
| :--- | :---: |
| calls | RDFS(9) |
|  | RDFS(1) |

Mark 5 as visited
Mark Pred[5]
RDFS(3) RDFS(5)

3 is already visited, so visit 6 -> RDFS(6)




Adjacency List


Visited Table (T/F)

| 0 | T |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | T |
| 2 | T |
| 3 | T |
| 4 | T |
| 5 | T |
| 6 | T |
| 7 | T |
| 8 | T |
| 9 | T |


| 8 |
| :--- |
| 9 |
| - |
| 1 |
| 3 |
| 3 |
| 5 |
| 6 |
| 2 |
| 8 |

Recursive calls

RDFS(9)
RDFS(1)
RDFS(3) RDFS(5) -> Stop


Adjacency List


Visited Table (T/F)

| 0 | T |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | T |
| 2 | T |
| 3 | T |
| 4 | T |
| 5 | T |
| 6 | T |
| 7 | T |
| 8 | T |
| 9 | T |


| 8 |
| :--- |
| 9 |
| - |
| 1 |
| 3 |
| 3 |
| 5 |
| 6 |
| 2 |
| 8 |

Pred

Recursive calls

RDFS(9)
RDFS(1)
RDFS(3) -> Stop




## Example Finished



RDFS( 2 ) -> Stop

Adjacency List


Visited Table (T/F)

| 0 | T |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | T |
| 2 | T |
| 3 | T |
| 4 | T |
| 5 | T |
| 6 | T |
| 7 | T |
| 8 | T |
| 9 | T |


| 8 |
| :--- |
| 9 |
| - |
| 1 |
| 3 |
| 3 |
| 5 |
| 6 |
| 2 |
| 8 |

Pred

Recursive calls finished

## DFS Path Tracking



Adjacency List


Visited Table (T/F)

| 0 | T |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | T |
| 2 | T |
| 3 | T |
| 4 | T |
| 5 | T |
| 6 | T |
| 7 | T |
| 8 | T |
| 9 | T |


| 8 |
| :--- |
| 9 |
| - |
| 1 |
| 3 |
| 3 |
| 5 |
| 6 |
| 2 |
| 8 |

Pred

Algorithm Path $(w)$

1. if $\operatorname{pred}[w] \neq-1$
2. then
3. 

Path(pred $[w]$ );
4. output $w$

Try some examples.
Path(0) ->
Path(6) ->
Path(7) ->

## DFS Tree

Resulting DFS-tree.
Notice it is much "deeper" than the BFS tree.


Captures the structure of the recursive calls

- when we visit a neighbor $w$ of $v$, we add $w$ as child of $v$
- whenever DFS returns from a vertex $v$, we climb up in the tree from $v$ to its parent


## Time Complexity of DFS <br> (Using adjacency list)

[ We never visited a vertex more than once

- We had to examine all edges of the vertices
$\square$ We know $\Sigma_{\text {vertex } v}$ degree( $v$ ) $=2 \mathrm{~m}$ where $m$ is the number of edges
- So, the running time of DFS is proportional to the number of edges and number of vertices (same as BFS)
- O(n + m)
$\square$ You will also see this written as:
[ $\mathrm{O}(|\mathrm{v}|+|\mathrm{e}|)|\mathrm{v}|=$ number of vertices ( n )
$|e|=$ number of edges ( m )

