The goals of this exercise are:

• to develop your skills at understanding, distilling, and communicating proofs and the conceptual ideas in them, especially for proofs in graph theory

• to deepen your understanding of breadth-first search and its efficiency

To prepare for this exercise as a receiver, you should try to understand the statements of Theorems 1.1 and 2.1 below, and review the material on breadth-first search covered in class on October 7. Your partner sender will communicate the proof of Theorem 2.1 to you.

1 Connected Components

We begin by defining the connected components of an undirected graph. To gain intuition, you may find it useful to draw some pictures of graphs with multiple connected components and use them to help you follow along the proof.

**Theorem 1.1.** Every undirected graph \( G = (V, E) \) be an undirected graph can be partitioned into connected components. That is, there are sets \( V_0, \ldots, V_{c-1} \subseteq V \) of vertices such that:

1. \( V_0, \ldots, V_{c-1} \) are disjoint, nonempty, and \( V_0 \cup V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_{c-1} = V \). (This is what it means for \( V_0, \ldots, V_{c-1} \) to be a partition of \( V \).

2. For every two vertices \( u, v \in V \), \( u \) and \( v \) are in the same component \( V_i \) if and only if there is a path from \( u \) to \( v \).

Moreover the sets \( V_0, \ldots, V_{c-1} \) are unique (up to ordering), and are called the connected components of \( V \).

In case you are interested, we include a proof of Theorem 1.1 below in Section 1, but studying that proof is not required for this exercise.

We remark that for directed graphs, one can consider weakly connected components, where we ignore the directions of edges, and strongly connected components, where two vertices \( u, v \) are the same component if and only if there is a directed path from \( u \) to \( v \) and a directed path from \( v \) to \( u \). Strongly connected components are more useful, but more complicated. In particular, unlike in undirected graphs (or weakly connected components), there can be edges crossing between strongly connected components.

2 Finding Connected Components via BFS

The main result of this exercise is an efficient algorithm for finding connected components:
Theorem 2.1. There is an algorithm that given an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ with $n$ vertices and $m$ edges, partitions $V$ into connected components in time $O(n + m)$.

Proof.
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3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Proof. For every vertex \( u \), define
\[
[u] = \{ v : \text{there is a path from } u \text{ to } v \text{ in } G \}.
\]
Observe that \( u \in [u] \); in particular, the set \([u]\) is nonempty.

Now let’s show that for every two vertices \( u \) and \( w \), we have either that \([u]\) and \([w]\) are disjoint or equal. Suppose they are not disjoint, i.e. there is a vertex \( v \in [u] \cap [w] \). This means that there is a path \( p_{uv} \) from \( u \) to \( v \) and a path \( p_{wv} \) from \( w \) to \( v \). Now we argue that \([u] \subseteq [w]\). Let \( a \) be any vertex in \([u]\), so there is a path \( p_{ua} \) from \( u \) to \( a \). Then we can get a path from \( w \) to \( a \) by first following the path \( p_{wv} \) to get from \( w \) to \( v \), then reversing the edges in \( p_{uv} \) to get from \( v \) to \( u \), and then following the path \( p_{ua} \) to get from \( u \) to \( a \). Thus, \( a \in [w] \). Since we showed that this holds for every \( a \in [u] \), we conclude that \([u] \subseteq [w]\). The reverse inclusion \([w] \subseteq [u]\) is proved in a similar manner.

So now we take \( V_0, \ldots, V_{c-1} \) to be all of the distinct sets that occur among those of the form \([u]\). Since every vertex \( u \in V \) is in the set \([u]\), the sets \( V_0, \ldots, V_{c-1} \) will cover all of \( V \), and by what we just showed, any two distinct sets will be disjoint from each other. This establishes Item 1. Now if a vertex \( u \) is in component \( V_i \), this means that \([u] = V_i \) (else \([u]\) and \( V_i \) would be distinct but not disjoint, contradicting what we showed above). So \( V_i \) contains exactly the vertices \( v \) that are reachable from \( u \), establishing Item 2.

We omit the proof of uniqueness of the connected components.

If you have seen equivalence relations, you may recognize some similarity with the above proof. Indeed, the above proof amounts to showing that “\( v \) is reachable from \( u \)” is an equivalence relation on \( V \), and then taking the connected components to be the equivalence classes under that relation.
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2 Finding Connected Components via BFS

The main result of this exercise is an efficient algorithm for finding connected components:

**Theorem 2.1.** There is an algorithm that given an undirected graph \( G = (V, E) \) with \( n \) vertices and \( m \) edges, partitions \( V \) into connected components in time \( O(n + m) \).
Proof. The idea is to do BFS from an arbitrary start vertex \( s_0 \in V \), and let our first connected component \( V_0 \) consist of all the vertices that BFS finds. Then, if there are any vertices in \( V - V_0 \), we pick an arbitrary \( s_1 \in V - V_0 \), and do BFS from \( s_1 \) to identify a second component \( V_1 \), and so on. Naively, this will take time \( O(c \cdot (n + m)) \) where \( c \) is the number of connected components, because we do \( c \) executions of BFS, each of which take time \( O(n + m) \).

We speed this up by observing that we can implement BFS from a start vertex \( s \) in time \( O(n_s + m_s) \), where \( n_s \) and \( m_s \) are the number of vertices and edges, respectively, in the connected component containing \( s \). Since we do BFS on distinct connected components (whose sets of vertices and edges are disjoint), our total runtime will just be \( O(n + m) \). To achieve the improved running time for BFS, we modify our description of BFS so that the bit-array \( S \) keeping track of the vertices we visit is already initialized as part of the input (otherwise we would spend time \( O(n) \) just initializing \( S \)). It will also be convenient to allow us to use an arbitrary label \( \ell \) to indicate which vertices we have visited in a single BFS iteration rather than marking them with the bit 1.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{BFSlabel}(G, s, S, \ell) \\
\text{Input :} & \quad \text{A directed graph } G = (V, E), \text{ a vertex } s \in V, \text{ a label } \ell \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ and an array } S \text{ of length } n = |V| \text{ where for every vertex } v, S[v] \neq \ell \\
\text{Output :} & \quad \text{The array is updated so that } S[v] = \ell \text{ for every } v \text{ reachable from } s, \text{ and the other entries of } S \text{ are unchanged} \\
\text{1. } S[s] = \ell; \\
\text{2. } F = \{s\}; & \quad \text{/* the frontier vertices */} \\
\text{3. } d = 0; \\
\text{4. } *\text{ loop invariant: } S[v] = \ell \iff v \text{ has distance } \leq d \text{ from } s, F = \text{vertices at distance } d \text{ from } s \text{ */} \\
\text{5. while } F \neq \emptyset \text{ do} \\
\text{6. } F = \{v \in V : \exists u \in F \text{ s.t. } (u, v) \in E \text{ and } S[v] \neq \ell\}; \\
\text{7. foreach } v \in F \text{ do } S[v] = \ell; \\
\text{8. } d = d + 1;
\end{align*}
\]

Similarly to the runtime analysis we did last time, the runtime of \( \text{BFSlabel}(G, s, S, \ell) \) can be bounded as

\[
O \left( \sum_{d=0}^{\infty} \sum_{u \in F_d} (1 + d_{out}(u)) \right) \leq O \left( \sum_{u \in R} (1 + d_{out}(u)) \right).
\]

where \( F_d \) is the set of vertices \( u \) such that \( \text{dist}_G(s, u) = d \), and \( R = \bigcup_{d=0}^{\infty} F_d \) is the set of vertices reachable from \( s \).

Now the key point is that, in an undirected graph \( G \), \( R \) is exactly the connected component containing \( s \), so \( |R| = n_s \) and \( \sum_{u \in R} d(u) = 2m_s \) (since each of the \( m_s \) undirected edges contributes to \( d_{out} \) for two vertices). Thus, the run time of \( \text{BFSlabel}(G, s, S, \ell) \) is \( O(n_s + m_s) \).
Now we can obtain our algorithm for connected components as follows:

1. **BFS-CC**\((G, s, S, \ell)\)
   - **Input**: An undirected graph \(G = (V, E)\)
   - **Output**: The number \(\ell\) of connected components in \(G\) and a partition of \(G\) into those components, specified by an array \(S\) of length \(n = |V|\) with entries from \([\ell]\)

2. Initialize \(S[v] = \star\) for all \(v \in V\);
3. \(\ell = 0\);
4. **foreach** \(s \in V\) **do**
   - **if** \(S[s] = \star\) **then**
   - \(\text{BFSlabel}(G, s, S, \ell)\);
   - \(\ell = \ell + 1\);
7. **return** \((\ell, S)\)

For the correctness of this algorithm, we prove the following loop invariant by induction: \(S\) has entries from \([\star, 0, 1, \ldots, \ell - 1]\) with the vertices of each label \(i \neq \star\) corresponding to a distinct connected component of \(G\). The base case follows because we initialize \(S\) to all \(\star\)’s and \(\ell = 0\). For the induction step, we observe that the only time \(S\) changes is in Line 6. Since \(S[s] = \star\), we know that \(s\) is not in any of the previously labelled connected components and thus \(\text{BFSlabel}(G, s, S, \ell)\) will label the entire connected component of \(s\) with label \(\ell\) and leave the rest of the array \(S\) unchanged. Thus, after we increment \(\ell\), the loop invariant will be maintained.

We also observe that due to the loop over \(s \in V\), we will be sure to assign every vertex in \(V\) to some connected component.

For the runtime, recall that \(\text{BFSlabel}(G, s, S, \ell)\) runs in time \(O(n_s + m_s)\), where \(n_s\) and \(m_s\) are the number of vertices and edges in the connected component of \(s\). Since we run \(\text{BFSlabel}\) on vertices \(s = s_0, \ldots, s_{c-1}\) that are all in different connected components, the overall runtime is

\[
O \left( \sum_{i=0}^{c-1} (n_{s_i} + m_{s_i}) \right) = O(n + m).
\]

In the above algorithm, BFS could have easily been replaced with another search strategy like DFS (since we don’t care about finding shortest paths). It turns out that DFS can be used in a more sophisticated, two-pass fashion, to find the strongly connected components of a directed graph. That algorithm is covered in CS124.

### 3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

**Proof.** For every vertex \(u\), define

\([u] = \{v : \text{there is a path from } u \text{ to } v \text{ in } G\}\).

Observe that \(u \in [u]\); in particular, the set \([u]\) is nonempty.

Now let’s show that for every two vertices \(u\) and \(w\), we have either that \([u]\) and \([w]\) are disjoint or equal. Suppose they are not disjoint, i.e. there is a vertex \(v \in [u] \cap [w]\). This means that there is a path \(p_{uv}\) from \(u\) to \(v\) and a path \(p_{wv}\) from \(w\) to \(v\). Now we argue that \([u] \subseteq [w]\). Let \(a\) be
any vertex in \([u]\), so there is a path \(p_{ua}\) from \(u\) to \(a\). Then we can get a path from \(w\) to \(a\) by first following the path \(p_{uv}\) to get from \(w\) to \(v\), then reversing the edges in \(p_{uv}\) to get from \(v\) to \(u\), and then following the path \(p_{ua}\) to get from \(u\) to \(a\). Thus, \(a \in [w]\). Since we showed that this holds for every \(a \in [u]\), we conclude that \([u] \subseteq [w]\). The reverse inclusion \([w] \subseteq [u]\) is proved in a similar manner.

So now we take \(V_0, \ldots, V_{c-1}\) to be all of the distinct sets that occur among those of the form \([u]\). Since every vertex \(u \in V\) is in the set \([u]\), the sets \(V_0, \ldots, V_{c-1}\) will cover all of \(V\), and by what we just showed, any two distinct sets will be disjoint from each other. This establishes Item 1. Now if a vertex \(u\) is in component \(V_i\), this means that \([u] = V_i\) (else \([u]\) and \(V_i\) would be distinct but not disjoint, contradicting what we showed above). So \(V_i\) contains exactly the vertices \(v\) that are reachable from \(u\), establishing Item 2.

We omit the proof of uniqueness of the connected components. \(\Box\)

If you have seen equivalence relations, you may recognize some similarity with the above proof. Indeed, the above proof amounts to showing that “\(v\) is reachable from \(u\)” is an equivalence relation on \(V\), and then taking the connected components to be the equivalence classes under that relation.