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Abstract

We study a constrained shortest path problem in group-labeled graphs with nonnegative edge length, called the shortest non-zero path problem. Depending on the group in question, this problem includes two types of tractable variants in undirected graphs: one is the parity-constrained shortest path/cycle problem, and the other is computing a shortest noncontractible cycle in surface-embedded graphs.

For the shortest non-zero path problem with respect to finite abelian groups, Kobayashi and Toyooka (2017) proposed a randomized, pseudopolynomial algorithm via permanent computation. For a slightly more general class of groups, Yamaguchi (2016) showed a reduction of the problem to the weighted linear matroid parity problem. In particular, some cases are solved in strongly polynomial time via the reduction with the aid of a deterministic, polynomial algorithm for the weighted linear matroid parity problem developed by Iwata and Kobayashi (2017), which generalizes a well-known fact that the parity-constrained shortest path problem is solved via weighted matching.

In this paper, as the first general solution independent of the group, we present a rather simple, deterministic, and strongly polynomial algorithm for the shortest non-zero path problem. The algorithm is based on Dijkstra's algorithm for the unconstrained shortest path problem and Edmonds' blossom shrinking technique in matching algorithms, and clarifies a common tractable feature behind the parity and topological constraints in the shortest path/cycle problem.
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1 Introduction

Finding a shortest path between two specified vertices, say \( s \) and \( t \), is a fundamental task in graphs. As a variant, it is well-known that one can find a shortest \emph{odd} (or \emph{even}) \( s \)-\( t \) path in an undirected graph with nonnegative edge length in strongly polynomial time via a reduction to the weighted matching problem (see, e.g., [18, § 29.11e]), where “odd” (or “even”) designates the parity of the number of traversed edges. We remark that, in the directed case, even determining whether a given directed graph contains an odd (or even) directed path from \( s \) to \( t \) or not is NP-complete [16].

A shortest cycle is also closely related, as it can be found, at least, by computing a shortest \( s \)-\( t \) path in the graph obtained by removing each edge \( e = \{s, t\} \). Shortest noncontractible cycles in graphs embedded in surfaces have been studied in topological graph theory with several motivations; e.g., in the unweighted case, the minimum number of edges in a noncontractible cycle is an index of embeddings called the \emph{edge-width}. The first polynomial-time algorithm for finding a shortest noncontractible cycle is based on a simple observation given by Thomassen [20], the so-called 3-path condition. The current fastest algorithm was proposed by Erickson and Har-Peled [8], and there are several faster ones for bounded-genus cases [1, 9]. For more detailed literature, we refer the readers to [4, 7].

As a common generalization of the parity and topological conditions (or others in some contexts), paths and cycles with label conditions in group-labeled graphs have recently been investigated from both combinatorial and algorithmic points of view [2, 3, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21, 22], where a group-labeled graph is a directed graph with each arc labeled by an element of a fixed group. Formally, for a group \( \Gamma \), a \( \Gamma \)-labeled graph is a pair of a directed graph and a mapping from the arc set to \( \Gamma \). In a \( \Gamma \)-labeled graph, the label of a walk is defined by sequential applications of the group operation of \( \Gamma \) to the labels of the traversed arcs, where each arc (e.g., from \( u \) to \( v \)) can be traversed in the backward direction (from \( v \) to \( u \)) by inverting its label. A walk is said to be \emph{non-zero} if its label is not equal to the identity element \( 1_{\Gamma} \) of \( \Gamma \). See Section 2 for precise definitions.

On one hand, the parity condition is handled by choosing \( \Gamma = \mathbb{Z}_2 = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} = \{0, 1\}, + \), orienting each edge arbitrarily, and assigning the label \( 1 \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \) to all the resulting arcs. Then, the label of a walk is non-zero if and only if the number of traversed edges is odd. Conversely, the label in any \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \)-labeled graph can be regarded as the parity by subdividing each arc with label \( 0 \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \) as two arcs with label \( 1 \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \).

On the other hand, contractibility in surfaces can be represented as follows. Suppose that an undirected graph \( G = (V, E) \) is embedded in a surface \( S \). Fix any point \( x \) in \( S \), and let \( \Gamma = \pi_1(S, x) \) be the fundamental group of \( S \) at the basepoint \( x \), in which each element is a homotopy class of closed curves with endpoint \( x \) and the group operation corresponds to composition of such curves. We also fix any simple curve \( \gamma_v \) in \( S \) from \( x \) to each vertex \( v \in V \). Then, after orienting each edge arbitrarily, we can define the label of each resulting arc \( \vec{e} = uv \) as the homotopy class that contains the closed curve composed of \( \gamma_u, \vec{e}, \) and \( \overline{\gamma_v} \) (the reverse of \( \gamma_v \)), so that the label of a closed walk in \( G \) is non-zero if and only if it is noncontractible in \( S \).

In this paper, we focus on the \emph{shortest non-zero path problem} defined as follows: we are given a \( \Gamma \)-labeled graph with two specified vertices \( s \) and \( t \) and a nonnegative length of each edge in the underlying graph, and required to find a shortest non-zero \( s \)-\( t \) path. Note that any element \( \alpha \in \Gamma \) can be chosen as the forbidden label instead of \( 1_{\Gamma} \), e.g., by adding to the input graph a new vertex \( t' \) (as the end vertex instead of \( t \)) and a new arc from \( t \) to \( t' \) with label \( \alpha^{-1} \). Thus, a shortest non-zero cycle is also found, at least, by solving this problem for the graph obtained by removing
each arc.

For the case when $\Gamma$ is finite and abelian, Kobayashi and Toyooka [15] proposed a randomized, pseudopolynomial-time algorithm via permanent computation, where “pseudopolynomial” means that the computational time polynomially depends on the length values (i.e., if every edge has a unit length, then it is bounded by a polynomial in the graph size). For a slightly more general case when $\Gamma$ is finitely generated and abelian (or dihedral, etc.), the author [23] showed that the problem reduces to the weighted linear matroid parity problem, for which Iwata and Kobayashi [12] devised a deterministic, polynomial-time algorithm for the case when the field in question is finite or that of rational numbers. In particular, for any prime $p$, the shortest non-zero path problem in $\mathbb{Z}_p$-labeled graphs is solved in strongly polynomial time via the reduction, which generalizes the aforementioned fact that the shortest odd (even) path problem is solved via weighted matching. However, since the fundamental group $\pi_1(S, x)$ is infinite or non-abelian even when $S$ is the torus or the Klein bottle, respectively, these results do not explain combinatorial tractability of topological constraints well.

In this paper, we present a deterministic, strongly polynomial-time algorithm for the shortest non-zero path problem in general, where basic operations on the group $\Gamma$ (such as the group operation, identity test of two elements, and getting the inverse element) as well as arithmetics on edge length (e.g., for reals) are regarded as elementary (i.e., performed in constant time). This implies that shortest odd (even) paths/cycles and shortest noncontractible cycles enjoy a common tractable feature that is captured as one induced by groups.

**Theorem 1.** There exists a deterministic algorithm for the shortest non-zero path problem that requires $O(nm)$ elementary operations, where $n$ and $m$ denote the numbers of vertices and of arcs (edges), respectively, in the input graph.

Our algorithm is inspired by and essentially extends a direct algorithm for the shortest odd (even) path problem given by Derigs [5], and is intuitively summarized as follows. First, we compute a shortest-path tree $T$ rooted at $s$, e.g., by Dijkstra’s algorithm [6]. If a unique $s$–$t$ path $P_t$ in $T$ is non-zero, then we conclude that $P_t$ is a desired solution. Otherwise, the task is to find an $s$–$t$ path that is shortest among those whose labels are different from $P_t$. For this purpose, we detect a lowest blossom with respect to $T$, which is a non-zero cycle $C$ enjoying the following two properties. If $t$ is on $C$, then we can assure that the $s$–$t$ path obtained from $P_t$ by detouring around $C$ is a desired one. Otherwise, we can obtain a shortest non-zero $s$–$t$ path by expanding a shortest non-zero $s$–$t$ path in a small graph after shrinking $C$ into a single vertex, which is found recursively.

As a byproduct, we also obtain a faster algorithm for finding a shortest non-zero cycle than the naïve approach by solving the shortest non-zero path problem for each arc, which requires $O(nm^2)$ time in total. The idea is similar to the algorithm for finding a noncontractible cycle proposed in [8]. We see that each lowest blossom corresponds to a shortest non-zero closed walk with end vertex $s$. Thus, by the nonnegativity of edge length, for finding a shortest non-zero cycle, it suffices to compute one lowest blossom with respect to one shortest-path tree rooted at each vertex, which can be done in linear time per vertex after computing a shortest-path tree by Dijkstra’s algorithm.

**Theorem 2.** There exists a deterministic algorithm for finding a shortest non-zero cycle in a given $\Gamma$-labeled graph with nonnegative edge length that requires $O(n(m + n \log n))$ elementary operations.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we define terms and notations, and sketch a basic strategy. In Section 3, as a key concept in our algorithms, we introduce lowest
blossoms and show several properties. Finally, in Section 4, we present our algorithms and analyze
the computational times, which complete the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2.

2 Preliminaries

Let $\Gamma$ be a group, which can be non-abelian or infinite. We adopt the multiplicative notation for $\Gamma$
with denoting the identity element by $1$. A $\Gamma$-labeled graph is a pair $(\bar{G}, \psi)$ of a directed graph $\bar{G} = (V, \bar{E})$ and a mapping $\psi: \bar{E} \rightarrow \Gamma$. We denote by $G = (V, E)$ the underlying graph of $\bar{G}$, i.e., $E := \{ e = \{u, v\} \mid \bar{e} = (u, v) \in \bar{E} \}$, and define $\psi_G(e, uv) := \psi(\bar{e})$ and $\psi_G(e, vu) := \psi(\bar{e})^{-1}$ for each edge $e = \{u, v\} \in E$ with the corresponding arc $\bar{e} = uv \in \bar{E}$. For simple notation, we deal with a $\Gamma$-labeled graph $(\bar{G}, \psi)$ as its underlying graph $G$ including the information of $\psi_G$ defined above. We assume that $G$ has no loop but may have parallel edges, i.e., $E$ is a multiset of 2-element subsets of $V$. We often refer to a subgraph $(V, F)$ of $G$ as its edge set $F \subseteq E$. For a vertex $v \in V$, we define $\delta_G(v) := \{ e \mid v \in e \in E \}$.

A walk in a $\Gamma$-labeled graph $G = (V, E)$ is an alternating sequence of vertices and edges, $W = (v_0, e_1, v_1, e_2, v_2, \ldots, e_k, v_k)$, such that $v_i \in V$ for each $i = 0, 1, \ldots, k$ and $e_i = \{v_{i-1}, v_i\} \in E$ for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$. We define $V(W) := \{v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_k\}$ and $E(W) := \{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_k\}$, where the multiplicity is ignored for $V(W)$ (as a set) and is included for $E(W)$ (as a multiset). For $i, j$ with $0 \leq i < j \leq k$, let $W[v_i, v_j]$ denote the subwalk $(v_i, e_{i+1}, v_{i+1}, \ldots, e_j, v_j)$ of $W$ (if it is uniquely determined). We call $W$ a path (or, in particular, a $v_0$-$v_k$ path) if all vertices $v_i$ are distinct (i.e., $|V(W)| = k + 1$), and a cycle if $v_0 = v_k$ and $W[v_1, v_k]$ is a $v_1$-$v_k$ path with $e_1 \notin E(W[v_1, v_k])$. Let $W$ denote the reversed walk of $W$, i.e., $W = (v_k, e_k, \ldots, v_1, e_1, v_0)$. For a walk $W' = (v'_0, e'_1, v'_1, \ldots, e'_{l}, v'_l)$ with $v'_0 = v_k$, we define the concatenation of $W$ and $W'$ as $W * W' := (v_0, e_1, v_1, \ldots, e_k, v_k = v'_0, e'_1, v'_1, \ldots, e'_l, v'_l)$. For given edge lengths $\ell \in \mathbb{R}^E_{\geq 0}$, the length of $W$ is defined as $\ell(W) := \sum_{e \in E(W)} \ell(e) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \ell(e_i)$. We say that a walk $W$ is shortest if the length $\ell(W)$ is minimized under specified constraints, e.g., $W$ is an $s$-$t$ path in $G$ for some fixed vertices $s, t \in V$. The label of $W$ is defined as $\psi_G(W) := \psi_G(e_1, v_0v_1) \cdot \psi_G(e_2, v_1v_2) \cdots \psi_G(e_k, v_{k-1}v_k)$, where we remark again that the group $\Gamma$ can be non-abelian. By definition, we always have $\psi_G(\bar{W}) = \psi_G(W)^{-1}$ and $\psi_G(W * W') = \psi_G(W) \cdot \psi_G(W')$. A walk $W$ in $G$ is non-zero if $\psi_G(W) \neq 1_\Gamma$. Note that whether cycles are non-zero or not is invariant under the choices of direction and end vertices, because $\psi_G(C) = \psi_G(C)^{-1}$ and $\psi_G(C[v_1, v_k] * (v_0, e_1, v_1)) = \psi_G(e_1, v_0v_1)^{-1} \cdot \psi_G(C) \cdot \psi_G(e_1, v_0v_1)$ hold for any cycle $C = (v_0, e_1, v_1, e_2, v_2, \ldots, e_k, v_k = v_0)$. We are now ready to state our problem formally.

**Problem 1** (Shortest Non-zero Path).

**Input:** A $\Gamma$-labeled graph $G = (V, E)$, edge lengths $\ell \in \mathbb{R}^E_{\geq 0}$, and two distinct vertices $s, t \in V$.

**Goal:** Find an $s$-$t$ path $P$ in $G$ minimizing $\ell(P)$ subject to $\psi_G(P) \neq 1_\Gamma$ (if any).

In order to solve this problem, we first compute a shortest-path tree $T$ of $(G, \ell)$ rooted at $s$ (formally defined in Definition 3) by Dijkstra’s algorithm. If, fortunately, a unique $s$-$t$ path $P_t$ in $T$ is non-zero, then we have to do nothing else. Otherwise, an $s$-$t$ path $Q$ in $G$ is non-zero if and only if $\psi_G(Q) \neq \psi_G(P_t) (= 1_\Gamma)$. When $T$ is fixed, we say that an $s$-$t$ path $Q$ is unorthodox if $\psi_G(Q) \neq \psi_G(P_t) =: \psi_T(t)$. Thus, our main task is to solve the following problem.
Problem 2 (Shortest Unorthodox Path).

Input: A Γ-labeled graph $G = (V, E)$, edge lengths $\ell \in \mathbb{R}^E_{\geq 0}$, two distinct vertices $s, t \in V$, and a shortest-path tree $T$ of $(G, \ell)$ rooted at $s$.

Goal: Find an $s$–$t$ path $Q$ in $G$ minimizing $\ell(Q)$ subject to $\psi_G(Q) \neq \psi_T(t)$ (if any), or conclude that all $s$–$t$ paths in $G$ are of label $\psi_T(t)$.

3 Lowest Blossoms

In this section, we introduce the concept of lowest blossoms and several operations utilized in our algorithm for the shortest unorthodox path problem. Throughout this section, let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected Γ-labeled graph with edge lengths $\ell \in \mathbb{R}^E_{\geq 0}$ and two distinct vertices $s, t \in V$.

First, we formally define a shortest-path tree.

Definition 3 (Shortest-Path Trees). A spanning tree $T \subseteq E$ is called a shortest-path tree of $(G, \ell)$ rooted at $s$ (or $s$-SPT for short) if, for each $v \in V$, a unique $s$–$v$ path, denoted by $P_v$, is shortest in $G$.

For an $s$-SPT $T$ of $(G, \ell)$ and each $v \in V$, we define $\text{dist}_T(v) := \ell(P_v)$ and $\psi_T(v) := \psi_G(P_v)$. An edge $e = \{u, v\} \in E$ is said to be consistent (with $T$) if $\psi_T(u) \cdot \psi_G(e, uv) = \psi_T(v)$, and inconsistent otherwise. Similarly, an $x$–$y$ path $R$ in $G$ is said to be orthodox if $\psi_T(x) \cdot \psi_G(R) = \psi_T(y)$, and unorthodox otherwise.

We observe useful properties of shortest-path trees.

Lemma 4. For any shortest-path tree $T$ of $(G, \ell)$ rooted at $s$, the following properties hold.

1. For any vertices $x, y \in V$ and any $x$–$y$ path $R$ in $G$, we have $\ell(R) \geq |\text{dist}_T(x) - \text{dist}_T(y)|$.
2. For any vertices $x, y \in V$, any unorthodox $x$–$y$ path $R$ in $G$ traverses some inconsistent edge in $E \setminus T$.

Proof. (1) For each edge $e = \{u, v\} \in E$, since $P_u$ and $P_v$ are both shortest in $G$, we have $\ell(P_v) \leq \ell(P_u) + \ell(e)$ and $\ell(P_u) \leq \ell(P_v) + \ell(e)$, and hence $\ell(e) \geq |\ell(P_u) - \ell(P_v)| = |\text{dist}_T(u) - \text{dist}_T(v)|$.

Thus,

$$\ell(R) = \sum_{e \in E(R)} \ell(e) \geq \sum_{e = \{u, v\} \in E(R)} |\text{dist}_T(u) - \text{dist}_T(v)| \geq |\text{dist}_T(x) - \text{dist}_T(y)|.$$

(2) Fix two vertices $x, y \in V$ and an $x$–$y$ path $R = (x = v_0, e_1, v_1, \ldots, e_k, v_k = y)$. If every edge $e = \{u, v\} \in E(R)$ is consistent with $T$, then

$$\psi_G(R) = \psi_G(e_1, v_0v_1) \cdot \psi_G(e_2, v_1v_2) \cdots \psi_G(e_k, v_{k-1}v_k) = \psi_T(v_0)^{-1} \cdot \psi_T(v_1)^{-1} \cdots \psi_T(v_k) = \psi_T(x)^{-1} \cdot \psi_T(y).$$

Hence, if $\psi_T(x) \cdot \psi_G(R) \neq \psi_T(y)$, then there exists an inconsistent edge $e = \{u, v\} \in E(R)$. Moreover, since every edge in $T$ is consistent with $T$ by definition, we conclude that $e \in E(R) \setminus T$. \qed
Figure 1: The blossom $C_e$ with base $b_e$ and stem $P_e$ for an inconsistent edge $e = \{u, v\} \in E \setminus T$, where solid lines represent edges in $T$.

Fix a shortest-path tree $T$ of $(G, \ell)$ rooted at $s$. By Lemma 4-(2), if every edge $e = \{u, v\} \in E \setminus T$ is consistent with $T$, then we can immediately conclude that all $s$–$t$ paths in $G$ are orthodox, i.e., of label $\psi_T(t)$.

In what follows, we assume that some edges are inconsistent, and define blossoms as follows.

**Definition 5 (Lowest Blossoms).** For an s-SPT $T$ of $(G, \ell)$ and an inconsistent edge $e = \{u, v\} \in E \setminus T$, let $W_e := P_u * (u, e, v) * P_v$ (where $u$ and $v$ are symmetric as $e$ has no direction, and fix an arbitrary direction to define $W_e$). Then, $W_e$ contains a unique cycle $C_e$ as its subwalk, and is decomposed as $W_e = P_{b_e} * C_e * P_{b_e}$ (see Fig. 1). We call $C_e$ a blossom, and $b_e$ and $P_e$ its base and stem, respectively. The height of $C_e$ is defined as $\frac{1}{2} \ell(W_e) = \frac{1}{2} (\text{dist}_T(u) + \text{dist}_T(v) + \ell(e))$, and a blossom of the minimum height is said to be lowest.

Note that any blossom $C_e$ is non-zero as the edge $e$ is inconsistent with $T$, i.e., $\psi_T(u) \cdot \psi_T(e, uv) \neq \psi_T(v)$. The following lemma shows one of the two key properties of lowest blossoms: for any vertex $w$ on a lowest blossom $C_e$ except for the base $b_e$, a unique detour around $C_e$ from $P_w$ yields a shortest unorthodox $s$–$w$ path $Q_w$.

**Lemma 6.** Let $T$ be an s-SPT of $(G, \ell)$, and $C_e$ a lowest blossom with base $b_e$ for $e = \{u, v\} \in E \setminus T$. Then, for any vertex $w \in V(C_e) \setminus \{b_e\}$, the unique $s$–$w$ path $Q_w$ such that $e \in E(Q_w) \subseteq T \cup \{e\}$ satisfies the following properties.

1. For any vertex $z \in V(P_{b_e}) \subseteq V(Q_w)$, we have $\psi_T(z) \cdot \psi_T(Q_w[z, w]) \neq \psi_T(w)$, i.e., $Q_w[z, w]$ is unorthodox.

2. For any vertex $z \in V(P_{b_e}) \subseteq V(Q_w)$ and any unorthodox $z$–$w$ path $R$ in $G$, we have $\ell(R) \geq \ell(Q_w[z, w])$.

3. $Q_w$ is a shortest unorthodox $s$–$w$ path in $G$, i.e., minimizes $\ell(Q_w)$ subject to $\psi_G(Q_w) \neq \psi_T(w)$.

**Proof.**

(1) By definition, $Q_w * P_e$ coincides with either $W_e = P_u * (u, e, v) * P_v$ itself or the reversed walk $W_e$. Since $Q_w[s, z] = P_z$ and $\psi_G(W_e) = \psi_T(u) \cdot \psi_G(e, uv) \cdot \psi_T(v)^{-1} \neq 1_G$, we have $\psi_G(Q_w[z, w]) = \psi_G(P_z)^{-1} \cdot \psi_G(W_e)^{\pm 1} \cdot \psi_G(P_w) \neq \psi_G(P_z)^{-1} \cdot 1_G \cdot \psi_G(P_w) = \psi_T(z)^{-1} \cdot \psi_T(w)$.

(2) By Lemma 4-(2), there exists an inconsistent edge $f = \{x, y\} \in E(R) \setminus T$, and we can write $R = R[z, x] * (x, f, y) * R[y, w]$ (possibly, $x = z$ or $y = w$). By Lemma 4-(1), we have
\( \ell(R[z,x]) \geq \dist_T(x) - \dist_T(z) \) and \( \ell(R[y,w]) \geq \dist_T(y) - \dist_T(w) \). Since \( C_e \) is a lowest blossom, we have

\[
\ell(R) = \ell(R[z,x]) + \ell(f) + \ell(R[y,w]) \\
\geq \dist_T(x) + \dist_T(y) + \ell(f) - \dist_T(w) - \dist_T(z) \\
\geq \dist_T(u) + \dist_T(v) + \ell(e) - \dist_T(w) - \dist_T(z) \\
= \ell(W_u) - \ell(P_w) - \ell(P_z) \\
= \ell(Q_w) - \ell(P_z) = \ell(Q_w[z,w]).
\]

(3) Just combine (1) and (2) by choosing \( z = s \).}

Fix a lowest blossom \( C \) with base \( b \), and let \( Q_w \) denote the shortest unorthodox \( s \rightarrow w \) path defined in Lemma 6 for each \( \gr{w} \in V(C) \setminus \{b\} \). If \( t \in V(C) \setminus \{b\} \), then \( Q_t \) is a desired \( s \rightarrow t \) path, and we are done. Otherwise, we shrink \( C \) into \( b \), and recursively find a shortest unorthodox \( s \rightarrow t \) path in the resulting graph, which can be expanded into a shortest unorthodox \( s \rightarrow t \) path in \( G \).

The shrinking and expanding operations are formally described in Definitions 7 and 8. Intuitively, for each vertex \( w \in V(C) \setminus \{b\} \) (which is removed by shrinking), we care about the only two \( b \rightarrow w \) paths along \( C, \) say \( R_{b,w}^1 = P_w[b,w] \) and \( R_{b,w}^2 = Q_w[b,w] \), and for each edge \( f = \{w,x\} \in \delta_G(w) \) with \( x \notin V(C) \), we create two new edges \( \tilde{f}_i = \{b,x\} \) \( (i = 1,2) \) corresponding to two \( b \rightarrow x \) paths \( R_{b,w}^i \ast (w,f,x) \) in \( G \) (see Fig. 2).

**Definition 7** (Shrinking Operation). For an \( s \rightleftharpoons T \) of \( (G,\ell) \) and a lowest blossom \( C \) with base \( b \), we say that a \( \Gamma \)-labeled graph \( \tilde{G} = (\tilde{V},\tilde{E}) \) with edge lengths \( \tilde{\ell} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^E \) and a spanning tree \( \tilde{T} \subseteq \tilde{E} \) is obtained by shrinking \( C \) into \( b \) (and denote \( \ast \) by \( * C \rightarrow b \) for \( C \in \{G,\ell,T\} \)) if it is defined as follows (see Fig. 2).

- \( \tilde{V} := V \setminus (V(C) \setminus \{b\}) \).
- \( \tilde{E} := (E \setminus E_{C,b}) \cup \tilde{F}_{C,b} \) and \( \tilde{T} := (T \setminus E_{C,b}) \cup \{ \tilde{f}_1 \mid f \in T \} \), where

\[
E_{C,b} := \{ e \in E \mid e \cap (V(C) \setminus \{b\}) \neq \emptyset \}, \\
\tilde{F}_{C,b} := \{ \tilde{f}_i = \{b,x\} \mid f = \{w,x\} \in E_{C,b}, \ w \in V(C) \setminus \{b\}, \ x \notin V(C), \ i \in \{1,2\} \}.
\]

- The labels and lengths are defined as follows.
  - For each \( e = \{u,v\} \in E \setminus E_{C,b} \), define \( \psi_{\tilde{G}}(e,uv) := \psi_G(e,uv) \) and \( \tilde{\ell}(e) := \ell(e) \).
  - For \( \tilde{f}_i = \{b,x\} \in \tilde{F}_{C,b} \) with \( f = \{w,x\} \), define \( \psi_{\tilde{G}}(\tilde{f}_i, bx) = \psi_G(R_{b,w}^i) \cdot \psi_G(f, wx) \) and \( \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{f}_i) := \ell(R_{b,w}^i) + \ell(f) \), where \( R_{b,w}^1 := P_w[b,w] \) and \( R_{b,w}^2 := Q_w[b,w] \).

**Definition 8** (Expanding Operation). Under the same setting as Definition 7, let \( v \in \tilde{V} \). For an \( s \rightarrow v \) path \( \tilde{R}_v \) in \( \tilde{G} \), we say that an \( s \rightarrow v \) path \( R_v \) in \( G \) is obtained by expanding \( b \) into \( C \) (and denote \( R_v \) by \( \tilde{R}_v[b \rightarrow C] \)) if it is defined as follows (Fig. 2 helps us to see reasonable correspondence between \( R_v \) and \( \tilde{R}_v \)).

- If \( E(\tilde{R}_v) \cap \tilde{F}_{C,b} = \emptyset \) (i.e., \( E(\tilde{R}_v) \subseteq E \setminus E_{C,b} \)), then \( R_v := \tilde{R}_v \).
Lemma 9. The following properties hold in Definitions 7 and 8.

1. If \( \mathcal{E}(\bar{R}_v) \cap \bar{F}_{C,b} = \{ \bar{f}_i \} \) for some \( \bar{f}_i = \{ b, x \} \) with \( f = \{ w, x \} \) \( \in \mathcal{E}_{C,b} \), then
   \[
   R_v := \begin{cases} 
   \bar{R}_v[s, b] \ast R_{b,w}^1 \ast (w, f, x) \ast \bar{R}_v[x, v], \\
   \bar{R}_v[s, x] \ast (x, f, w) \ast R_{b,w}^1 \ast \bar{R}_v[b, v],
   \end{cases}
   \]
   where the first case is chosen if \( \bar{R}_v = \bar{R}_v[s, b] \ast (b, \bar{f}_i, x) \ast \bar{R}_v[x, v] \), and the second otherwise (i.e., if \( \bar{R}_v = \bar{R}_v[s, x] \ast (x, \bar{f}_i, b) \ast \bar{R}_v[b, v] \)).

2. Otherwise, since \( \bar{R}_v \) is a path and \( \bar{F}_{C,b} \subseteq \delta_{\bar{G}}(b) \), we may assume that \( \mathcal{E}(\bar{R}_v) \cap \bar{F}_{C,b} = \{ \bar{f}_i, \bar{f}_j \} \) for distinct \( \bar{f}_i = \{ b, x \} \) and \( \bar{f}_j = \{ b, x' \} \) with \( f = \{ w, x \} \) \( \in \mathcal{E}_{C,b} \) and \( f' = \{ w', x' \} \) \( \in \mathcal{E}_{C,b} \), respectively, which successively appear in \( \bar{R}_v \) as \( \bar{R}_v[x', x] = (x', \bar{f}_j, b, \bar{f}_i, x) \). Then, let
   \[
   R_v^1 := P_w \ast (w, f, x) \ast \bar{R}_v[x, v], \\
   R_v^2 := Q_w \ast (w, f, x) \ast \bar{R}_v[x, v],
   \]
   and define \( R_v := R_v^1 \) if \( \psi_\bar{G}(\bar{R}_v) = \psi_G(R_v^1) \) or \( \psi_G(R_v^1) \neq \psi_T(v) \), and \( R_v := R_v^2 \) otherwise (i.e., if \( \psi_G(\bar{R}_v) \neq \psi_T(v) \)).

We observe basic properties on these operations.

Lemma 9. The following properties hold in Definitions 7 and 8.

1. If \( |\mathcal{E}(\bar{R}_v) \cap \bar{F}_{C,b}| \leq 1 \), then \( \ell(R_v) = \hat{\ell}(\bar{R}_v) \) and \( \psi_G(R_v) = \psi_G(\bar{R}_v) \).
2. If \( |\mathcal{E}(\bar{R}_v) \cap \bar{F}_{C,b}| = 2 \), then \( \ell(R_v) \leq \hat{\ell}(\bar{R}_v) \). In addition, if \( \psi_G(\bar{R}_v) \neq \psi_T(v) \), then \( \psi_G(R_v) \neq \psi_T(v) \).
3. \( \bar{T} \) is an s-SPT of \((\bar{G}, \hat{\ell})\) such that, for every \( v \in \hat{\bar{V}} \), we have \( \text{dist}_{\bar{T}}(v) = \text{dist}_T(v) \) and \( \psi_{\bar{T}}(v) = \psi_T(v) \), and a unique s-v path \( \bar{P}_v \) in \( \bar{T} \) is expanded into \( P_v \), i.e., \( \bar{P}_v[b \to C] = P_v \).

Proof. (1) It immediately follows from the definitions (in particular, see \( \psi_\bar{G} \) and \( \hat{\ell} \)).

(2) We use the same notation as the third case in Definition 8. The latter property on the label is easy to see from the definition \( \psi_G(R_v) = \psi_G(\bar{R}_v) \) or \( \psi_G(R_v) \neq \psi_T(v) \) holds.

\footnote{This definition may be somewhat counterintuitive against the term “expanding,” but we adopt it for simple argument (the only properties in Lemma 9.2 are needed).}
For the former property on the length, we confirm \( \ell(R_v[s, x]) \leq \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{R}_v[s, x]) \) as follows. Let 
\[
R_w := \tilde{R}_w[s, x'] \ast (x', f', w') \ast \tilde{R}^2_{b, w'} \ast \tilde{R}^1_{b, w} \text{ be an } s-w \text{ walk in } G. \]
Then, \( \tilde{R}_w[s, x] \) corresponds to 
\[
R_w \ast (w, f, x) \text{ by definition, and we have }
\]
\[
\tilde{\ell}(\tilde{R}_v[s, x]) = \ell(R_w) + \ell(f) \geq \ell(P_w) + \ell(f) = \ell(R^1_v[s, x]).
\]
Thus, if \( R_v = R^1_v \), then we are done.

Suppose that \( R_v = R^2_v \) and we show \( \ell(R^2_v[s, x]) \leq \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{R}_v[s, x]) \). If \( E(C) \subseteq E(R_w) \), then
\[
\tilde{\ell}(\tilde{R}_v[s, x]) \geq \ell(R_w[w', w]) + \ell(C) + \ell(f)
\]
\[
\geq \ell(P_w) + \ell(C) + \ell(f)
\]
\[
\geq \ell(Q_w) + \ell(f) = \ell(R^2_v[s, x]).
\]

Otherwise, the \( s-w \) path \( R'_w \) obtained from \( R_w \) by skipping the edges traversed twice satisfies \( \psi_G(R'_w) = \psi_G(R_w) \neq \psi_T(w) \) (note that \( \psi_G(R_w) \cdot \psi_G(f, wx) = \psi_G(\tilde{R}_v[s, x]) \neq \psi_G(R^1_v[s, x]) = \psi_T(w) \cdot \psi_G(f, wx) \) by definition). Hence, by Lemma 6-(3), we have
\[
\tilde{\ell}(\tilde{R}_v[s, x]) \geq \ell(R'_w) + \ell(f) \geq \ell(Q_w) + \ell(f) = \ell(R^2_v[s, x]).
\]

(3) For each \( v \in \tilde{V} \), we see \( |E(\tilde{P}_v) \cap \tilde{F}_{C,b}| \leq 1 \) and \( \tilde{P}_v[b \rightarrow C] = P_v \) by definition (in particular, see \( \tilde{T} \)), and \( \text{dist}_{\tilde{T}}(v) = \text{dist}_{T}(v) \) and \( \tilde{\psi}_T(v) = \psi_T(v) \) follow from (1). Moreover, by (1) and (2), for any \( s-v \) path \( \tilde{R}_v \) in \( \tilde{G} \), there exists a corresponding \( s-v \) path \( R_v = \tilde{R}_v[b \rightarrow C] \) in \( G \) such that \( \ell(R_v) \leq \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{R}_v) \). Since \( P_v \) is shortest in \( G \), so is \( \tilde{P}_v \) in \( \tilde{G} \).

Finally, as the other of the two key properties of lowest blossoms, the following lemma assures that one can find a shortest unorthodox \( s-t \) path in \( \tilde{G} \), by doing so recursively in the graph \( \tilde{G} \) obtained by shrinking a lowest blossom into its base, which completes the correctness of our strategy to solve the shortest unorthodox path problem.

**Lemma 10.** For an \( s\text{-SPT}T \) of \( (G, \ell) \) and a lowest blossom \( C \) with base \( b \), let \( \tilde{G} := G[C \rightarrow b] \), \( \tilde{\ell} := \ell[C \rightarrow b] \), and \( \tilde{T} := T[C \rightarrow b] \). If \( t \in \tilde{V} \), then the following properties hold.

1. If \( G \) has an unorthodox \( s-t \) path (with respect to \( T \)), then so does \( \tilde{G} \) (with respect to \( \tilde{T} \)).
2. For any shortest unorthodox \( s-t \) path \( \tilde{Q}_t \) in \( \tilde{G} \), the expanded path \( \tilde{Q}_t[b \rightarrow C] \) is a shortest unorthodox \( s-t \) path in \( G \).

**Proof.** We fix an arbitrary unorthodox \( s-t \) path \( R_t \) in \( G \), and construct an unorthodox \( s-t \) path \( \tilde{R}_t \) in \( \tilde{G} \) such that \( |E(\tilde{R}_t) \cap \tilde{F}_{C,b}| \leq 1 \) and \( \tilde{\ell}(\tilde{R}_t) \leq \ell(R_t) \), which immediately leads to (1). Moreover, this also implies (2) as follows: for any shortest unorthodox \( s-t \) path \( \tilde{Q}_t \) in \( \tilde{G} \), we see \( \psi_G(\tilde{Q}_t) \neq \psi_T(t) \) and \( \ell(\tilde{Q}_t) \leq \ell(\tilde{R}_t) \leq \ell(R_t) \) by Lemma 9, where \( \tilde{Q}_t := \tilde{Q}_t[b \rightarrow C] \).

If \( V(R_t) \cap (V(C) \setminus \{b\}) = \emptyset \), then \( R_t \) remains in \( G \) as it is in \( G \). Then, by defining \( \tilde{R}_t := R_t \), we have \( |E(\tilde{R}_t) \cap \tilde{F}_{C,b}| = 0 \leq 1 \), which implies \( \psi_G(\tilde{R}_t) = \psi_G(R_t) = \psi_T(t) \) and \( \ell(\tilde{R}_t) = \ell(R_t) \) by Lemma 9(1), and we are done.

Otherwise, \( V(R_t) \cap (V(C) \setminus \{b\}) \neq \emptyset \). Let \( w \) be the last vertex on \( R_t \) intersecting the blossom \( C \) or its stem \( P_b \), i.e., \( V(R_t[w, t]) \cap (V(C) \cup V(P_b)) = \{w\} \) (possibly, \( w = t \) if \( w \in V(P_b) \)).

**Case 1.** When \( w \in V(C) \setminus \{b\} \) (see Fig. 3).
Case 2.1.1. Suppose that $\psi_T(w) \cdot \psi_G(R_t[w,t]) \neq \psi_T(t)$. Then, let $R'_t := P_b \ast (b, \tilde{f}_1, x) \ast R_t[x,t]$ so that $R'_t := \tilde{R}'_t[b \to C] = P_w \ast R_t[w,t]$. As $P_w$ is a shortest $s$–$w$ path in $G$, by Lemma 6 we see
\[
\psi_G(R'_t) = \psi_G(P_w) \cdot \psi_G(R_t[w,t]) = \psi_T(w) \cdot \psi_G(R_t[w,t]) \neq \psi_T(t),
\]
\[
\tilde{\ell}(R'_t) = \ell(R'_t) = \ell(P_w) + \ell(R_t[w,t]) \leq \ell(R_t[s,w]) + \ell(R_t[w,t]) = \ell(R_t).
\]

Case 1.2. Otherwise (i.e., if $\psi_T(w) \cdot \psi_G(R_t[w,t]) = \psi_T(t)$), let $R'_t := P_b \ast (b, \tilde{f}_2, x) \ast R_t[x,t]$ so that $R'_t := \tilde{R}'_t[b \to C] = Q_w \ast R_t[w,t]$. Since $\psi_G(R_t) \neq \psi_T(t)$, we have $\psi_G(R_t[s,w]) \neq \psi_T(w)$. Hence, by Lemmas 6 and 9 we see
\[
\psi_G(R'_t) = \psi_G(R'_t) = \psi_G(Q_w) \cdot \psi_G(R_t[w,t]) = \psi_G(Q_w) \cdot \psi_T(w)^{-1} \cdot \psi_T(t) \neq \psi_T(t),
\]
\[
\tilde{\ell}(R'_t) = \ell(R'_t) = \ell(Q_w) + \ell(R_t[w,t]) \leq \ell(R_t[s,w]) + \ell(R_t[w,t]) = \ell(R_t).
\]

Case 2. When $w \in V(P_b)$ (see Figs. 4 and 5).

Let $u$ and $v$ be the first and last vertices, respectively, on $R_t$ intersecting $V(C) \setminus \{b\}$, i.e., $V(R_t[s,u]) \cap (V(C) \setminus \{b\}) = \{u\}$ and $V(R_t[v,t]) \cap (V(C) \setminus \{b\}) = \{v\}$ (possibly $u = v$). Since $w \in V(P_b)$ appears in $R_t$ later than $u$ and $v$, we can write $R_t = R_t[s,u] \ast R_t[u,v] \ast R_t[v,w] \ast R_t[w,t]$. Let $y_1 \in V(R_t[s,u]) \cap V(P_b)$ and $y_2 \in V(R_t[v,t]) \cap V(P_b)$ be respectively the farthest vertices on $P_b$ from $s$, i.e., $V(R_t[s,u]) \cap V(P_b[y_1,b]) = \{y_1\}$ and $V(R_t[v,t]) \cap V(P_b[y_2,b]) = \{y_2\}$ (possibly, $y_1 = s$ or $y_2 = w$). As $R_t$ is a path, we have $y_1 \neq y_2$, and let $y$ be the farther one, i.e., $y := y_1$ if $y_1 \in V(P_b[y_2,b])$ and $y := y_2$ otherwise (if $y_2 \in V(P_b[y_1,b])$).

Case 2.1. When $y = y_1$ (see Fig. 4).

In this case, $V(R_t[s,y]) \cap (V(C) \cup V(P_b[y,b])) = \{y\}$ and $V(R_t[v,t]) \cap (V(C) \cup V(P_b[y,b])) = \{v\}$. Let $f = \{v,x\} \in E_{C,b}$ be the first edge in $R_t[v,t]$.

Case 2.1.1. Suppose that $\psi_G(R_t[s,y]) \cdot \psi_T(y)^{-1} \cdot \psi_T(v) \cdot \psi_G(R_t[v,t]) \neq \psi_T(t)$. Then, let $R'_t := R_t[s,y] \ast P_b[y,b] \ast (b, \tilde{f}_1, x) \ast R_t[x,t]$ so that $R'_t := \tilde{R}'_t[b \to C] = R_t[s,y] \ast P_v[y,v] \ast R_t[v,t]$. As $P_v = P_y \ast P_v[y,v]$, by Lemmas 4 and 9 we see
\[
\psi_G(R'_t) = \psi_G(R'_t) = \psi_G(R_t[s,y]) \cdot \psi_T(y)^{-1} \cdot \psi_T(v) \cdot \psi_G(R_t[v,t]) \neq \psi_T(t),
\]
\[
\ell(R'_t) = \ell(R'_t) = \ell(R_t[s,y]) + (\text{dist}_T(v) - \text{dist}_T(y)) + \ell(R_t[v,t]) \leq \ell(R_t[s,y]) + \ell(R_t[y,v]) + \ell(R_t[v,t]) = \ell(R_t).
\]
Case 2.2. When $y = y_2$, where the solid line represents $R_t$, the dashed one is $R_{t}'$ with $R_{t}'[y,v] = P_{v}[y,v]$ or $Q_{v}[y,v]$, and the dotted ones are $P_b$ and $C$.

**Case 2.2.1.** Otherwise (i.e., if $\psi_G(R_t[y,v]) \cdot \psi_T(y)^{-1} \cdot \psi_T(v) \cdot \psi_G(R_t[v,t]) = \psi_T(t)$), let $\tilde{R}_{t}' := R_t[s,y] \ast P_b[y,b] \ast (b, f_2, x) \ast R_t[x,t]$ so that $R_t' := \tilde{R}_{t}'[b \rightarrow C] = R_t[s,y] \ast Q_{v}[y,v] \ast R_{t}[v,t]$. Since $\psi_G(R_t) \neq \psi_T(t)$, we have $\psi_G(R_t[y,v]) \neq \psi_T(y)^{-1} \cdot \psi_T(v)$. As $y \in V(P_b)$ and $v \in V(C) \setminus\{b\}$, by Lemmas 4 and 9 we see

$$\tilde{\ell}(\tilde{R}_t') = \ell(R_t') = \ell(R_t[s,y]) + \ell(Q_{v}[y,v]) + \ell(R_{t}[v,t])$$

As $\psi_G(R_t) \neq \psi_T(t)$, we have $\psi_G(R_t[y,v]) \neq \psi_T(y)^{-1} \cdot \psi_T(v)$. As $y \in V(P_b)$ and $v \in V(C) \setminus\{b\}$, by Lemmas 4 and 9 we see

$$\tilde{\ell}(\tilde{R}_t') = \ell(R_t') = \ell(R_t[s,y]) + \ell(Q_{v}[y,v]) + \ell(R_{t}[v,t])$$

**Case 2.2.** When $y = y_2$ (see Fig. 5).

In this case, $V(R_t[s,u]) \cap (V(C) \cup V(P_b[y,b])) = \{u\}$ and $V(R_t[y,t]) \cap (V(C) \cup V(P_b[y,b])) = \{y\}$. Let $f = \{x,u\} \in E_{C,b}$ be the last edge in $R_t[s,u]$.

**Case 2.2.1.** Suppose that $\psi_G(R_t[s,u]) \cdot \psi_T(u)^{-1} \cdot \psi_T(y) \cdot \psi_G(R_t[y,t]) \neq \psi_T(t)$. Then, let $\tilde{R}_t' := R_t[s,x] \ast (x, f_1, b) \ast P_u[b,y] \ast R_{t}[y,t]$ so that $R_t' := \tilde{R}_t'[b \rightarrow C] = R_t[s,u] \ast P_u[u,y] \ast R_{t}[y,t]$. As $P_u = P_u[u,y] \ast P_y$, by Lemmas 4 and 9 we see

$$\tilde{\ell}(\tilde{R}_t') = \ell(R_t') = \ell(R_t[s,u]) + \ell(Q_{v}[y,v]) + \ell(R_{t}[v,t])$$

As $\psi_G(R_t) \neq \psi_T(t)$, we have $\psi_G(R_t[y,v]) \neq \psi_T(y)^{-1} \cdot \psi_T(v)$. As $y \in V(P_b)$ and $v \in V(C) \setminus\{b\}$, by Lemmas 4 and 9 we see

$$\tilde{\ell}(\tilde{R}_t') = \ell(R_t') = \ell(R_t[s,u]) + \ell(Q_{v}[y,v]) + \ell(R_{t}[v,t])$$

Figure 5: General picture of Case 2.2 (when $y = y_2$), where the solid line represents $R_t$, the dashed one is $R_t'$ with $R_{t}'[u,y] = P_{u}[u,y]$ or $Q_{u}[u,y]$, and the dotted ones are $P_b$ and $C$. 
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Case 2.2.2. Otherwise (i.e., if \( \psi_G(R_t[s,u]) \cdot \psi_T(u)^{-1} \cdot \psi_T(y) \cdot \psi_G(R_t[y,t]) = \psi_T(t) \)), let \( \tilde{R}_t := R_t[s,x] \ast (x, f_2, b) \ast T^u_t[b, y] \ast R_t[y, t] \). Since \( \psi_G(R_t) \neq \psi_T(t) \), we have \( \psi_G(R_t[u, y]) \neq \psi_T(u)^{-1} \cdot \psi_T(y) \). As \( y \in V(P_b) \) and \( u \in V(C) \setminus \{b\} \), by Lemmas \[6\] and \[9\], we see
\[
\psi_G(\tilde{R}_t) = \psi_G(R_t) = \psi_G(R_t[s, u]) \cdot \psi_G(Q_u[u, y])^{-1} \cdot \psi_G(R_t[y, t]) \\
\neq \psi_G(R_t[s, u]) \cdot \psi_T(u)^{-1} \cdot \psi_T(y) \cdot \psi_G(R_t[y, t]) = \psi_T(t),
\]
\[
\tilde{e}(\tilde{R}_t) = e(R_t) = e(R_t[s, u]) + e(Q_u[u, y]) + e(R_t[y, t]) \\
\leq e(R_t[s, u]) + e(R_t[u, y]) + e(R_t[y, t]) = e(R_t).
\]

Thus, for any unorthodox \( s-t \) path \( R_t \) in \( G \), we can construct an unorthodox \( s-t \) path \( \tilde{R}_t \) in \( \tilde{G} \) such that \( |E(\tilde{R}_t) \cap \tilde{F}_{C,b}| \leq 1 \) and \( \tilde{e}(\tilde{R}_t) \leq e(R_t) \), and we are done. \( \square \)

4 Algorithm

In this section, we present and analyze an algorithm for the shortest non-zero path problem, which is summarized again as follows. We first compute a shortest-path tree \( T \) of \((G, \ell)\) rooted at \( s \) together with \( \psi_T(v) \) for each vertex \( v \) by Dijkstra’s algorithm. If the unique \( s-t \) path \( P_t \) in \( T \) is non-zero (i.e., \( \psi_T(t) \neq 1_T \)), then return \( P_t \). Otherwise, we solve the shortest unorthodox path problem as follows. We find a lowest blossom \( C \) with base \( b \). If \( t \in V(C) \setminus \{b\} \), then return the detour \( Q_t \) from \( P_t \) around \( C \). Otherwise, we recursively find a shortest unorthodox \( s-t \) path \( \tilde{Q}_t \) in a small graph \( G[C \to b] \) constructed by shrinking \( C \) into \( b \), and return the expanded \( s-t \) path \( \tilde{Q}_t[b \to C] \) in \( G \).

4.1 Algorithm description

Throughout this section, we assume that the input graph \( G \) is connected (by extracting the connected component that contains \( s \) and \( t \) in advance if necessary).

First, for the sake of completeness, we describe Dijkstra’s algorithm adjusted to our problem, which computes a shortest-path tree \( T \) rooted at \( s \) together with \( \psi_T \) and \( \psi_T \) (cf. Definition \[3\]).

Algorithm 1 (Dijkstra\((G, \ell, s)\)).

**Input:** A connected \( \Gamma \)-labeled graph \( G = (V, E) \), edge lengths \( \ell \in \mathbb{R}^{\Gamma}_{\geq 0} \), and a vertex \( s \in V \).

**Output:** An \( s \)-SPT \( T \) of \((G, \ell)\) with \( \dist_T \) and \( \psi_T \).

**Step 1.** For each \( v \in V \setminus \{s\} \), set \( \dist_T(v) \leftarrow +\infty \). Set \( \dist_T(s) \leftarrow 0 \), \( \psi_T(s) \leftarrow 1_T \), and \( U \leftarrow \emptyset \).

**Step 2.** While \( \Delta := \min \{ \dist_T(v) \mid v \in V \setminus U \} < +\infty \), pick \( v \in V \setminus U \) with \( \dist_T(v) = \Delta \), update \( U \leftarrow U \cup \{v\} \), and do the following for each edge \( e = \{v, w\} \in \delta_G(v) \) with \( w \notin U \):

- if \( \dist_T(w) > \Delta + e \), then update \( \dist_T(w) \leftarrow \Delta + e \), \( \psi_T(w) \leftarrow \psi_T(v) \cdot \psi_G(e, vw) \), and \( \last(w) \leftarrow e \).

**Step 3.** Set \( T \leftarrow \{ \last(v) \mid v \in V \setminus \{s\} \} \), and return \( T \) with \( \dist_T \) and \( \psi_T \).

After performing Dijkstra\((G, \ell, s)\), we can use the following algorithm to solve the shortest unorthodox path problem, whose correctness is shown in Section \[3\].
Algorithm 2 (SUP\([G, \ell, s, t, T]\)).

**Input:** A connected \(\Gamma\)-labeled graph \(G = (V, E)\), edge lengths \(\ell \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^E\), distinct vertices \(s, t \in V\), and an \(s\)-SPT \(T\) of \((G, \ell)\) with \(\dist_T\) and \(\psi_T\).

**Output:** A shortest unorthodox \(s\)–\(t\) path in \(G\) if any, or a message “NO” otherwise.

**Step 1.** If every edge \(e = \{u, v\} \in E \setminus T\) is consistent with \(T\) (i.e., \(\psi_T(u) \cdot \psi_G(e, uv) = \psi_T(v)\)), then halt with the message “NO” (cf. Lemma 3(2)).

**Step 2.** Otherwise, pick an inconsistent edge \(e = \{u, v\} \in E \setminus T\) that minimizes \(\dist_T(u) + \dist_T(u) + \ell(e)\), so that \(C_e = P_u[b_c, u] \ast (u, e, v) \ast P_v[v, b_e]\) is a lowest blossom with base \(b_c\) (cf. Definition 5).

**Step 3.** If \(t \in V(C_e) \setminus \{b_e\}\), then halt with returning the \(s\)–\(t\) path \(Q_t\) in \(G\) obtained as follows (cf. Lemma 6(3)): \(Q_t := P_u \ast (u, e, v) \ast P_v[v, t]\) if \(t \in V(P_v)\), and \(Q_t := P_v \ast (v, e, u) \ast P_u[u, t]\) otherwise (then, \(t \in V(P_u)\)).

**Step 4.** Otherwise, construct a \(\Gamma\)-labeled graph \(\tilde{G} = (\tilde{V}, \tilde{E})\) with edge lengths \(\tilde{\ell} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^\tilde{E}\) and a spanning tree \(\tilde{T} \subseteq \tilde{E}\) by shrinking \(C_e\) into \(b_c\), i.e., set \(\tilde{G} := G[C_e \rightarrow b_c]\), \(\tilde{\ell} := \ell[C_e \rightarrow b_c]\), and \(\tilde{T} := T[C_e \rightarrow b_c]\) (cf. Definition 7).

**Step 5.** Perform \(SUP[\tilde{G}, \tilde{\ell}, s, t, \tilde{T}]\) recursively, where \(\dist_{\tilde{T}}\) and \(\psi_{\tilde{T}}\) are obtained just by restricting \(\dist_T\) and \(\psi_T\), respectively, to \(\tilde{V}\) (cf. Lemma 9(3)), and halt with the following output.

- If the output of \(SUP[\tilde{G}, \tilde{\ell}, s, t, \tilde{T}]\) is a shortest unorthodox \(s\)–\(t\) path \(\tilde{Q}_t\) in \(\tilde{G}\), then return the expanded \(s\)–\(t\) path \(\tilde{Q}_t[b_e \rightarrow C_e]\) in \(G\) (cf. Definition 8 and Lemma 10(2)).
- Otherwise, return the message “NO” (cf. Lemma 10(1)).

We are now ready to describe the whole algorithm for the shortest non-zero path problem.

Algorithm 3 (SHORTESTNON-ZEROPath\([G, \ell, s, t]\)).

**Input:** A connected \(\Gamma\)-labeled graph \(G = (V, E)\), edge lengths \(\ell \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^E\), and distinct vertices \(s, t \in V\).

**Output:** A shortest non-zero \(s\)–\(t\) path in \(G\) if any, or a message “NO” otherwise.

**Step 1.** Perform \(D\)\(IJK\)\(STRA[G, \ell, s]\) and obtain an \(s\)-SPT \(T\) of \((G, \ell)\) with \(\dist_T\) and \(\psi_T\).

**Step 2.** If \(\psi_T(t) \neq 1_T\), then halt with returning a unique \(s\)–\(t\) path \(P_t\) included in \(T\).

**Step 3.** Otherwise (i.e., if \(\psi_T(t) = 1_T\)), perform \(SUP[G, \ell, s, t, T]\) and halt with the same output.

As remarked in the introduction just before Theorem 2, we also find a shortest non-zero cycle by computing one lowest blossom \(C_r\) with respect to one shortest-path tree \(T_r\) of \((G, \ell)\) rooted at each vertex \(r \in V\), whose correctness is seen as follows.

Fix a vertex \(r \in V\), an \(r\)-SPT \(T_r\) of \((G, \ell)\), and a lowest blossom \(C_r\). Let \(e = \{u, v\} \in E(C_r) \setminus T_r\) be the corresponding inconsistent edge, and define \(W_e := P_u \ast (u, e, v) \ast P_v\) as a closed walk in \(G\) with end vertex \(r\) that is included in \(T_r \cup \{e\}\) (cf. Fig. 1). We show that \(W_e\) is a shortest non-zero closed walk in \(G\) with end vertex \(r\), which implies that \(C_r\) is a shortest non-zero cycle in \(G\) if \(r\) is on some shortest non-zero cycle in \(G\) by the nonnegativity of edge length.

Let \(W\) be a non-zero closed walk in \(G\) with end vertex \(r\). Then, \(W\) traverses some inconsistent edge \(f = \{x, y\} \in E \setminus T_r\) by Lemma 4(2), and define \(W_f := P_x \ast (x, f, y) \ast P_y\). Since \(C_r\) is a lowest blossom, we have \(\ell(W_e) \leq \ell(W_f)\). In addition, by Lemma 4(1), we have \(\ell(W_f) \leq \ell(W)\), and we are done.
The algorithm for finding a shortest non-zero cycle is formally described as follows. Theorem 2 follows from the fact that Dijkstra’s algorithm can be implemented in $O(m + n \log n)$ time with the aid of Fibonacci heaps (see, e.g., [18, § 7.4]), where $n := |V|$ and $m := |E|$.

Algorithm 4 (ShortestNon-zeroCycle($G, \ell$)).

Input: A connected $\Gamma$-labeled graph $G = (V, E)$ and edge lengths $\ell \in \mathbb{R}^E_{\geq 0}$.

Output: A shortest non-zero cycle in $G$ if any, or a message “NO” otherwise.

Step 1. For each vertex $r \in V$, compute an $r$-SPT $T_r$ of $(G, \ell)$ by Dijkstra[$G, \ell, r$], and then find a lowest blossom $C_r$ with respect to $T_r$ (cf. Step 2 of SUP).

Step 2. Return the shortest cycle among $C_r$ ($r \in V$) if at least one has been found, and “NO” otherwise.

4.2 Computational time

In this section, we show that the total computational time can be bounded by $O(nm)$ for the input graph $G = (V, E)$ with $|V| = n$ and $|E| = m$, which completes the proof of Theorem 1.

First of all, the connected component $G' = (V', E')$ of $G$ that contains both $s$ and $t$ is obtained in $O(n + m)$ time, e.g., by the depth first search. Thus, we may assume that $G$ is connected, and then $n = O(m)$.

In addition, although $G$ may have arbitrarily many parallel edges in general, we can reduce them to at most two between each pair of two vertices in advance, because more than two parallel edges between the same pair are redundant for our problems as follows. If there are two parallel edges with the same label, then one that is not longer than the other is enough. Moreover, if there are three parallel edges with distinct labels, then any non-zero (or unorthodox) $s$–$t$ path traversing a longest one among them can be transformed into another non-zero (or unorthodox, respectively) $s$–$t$ path not longer than the original path by replacing the edge with at least one of the other two.

Simplification of redundant parallel edges is done in $O(n^2 + m)$ time by checking all the pairs of two vertices and reducing more than two parallel edges to at most two. Thus, we may assume that $G$ has at most two parallel edges between any pair of two vertices, and then $m = O(n^2)$. Then, a naïve implementation of Dijkstra’s algorithm requires $O(n^2)$ time, which is true for Dijkstra[$G, \ell, s$]. As remarked for finding a shortest non-zero cycle, we can employ a faster implementation for sparse graphs, but it does not help in speeding up in total.

In what follows, we show that the computational time of SUP[$G, \cdots$] is bounded by $O(nm)$. Since the input graph of a recursive call after shrinking a lowest blossom into the base has strictly fewer vertices, the number of recursive calls is at most $n$. In addition, as shown later in Claim 11, the number of edges in any recursion is bounded by $O(m)$ if we reduce redundant parallel edges whenever some appears as a new edge not contained in the new shortest-path tree (then, each pair of two vertices has at most two parallel edges). Hence, it suffices to show that SUP[$G, \cdots$] can be implemented in $O(m)$ time except for the recursive call.

It is easy to confirm that a naïve implementation of Steps 1–2 requires $O(m)$ time. In addition, Steps 3 and 5 (except for the recursive call SUP[$\tilde{G}, \cdots$]) are done in $O(n)$ time, because the relevant edges in $G$ are included in $T \cup \{e\} \cup (E(\tilde{Q}_t) \cap E)$, whose size is $O(n)$ as $T$ is a spanning tree of $G$ and $\tilde{Q}_t$ is a path in $\tilde{G}$.

Let us focus on Step 4, i.e., shrinking a lowest blossom $C_e$ into the base $b_e$. We use the same notation as Definitions 5 and 7 by setting $C = C_e$ and $b = b_e$. Since the number of removed
the edge set of $G$

Proof. $\sigma(e)$ has at most two parallel edges between each pair of two vertices, then we have $\psi_G(R_{b,w}) = \psi_T(b)^{-1} \cdot \psi_T(w)$, $\ell(R_{b,w}) = \text{dist}_T(w) - \text{dist}_T(b)$, $\psi_G(R^2_{b,w}) = \psi_T(b)^{-1} \cdot \psi_G(Q_w)$, and $\ell(R^2_{b,w}) = \ell(Q_w) - \ell(T(b))$, where

$$
\psi_G(Q_w) = \begin{cases} 
\psi_G(W_e) \cdot \psi_T(w) & (w \in V(P_v)), \\
\psi_G(W_e)^{-1} \cdot \psi_T(w) & (w \in V(P_u)), 
\end{cases}
$$

$$
\ell(Q_w) = \ell(W_e) - \text{dist}_T(w),
$$

$$
\psi_G(W_e) = \psi_T(u) \cdot \psi_G(e,uv) \cdot \psi_T(v)^{-1},
$$

$$
\ell(W_e) = \text{dist}_T(u) + \text{dist}_T(v) + \ell(e).
$$

Using these equations, we can compute $\psi_G(\tilde{f}_i, bx)$ and $\ell(\tilde{f}_i)$ by a constant number of elementary operations. In addition, if some $\tilde{f}_i \in \tilde{F}_{C,b} \setminus \tilde{T}$ is redundant, then we immediately remove it to keep the number of edges in the current graph appropriately small (cf. Claim 11), which does not affect the recursive call $\text{SUP}[\tilde{G}, \ldots]$.

The following claim completes the analysis and hence the proof of Theorem 1.

Claim 11. For any graph $G' = (V', E')$ that appears as an input of a recursive call of $\text{SUP}$, if $G'$ has at most two parallel edges between each pair of two vertices, then we have $|E'| \leq 2|E|$.

Proof. We prove $|E'| \leq 2|E|$ by constructing a mapping $\sigma : E' \to E$ such that $|\sigma^{-1}(e)| \leq 2$ for every $e \in E$. Let $G = G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_k = G'$ be the sequence of the $\Gamma$-labeled graphs such that $G_j = G_{j-1}$ ($j = 1, 2, \ldots, k$), i.e., $\text{SUP}[G_j, \ldots]$ is recursively called in Step 5 of $\text{SUP}[G_{j-1}, \ldots]$. We define $\sigma$ as the composition of mappings $\sigma_j : E_j \to E_{j-1}$ ($j = 1, 2, \ldots, k$) defined as follows, where $E_j$ denotes the edge set of $G_j$ for each $j = 0, 1, \ldots, k$.

Let $e \in E_j$. If $e \in E_{j-1}$, then $\sigma_j(e) := e$. Otherwise, $e$ is a new edge $\tilde{f}_i = \{b, x\} \in E_j \setminus E_{j-1}$ ($i \in \{1, 2\}$) corresponding to some removed edge $f = \{w, x\} \in E_{j-1} \setminus E_j$, and define $\sigma_j(\tilde{f}_i) = f$.

Let $\sigma := \sigma_k \circ \cdots \circ \sigma_2 \circ \sigma_1$. For any edge $e = \{u, v\} \in E = E_0$, each edge $e' \in \sigma^{-1}(e) \subseteq E' = E_k$ connects the same pair of two vertices $u', v' \in V'$ by the above definition, where $u'$ and $v'$ are the vertices into which $u$ and $v$, respectively, are virtually merged by shrinking operations. Thus, since each pair of two vertices has at most two parallel edges in $G'$, we conclude that $|\sigma^{-1}(e)| \leq 2$ holds for every $e \in E$.
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