

Shortest Path Centrality and the All-pairs Shortest Paths Problem via Sample Complexity^{*}

Alane M. de Lima, Murilo V. G. da Silva, and André L. Vignatti

Federal University of Paraná, Curitiba PR 08544, Brazil
{amlima,murilo,vignatti}@inf.ufpr.br

Abstract. In this paper we are interested in the all-pairs shortest paths problem (APSP) for an input graph G assumed to be connected undirected with nonnegative real edge weights. In the exact deterministic case, it is an open question whether this problem admits a $\mathcal{O}(n^{3-c})$ time algorithm, for any constant $c > 0$, even in the case where edge weights are natural numbers. There is a variety of approximation algorithms for the problem and the time complexity of the fastest one depends on the graph being sparse or dense and also on the corresponding approximation guarantee. In this paper we deal with a version of the APSP that fits neither in the exact nor the approximate case. We give a $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log n)$ randomized algorithm for APSP such that for every pair of vertices the algorithm either computes the exact shortest path or does not compute any shortest path, depending on a certain measure of “importance” (or centrality) of the shortest path in question.

Keywords: all-pairs shortest paths · shortest path centrality · sample complexity

1 Introduction

The All-pairs Shortest Path (APSP) is the problem of computing a path with the minimum length between every pair of vertices in a weighted graph. It is a fundamental problem which is the core of many applications. The fastest known exact algorithms for weighted graphs were the algorithms proposed by Williams (2014) [19], which runs in $\mathcal{O}(\frac{n^3}{2^{c\sqrt{\log n}}})$, for some constant $c > 0$, and by Pettie and Ramachandram (2002) [12], which runs in $\mathcal{O}(mn + n^2 \log \log n)$. Currently, it is an open question whether this problem admits an algorithm in $\mathcal{O}(n^{3-c})$ time, for any constant $c > 0$.

The fastest approximation algorithm for the same problem depends on the approximation guarantee and also on the sparsity of the input graph. Elkin et al. (2019) [4] proposed an approximation that runs in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ and have multiplicative factor $1 + \epsilon$ and an additive term $\beta(G)$, where $\beta(G)$ depends on the edge weights. Baswana and Kavitha (2010) [3] proposed two approximation algorithms, one with a multiplicative factor of 2 that runs in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(m\sqrt{n} + n^2)$ time and other with a $7/3$ multiplicative factor that runs in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(m^{2/3}n + n^2)$ time.

^{*} Supported by CAPES and CNPq.

In this paper, we present a $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log n)$ randomized algorithm for APSP that outputs a solution that fits neither in the exact nor approximate case. For every pair of vertices our algorithm either computes the exact shortest path or does not compute any shortest path, depending on a certain measure of “importance” (or centrality) of the shortest path in question. The precise definition of centrality is given in Section 2.1, but the intuition is that, for a pair of vertices (u, v) , the centrality $c(u, v)$ relates to the amount of shortest paths P in G such that P is a subpath of a shortest path between u and v .

The techniques used in this paper are inspired by the work of Riondato and Kornaropoulos (2016) and Riondato and Upfal (2018) [14, 15], which developed algorithms for the betweenness centrality problem under the light of the Vapnik-Chervonenkis (VC) dimension theory and the ϵ -sample theorem for a fixed size sample, and also under the light of Rademacher averages in a progressive sampling approach. More recently Lima et al. (2019) [7] used some of those tools for the estimation of the percolation centrality, a generalization of betweenness centrality. The algorithms in [7, 14, 15] compute an estimate for a certain value associated to the vertices of G . In this paper we use such tools for the first time for estimating a value associated to the paths (instead of vertices) of a graph. More precisely, we use VC-dimension and Rademacher averages in a sampling algorithm to obtain, with probability $1 - \delta$, an estimate for the centrality $c(u, v)$ within ϵ of the optimal value, for any fixed constants $0 < \epsilon, \delta < 1$. As a result, we show that this algorithm can be adapted to output, with probability $1 - \delta$, a shortest path between u and v if $c(u, v)$ is at least ϵ . Both algorithms run in $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log n)$ time.

The aim of using techniques from sample complexity in algorithm design is to provide simple solutions that are efficient in practice. In [14] a series of experiments show that in practice such algorithms are fast and generally return solutions with superior quality and higher probability than the parameters ϵ and $1 - \delta$ in question. We experimentally evaluated our approach on random power-law graphs and Erds-Renyi graphs, considering a fixed sample size, and compared with the classic Floyd-Warshall algorithm. The corresponding results showed that the number of shortest paths not computed by the algorithm is small, even for modest $\epsilon = 0.05$ and $\delta = 0.1$, and that our algorithm runs faster in relation to the exact solution as the size of the graph increases.

2 Preliminaries

The definitions, notation and results which are the theoretical foundation of our work are presented below.

2.1 Shortest Paths in Graphs

Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph and a function $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, where $w(e)$ is the nonnegative *weight* of the edge e . W.l.o.g. we assume that G is connected, since all results in this paper can be applied to the connected components of

a graph, when a graph is disconnected. A *path* is a sequence of vertices $p = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k)$ such that, for $1 \leq i < k$, $v_i \neq v_{i+1}$ and there is $(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E$. Let E_p be the set of edges of a path p . The length of p , denoted by $l(p)$, corresponds to the sum $\sum_{e \in E_p} w(e)$. For a pair $(u, v) \in V^2$, let P_{uv} be the set of all paths from u to v . A *shortest path* is a path $p_{uv} \in P_{uv}$ where $l(p_{uv}) = \min\{l(p_{u'v'}) : p_{u'v'} \in P_{uv}\}$. The length of a shortest path is called *distance*.

A *shortest paths tree (SPT)* of a vertex u is a spanning tree T_u of G such that the path from u to every other vertex of T_u is a shortest path in G . Note that there might be many SPTs for a given vertex. In this paper we are interested in fixing one canonical SPT for every vertex of G . More precisely, we fix an (arbitrary) ordering of the vertex set V and let the canonical SPT for a vertex u be the SPT output by Dijkstra's algorithm and denote such tree T_u . We also call T_u the *Dijkstra tree* of u . Let p_{uv} be a shortest path from the root u to v in the tree T_u . Then every subpath of p_{uv} is also a shortest path in G . We denote such set of subpaths (including p_{uv}) as $S(p_{uv})$. Since G is undirected, the same applies for paths in reverse order, i.e., every subpath of p_{vu} in T_u is also a shortest path. Let $S(p_{vu})$ be such set of shortest paths.

Note that there are exactly n Dijkstra trees for G since Dijkstra's algorithm is deterministic and we have a fixed ordering for V . The set of n Dijkstra trees of G is denoted by \mathcal{T} . Let $S(T_u) = \bigcup_{v \in V \setminus \{u\}} (S(p_{uv}) \cup S(p_{vu}))$. The canonical set of shortest paths of G (w.r.t. the ordering) is $S(G) = \bigcup_{u \in V} S(T_u)$. For the sake of convenience in Definition 1 we present the length of a shortest path (distance) between a pair $(u, v) \in V^2$ in terms of Dijkstra trees.

Definition 1 (Distance). *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, a function $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, a pair $(u, v) \in V^2$ and a Dijkstra tree T_x , the distance from u to v is defined as*

$$d(p_{uv}) = \sum_{e \in E_{T_x}} w(e)$$

where $p_{uv} \in S(T_x)$ and E_{T_x} is the set of edges of p_{uv} in T_x .

We define below the *shortest path centrality* as the proportion of Dijkstra trees that contains some shortest path from u to v among all n Dijkstra trees.

Definition 2 (Shortest Path Centrality). *Given an undirected weighted graph $G = (V, E)$ with $n = |V|$, a pair $(u, v) \in V^2$ and the Dijkstra tree T_x for each $x \in V$, let $p_{uv} = (u, \dots, v)$ be a shortest path from u to v such that $p_{uv} \in S(G)$. The shortest path centrality of a pair $(u, v) \in V^2$ is defined as*

$$c(u, v) = \frac{t_{uv}}{n}$$

where $t_{uv} = \sum_{T_x \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{1}_{\tau_{uv}}(T_x)$ and $\tau_{uv} = \{T_x \in \mathcal{T} : p_{uv} \in S(T_x)\}$.

The function $\mathbb{1}_{\tau_{uv}}(T_x)$ returns 1 if there is some shortest path from u to v in T_x (and 0 otherwise).

Intuitively speaking, a pair (u, v) has high shortest path centrality if the canonical shortest path $p_{uv} \in S(T_u)$ (and $S(T_v)$) is a subpath of a large number of canonical shortest paths in $S(G)$.

2.2 Sample Complexity and VC-dimension

In sampling algorithms, typically the aim is the estimation of a certain quantity according to given parameters of quality and confidence using a random sample of size as small as possible. A central concept in sample complexity theory is the Vapnik-Chervonenkis Theory (VC-Dimension), in particular, the idea of finding an upper bound for the VC-dimension of a class of binary functions related to the sampling problem at hand. In our context, for instance, we may consider a binary function that takes a Dijkstra tree and outputs 1 if such tree contains a shortest path for a given set. Generally speaking, from the upper bound for the given class of binary functions we can derive an upper bound to the sample size for the sampling algorithm.

We present below the main definitions and results we use in this section and in Section 2.3. An in-depth exposition of them can be found in the books of Shalev-Schwartz and Ben-David (2014) [17], Mitzenmacher and Upfal (2017) [9], Anthony and Bartlett (2009) [1], and Mohri et al. (2012) [10].

Given a domain U and a set of values of interest \mathcal{H} , let \mathcal{F} be the family of functions from U to \mathbb{R}^* such that there is one $f_h \in \mathcal{F}$ for each $h \in \mathcal{H}$. Let S be a collection of r elements from U sampled with respect to a probability distribution π .

Definition 3. For each $f_h \in \mathcal{F}$, such that $h \in \mathcal{H}$, we define the expectation of f_h and its empirical average as L_U and L_S , respectively, i.e.,

$$L_U(f_h) = \mathbb{E}_{u \in U}[f_h(u)] \quad \text{and} \quad L_S(f_h) = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{s \in S} f_h(s).$$

Definition 4. Given $0 < \epsilon, \delta < 1$, a set S is called ϵ -representative w.r.t. some domain U , a set \mathcal{H} , a family of functions \mathcal{F} and a probability distribution π if

$$\forall f_h \in \mathcal{F}, |L_S(f_h) - L_U(f_h)| \leq \epsilon.$$

The expectation of the empirical average $L_S(f_h)$ corresponds to $L_U(f_h)$, by linearity of expectation, therefore $|L_S(f_h) - L_U(f_h)| = |L_S(f_h) - \mathbb{E}_{f_h \in \mathcal{F}}[L_S(f_h)]|$. By the *law of large numbers*, $L_S(f_h)$ converges to its true expectation as r goes to infinity, once $L_S(f_h)$ is the empirical average of r random variables sampled independently and identically w.r.t. π . Since this law provides no information about the value $|L_S(f_h) - L_U(f_h)|$ for any sample size, we use results from Rademacher averages and VC-dimension, which provide bounds on the size of the sample that guarantees that the maximum deviation of $|L_S(f_h) - L_U(f_h)|$ is within ϵ with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for given $0 < \epsilon, \delta < 1$.

Definition 5 (Range Space). A range space is a pair $\mathcal{R} = (U, \mathcal{I})$, where U is a domain (finite or infinite) and \mathcal{I} is a collection of subsets of U , called ranges.

For a given $S \subseteq U$, the *projection* of \mathcal{I} on S is the set $\mathcal{I}_S = \{S \cap I : I \in \mathcal{I}\}$. If $|\mathcal{I}_S| = 2^{|S|}$ then we say S is *shattered* by \mathcal{I} . The VC-dimension of a range space is the size of the largest subset S that can be shattered by \mathcal{I} , i.e.,

Definition 6 (VC-dimension). *The VC-dimension of a range space $\mathcal{R} = (U, \mathcal{I})$, denoted by $VCDim(\mathcal{R})$, is $VCDim(\mathcal{R}) = \max\{k : \exists S \subseteq U \text{ such that } |S| = k \text{ and } |\mathcal{I}_S| = 2^k\}$.*

An upper bound to the VC-dimension of a range space allows to build an ϵ -representative sample, as stated in Theorem 1.

Theorem 1 (see [6], Section 1). *Let $\mathcal{R} = (U, \mathcal{I})$ be a range space with $VCDim(\mathcal{R}) \leq k$ and a probability distribution π on the domain U . Given $0 < \epsilon, \delta < 1$, let $S \subseteq U$ be a collection of elements sampled according to the distribution π , with*

$$|S| = \frac{c}{\epsilon^2} \left(k + \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \right)$$

where c is a universal positive constant. Then S is ϵ -representative with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

In the work of Lffler and Phillips (2009) [8], it has been proven that the constant c is approximately $\frac{1}{2}$.

2.3 Progressive Sampling and Rademacher Averages

In some problems, finding the correct sample size or even a tight one is not obvious. In our algorithm, presented in Section 3, we sample Dijkstra trees in G , and the bound given by Theorem 5 limits the sample size in terms of the VC-dimension of a range space associated to G . Additionally, we improve the algorithm making use of progressive sampling, in which the process starts with a small sample size which progressively increases until the accuracy improves [13]. The combination of an appropriate scheduling for the sample increase with an efficient-to-evaluate stopping condition (i.e., knowing when the sample is large enough) leads to a greater improvement in time for estimation of the value of interest [15]. In this section we present the theoretical framework used in the progressive sampling algorithm.

A key idea is that the stopping condition takes into consideration the input distribution, which can be extracted by the use of Rademacher Averages ([9], chapter 14). This theory lies in the core of statistical learning theory, although their applications extend the context of learning algorithms [16]. One of the main advantages of using Rademacher averages, besides deriving the bounds from a sample of the domain, is that it applies to any real-valued function and not only to 0–1 classification functions [15].

Consider the computation of the maximum deviation of $L_S(f_h)$ from the true expectation of f_h , for all $f_h \in \mathcal{F}$, that is, $\sup_{f_h \in \mathcal{F}} |L_S(f_h) - L_U(f_h)|$. The *empirical Rademacher average* of \mathcal{F} is defined as follows.

Definition 7. *Consider a sample $S = \{z_1, \dots, z_r\}$ and a distribution of r Rademacher random variables $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$, i.e., $\Pr(\sigma_i = 1) = \Pr(\sigma_i = -1) = 1/2$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. The empirical Rademacher average of a family of functions \mathcal{F} w.r.t. to S is defined as*

$$\tilde{R}_r(\mathcal{F}, S) = \mathbb{E}_\sigma \left[\sup_{f_h \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i f_h(z_i) \right].$$

In this work, we use the bound previously introduced by Riondato and Upfal [15] for the connection of the empirical Rademacher average with the value of $\sup_{f_h \in \mathcal{F}} |L_S(f_h) - L_U(f_h)|$, which extended the bound of Oneto et al. [11] to the supremum of its absolute value to functions with codomain in $[0, 1]$.

Theorem 2. *With probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\sup_{f_h \in \mathcal{F}} |L_S(f_h) - L_U(f_h)| \leq 2\tilde{R}_r(\mathcal{F}, S) + \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta} + \sqrt{(\ln \frac{3}{\delta} + 4r\tilde{R}_r(\mathcal{F}, S)) \ln \frac{3}{\delta}}}{r} + \sqrt{\frac{3}{2r\delta}}.$$

The exact computation of $\tilde{R}_r(\mathcal{F}, S)$ depends on an extreme value, i.e., the supremum of deviations for all functions in \mathcal{F} , which can be expensive over a large (or infinite) set of functions [9]. Even a Monte Carlo simulation to estimating $\tilde{R}_r(\mathcal{F}, S)$ is expensive to be extracted in this case; hence, we use the bound given by Theorem 3, which is a variant of Massart's Lemma (see Theorem 14.22, [9]) that is convex, continuous in \mathbb{R}^+ and can be efficiently minimized by standard convex optimization methods.

Consider the vector $v_{f_h} = (f_h(z_1), \dots, f_h(z_m))$ for a given sample $S = \{z_1, \dots, z_m\}$, and let $\mathcal{V}_S = \{v_{f_h}, f_h \in \mathcal{F}\}$.

Theorem 3. *(Riondato and Upfal [15]) Let $w : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be the function*

$$w(s) = \frac{1}{s} \ln \sum_{v_{f_h} \in \mathcal{V}} \exp \frac{s^2 \|v_{f_h}\|^2}{2m^2}.$$

Then $\tilde{R}_r(\mathcal{F}, S) \leq \min_{s \in \mathbb{R}^+} w(s)$.

3 Estimation for the Shortest Path Centrality and the All-pairs Shortest Path Problem

We first define the problem in terms of a range space, and then we give an outline of an algorithm that takes as input an undirected weighted graph $G = (V, E)$ with n vertices and m edges with nonnegative weights, a sample schedule $(|S_i|)_{i \geq 1}$ and the quality and confidence parameters $0 < \epsilon, \delta < 1$, assumed to be constants. In fact, the sample schedule can be efficiently computed from G , ϵ and δ , but we give it as input to the algorithm for the sake of convenience. The output of the algorithm is a matrix \tilde{c} for the centrality estimation and a matrix d with the distances between every pair of vertices.

Let $n = |V|$ and \mathcal{T} be the set of n Dijkstra trees of G . The set \mathcal{H} from Section 2.2 is defined to be V^2 and the universe U is the set \mathcal{T} . For each pair $(u, v) \in V^2$,

let p_{uv} be a shortest path from u to v . Let $\tau_{uv} = \{T_x \in \mathcal{T} : p_{uv} \in S(T_x)\}$. Let $\mathcal{I} = \{\tau_{uv} : (u, v) \in V^2\}$. Note that $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I})$ is a range space. For $T_x \in \mathcal{T}$, let $f_{uv} : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be the function

$$f_{uv}(T_x) = \mathbb{1}_{\tau_{uv}}(T_x).$$

The indicator function $\mathbb{1}_{\tau_{uv}}(T_x)$ returns 1 if there is some shortest path from u to v in T_x (and 0 otherwise). We define $\mathcal{F} = \{f_{uv} : (u, v) \in V^2\}$.

Each $T_x \in \mathcal{T}$ is sampled according to the function $\pi(T_x) = \frac{1}{n}$ (which is a valid probability distribution), and $\mathbb{E}[f_{uv}(T_x)] = c(u, v)$ for all $(u, v) \in V^2$, as proved in Theorem 4.

Theorem 4. *For $f_{uv} \in \mathcal{F}$ and for $T_x \in \mathcal{T}$, such that each T_x is sampled according to the probability function $\pi(T_x)$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[f_{uv}(T_x)] = c(u, v).$$

Proof. Given an undirected weighted graph $G = (V, E)$, for all $(u, v) \in V^2$, we have from Definition 3

$$\begin{aligned} L_U(f_{uv}) &= L_{\mathcal{T}}(f_{uv}) = \mathbb{E}_{T_x \in \mathcal{T}}[f_{uv}(T_x)] = \sum_{T_x \in \mathcal{T}} \pi(T_x) f_{uv}(T_x) \\ &= \sum_{T_x \in \mathcal{T}} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{1}_{\tau_{uv}}(T_x) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{T_x \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{1}_{\tau_{uv}}(T_x) = \frac{t_{uv}}{n} = c(u, v) \end{aligned}$$

□

Let $S = \{T_i, 1 \leq i \leq r\}$ be a set of r Dijkstra trees sampled independently and identically from \mathcal{T} . Next, we define $\tilde{c}(u, v)$, the estimation to be computed by the algorithm, as the empirical average from Definition 3:

$$\tilde{c}(u, v) = L_S(f_{uv}) = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{T_i \in S} f_{uv}(T_i) = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{T_i \in S} \mathbb{1}_{\tau_{uv}}(T_i).$$

For each $(u, v) \in V^2$, the value $\tilde{c}(u, v)$ can be defined as $\|\mathbf{v}_{uv}\|_1/r$, where

$$\mathbf{v}_{uv} = (f_{uv}(T_1), \dots, f_{uv}(T_r)).$$

Each function f_{uv} , however, is a binary function such that $\|\mathbf{v}_{uv}\| = t_{uv}$. Hence, we denote \mathcal{V} as the set of such values, i.e., $\mathcal{V} = \{t_{uv}, (u, v) \in V^2\}$. Note that $|\mathcal{V}| \leq (|V^2| - n)/2$, once G is undirected – and then for a pair (u, v) , $t_{uv} = t_{vu}$ – and there may be different pairs of vertices (u_k, v_k) and (u_l, v_l) with $t_{u_k v_k} = t_{u_l v_l}$.

The VC-dimension of the range space $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I})$, which is an upper bound to the fixed sample size that guarantees that $|\tilde{c}(u, v) - c(u, v)| \geq \epsilon$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for each $(u, v) \in V^2$ and for $0 < \epsilon, \delta < 1$, is stated below.

Theorem 5. *The VC-dimension of the range space $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I})$ is*

$$VCDim(\mathcal{R}) \leq 2\lceil \lg n \rceil + 1.$$

Proof. Let $VCDim(\mathcal{R}) = k$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, there is $S \subseteq U$ such that $|S| = k$ and S is shattered by \mathcal{I} . By the definition of shattering, each $T_i \in S$ must appear in 2^{k-1} different ranges in \mathcal{I} . On the other hand, if T_i is a path graph (i.e., a tree with two vertices of degree one and $n - 2$ vertices of degree two), then $|S(T_i)| = n^2$. Hence, $2^{k-1} \leq n^2$, and $k - 1 \leq 2 \lg n$. Since k must be integer, $k \leq 2\lceil \lg n \rceil + 1 \leq 2 \lg n + 1$. Finally, $VCDim(\mathcal{F}) = k \leq 2\lceil \lg n \rceil + 1$. \square

Note that for a sample of size r , by Hoeffding bound we have

$$\Pr(|\tilde{c}(u, v) - c(u, v)| \geq \epsilon) \leq 2\exp(-2r\epsilon^2).$$

Applying union bound for all $(u, v) \in V^2$, the value of r must be $2\exp(-2r^2)n^2 \geq \delta$, which leads to $r \geq \frac{1}{2\epsilon^2}(\ln 2 + 2 \ln n + \ln(1/\delta))$, so the bound from Theorem 5 is not much better than the bound obtained using standard Hoeffding together with union bound.

A more careful proof of Theorem 5 could give a slightly better result. More specifically, at the point we argue that $|S(T_i)| = n^2$, we could use that $|S(T_i)| = n \cdot \text{Diam}(G)$, where $\text{Diam}(G)$ is the diameter of G , since in the worst case a Dijkstra tree T_i cannot be deeper than the diameter of G . Since in many real world graphs $\text{Diam}(G) = \log n$, we have that in such case the bound of Theorem 5 could be improved to $VCDim(\mathcal{R}) \leq \lceil \lg(n \log n) \rceil + 1$. However, this improvement may not be very impressive. For this reason, we define a progressive sampling schedule defined as follows.

Let S_1 be the initial sample size and $\delta_1 = \delta/2$. At this point, the only information available about the empirical Rademacher complexity of S_1 is that $\tilde{R}_r(\mathcal{F}, S_1) \geq 0$. Plugging this with the r.h.s. of the bound in Theorem 2, which has to be at most ϵ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\ln(3/(\delta/2)) + \sqrt{\ln(3/(\delta/2)) \ln(3/(\delta/2))}}{|S_1|} + \sqrt{\frac{\ln(3/(\delta/2))}{2|S_1|}} &\leq \epsilon \\ \frac{2 \ln(6/\delta)}{|S_1|} + \sqrt{\frac{\ln(6/\delta)}{2|S_1|}} &\leq \epsilon \\ \frac{4 \ln^2(6/\delta)}{|S_1|^2} + \frac{\ln(6/\delta)}{2|S_1|} &\leq \epsilon^2 \end{aligned}$$

which leads to the quadratic inequality

$$2|S_1|^2 \epsilon^2 - |S_1| \ln(6/\delta) - 8 \ln^2(6/\delta) \geq 0.$$

Applying Bhaskara theorem, then

$$|S_1| \geq \frac{\ln(6/\delta)(1 + \sqrt{1 + 8^2 \epsilon^2})}{4\epsilon^2}.$$

According to the results of Provost et al. [13] and as previously observed by Riondato and Upfal [15], there is evidence that a geometric sampling schedule may be optimal, i.e., the one that $S_i = c^i S_1$, for each $i \geq 1$ and for a constant $c > 1$.

We present next the outline of the algorithm for estimating shortest path centrality. Afterwards, we show how to use this algorithm for computing a shortest path between every vertex with centrality at least ϵ . Consider the matrix for the shortest path centrality estimation, denoted by \tilde{c} , the matrix for the estimation of canonical shortest paths tree \tilde{t} , and the set \mathcal{V}_S that contains the values in \tilde{t} without repetition. At the beginning all entries of \tilde{c} and \tilde{t} are set to zero. The following steps are repeated for each $i \geq 1$. For the sake of clarity, $S_0 = \emptyset$.

- step 1.** Create a sample of $|S_i| - |S_{i-1}|$ elements of V chosen uniformly and independently (with replacement) at random;
- step 2.** For each $x \in \{S_i - S_{i-1}\}$, compute a canonical shortest path tree T_x and an array of distances $dist$ of size $n - 1$ from x to each $y \in V$, $x \neq y$. For every shortest p_{uv} in $S(T_x)$, increase the canonical shortest path tree value $\tilde{t}(u, v)$ by 1;
- step 3.** Compute the bound to $\tilde{R}_r(\mathcal{F}, S_i)$ by minimizing the function defined in Theorem 2. If it satisfies the stopping condition, then return the set $\{\tilde{c}(u, v) = \tilde{t}_{uv}/|S_i|, (u, v) \in V^2\}$. Otherwise, increase the size of S_i until it has size $|S_{i+1}|$, increase i and return to step 1.

Step 1 is trivial and step 2 can be performed by running Dijkstra's Algorithm in time $\mathcal{O}(m + n \log n)$ in the input graph G . Step 3 can be performed by a modification of a DFS algorithm running on T_x with starting vertex x . This modification of a DFS can be implemented in the following way. When recursively traversing T_x , keep a list L of the predecessors of each visited vertex v . So when a vertex v in T_x is visited by the DFS, we have that every vertex u in the list L is a starting vertex of a shortest path from u to v in $S(T_x)$. Since T_x is undirected, we can update both $\tilde{t}(u, v)$ and $\tilde{t}(v, u)$. Note that since $S(T_x)$ might have $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ shortest paths, this algorithm perform $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ updates in the matrix \tilde{t} .

A key observation is that at the moment that the modified DFS updates $\tilde{t}(u, v)$, the algorithm has the shortest path p_{uv} at hand. So we can both compute a matrix d of shortest distances as well as, at the end of the execution, recover a shortest path for every pair of vertices (u, v) whenever the entry $\tilde{t}(u, v)$ has been updated.

Next we give the main algorithm and the DFS modification in more details (Algorithms 1 and 2, respectively). For the storage of each value in \mathcal{V}_S in a sparse way and without repetition, Algorithm 1 keeps an array *count* of size n , such that each value in *count*[p] contains the amount of pairs of vertices having p canonical shortest path trees, for $1 \leq p \leq n$. For the sake of clarity, we present in Algorithm 2 the computation, at the same time, of both matrices \tilde{c} and d , where $\tilde{c} = \tilde{t}/|S_r|$, where r is the last iteration of the sampling schedule. Depending on the application one might want to adapt the algorithm for computing only one of the two matrices if necessary.

Algorithm 1: UPDATESHORTESTPATHS($L, dist, i, T_x, d, \tilde{t}, \mathcal{V}_S, count$)

Data: List L , array of distances $dist$ generated by Dijkstra algorithm, vertex i , Dijkstra tree T_x , exact distances matrix d , number of canonical shortest path trees matrix \tilde{t} , set \mathcal{V}_S , counter array $count$.

Result: Updates the distances d and the values in t using paths from $S(T_x)$.

```

1 for  $j \in L$  do
2    $d[j][i] \leftarrow d[i][j] \leftarrow dist[i] - dist[j]$ 
3    $\tilde{t}[j][i] \leftarrow \tilde{t}[i][j] \leftarrow \tilde{t}[i][j] + 1$ 
4    $count[\tilde{t}[j][i]] \leftarrow count[\tilde{t}[j][i]] + 1$ 
5   if  $\tilde{t}[j][i]$  or  $\tilde{t}[i][j] \notin \mathcal{V}_S$  then
6      $\mathcal{V}_S.add(\tilde{t}[j][i])$ 
7   else if  $count[\tilde{t}[j][i] - 1] \geq 1$  then
8      $count[\tilde{t}[j][i] - 1] \leftarrow count[\tilde{t}[j][i] - 1] - 1$ 
9     if  $count[\tilde{t}[j][i] - 1] = 0$  then
10       $\mathcal{V}_S.remove(\tilde{t}[j][i])$ 
11 L.add( $i$ )
12 for  $k \in i.outNeighbors()$  do
13   UPDATESHORTESTPATHS( $L, dist, k, T_x, d, \tilde{t}, \mathcal{V}_S, count$ )
14 L.remove( $i$ )

```

Lemma 1. *At the beginning of every call to Algorithm 1, the list L contains the predecessors of i in the path from x to i in the tree T_x .*

Proof. We use induction on the size of L . Let P_{xi} be the set of predecessors of i in the path from x to i in the tree T_x . If $L = \{\}$ (i.e., UPDATESHORTESTPATHS is called by Algorithm 1 and has not yet recursively called itself), then $i = x$. As $P_{xx} = \{\}$, then $L = P_{xx}$, and the base case follows.

In the inductive step, we show that the result follows for the recursive calls of UPDATESHORTESTPATHS (line 13). Let L' and k be, respectively, the list and the vertex used as arguments on the recursive calls. As k is a successor of i , then $P_{xk} = P_{xi} \cup \{i\}$. But, from line 11, $L' = L \cup \{i\}$. By the induction hypothesis $L = P_{xi}$ and therefore $L' = P_{xi} \cup \{i\} = P_{xk}$. \square

Theorem 6. *The value $d[i][j]$ (or $d[j][i]$) set by Algorithm 1 is equal to the distance between vertices i and j .*

Proof. Let d_{st} be the distance between vertices s and t . The algorithm sets $d[i][j] = d_{xi} - d_{xj}$. Thus, it suffices to prove that $d_{xi} - d_{xj} = d_{ij}$. Suppose by contradiction that $d_{xi} - d_{xj} \neq d_{ij}$, and split this supposition in two cases: (i) $d_{xi} - d_{xj} > d_{ij}$ and (ii) $d_{xi} - d_{xj} < d_{ij}$. In case (i), the path from x to i can be traversed in two parts, from x to j and from j to i . Hence, the total distance from x to i is $d_{xj} + d_{ij} < d_{xj} + d_{xi} - d_{xj} = d_{xi}$, contradicting the fact that d_{xi} is minimum. In case (ii), by Algorithm 1 we have that $j \in L$, and therefore (Lemma 1) j is a predecessor of i . So, the shortest path between x and i necessarily passes through j . Let p_{xi} be the shortest path between x and i . Thus, i can reach j through the path p_{xi} and in this case the distance is $d_{xi} - d_{xj}$.

But, by the hypothesis of case (ii), $d_{xi} - d_{xj} < d_{ij}$, contradicting the fact that d_{ij} is minimum. \square

Corollary 1. *All shortest paths in $S(T_x)$ can be computed by Algorithm 1.*

Proof. Consider a vertex z , such that the vertex i is a successor of z in T_x . At the beginning of a call to Algorithm 1 for the vertex i , we have from Lemma 1 that the list L contains the predecessors of i in the shortest path $p_{xi} \in S(T_x)$. So, the vertex z , which is the most recently added vertex to L before the calling to UPDATESHORTESTPATHS (Algorithm 1) in line 13 for i is the immediate predecessor of i in p_{xi} . Hence, z can be stored alongside with $d[j][i]$ in line 2, for each $j \in L$. \square

Algorithm 2: PROBABILISTICALLPAIRSHORTESTPATHS(G, ϵ, δ)

Data: Weighted graph $G = (V, E)$ with $n = |V|$ and $m = |E|$, accuracy parameter $0 < \epsilon < 1$, confidence parameter $0 < \delta < 1$, sample scheduling $(S_i)_{i \geq 1}$

Result: Probabilistic Shortest Path Distance $d[u][v]$, for each $(u, v) \in V^2$.

- 1 **for** $(u, v) \in V^2$ **do**
- 2 $\tilde{c}[u][v] \leftarrow \tilde{t}[u][v] \leftarrow 0$
- 3 **if** $u = v$ **then**
- 4 $d[u][v] \leftarrow 0$
- 5 **else**
- 6 $d[u][v] \leftarrow \infty$
- 7 $count[i] \leftarrow 0, \forall i \in 1, \dots, n$
- 8 $S_0 \leftarrow 0$
- 9 $\mathcal{V}_S \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 10 $i \leftarrow 0, j \leftarrow 1$
- 11 **do**
- 12 $i \leftarrow i + 1$
- 13 **for** $l \leftarrow 1$ **to** $|S_i| - |S_{i-1}|$ **do**
- 14 sample $x \in V$ with probability $1/n$
- 15 $T_x, dist \leftarrow \text{SINGLESOURCESHORTESTPATHS}(x)$
- 16 $L \leftarrow$ empty list
- 17 UPDATESHORTESTPATH($L, dist, x, T_x, d, \tilde{t}, \mathcal{V}_S, count$)
- 18 $w_s \leftarrow \min_{s \in \mathbb{R}^+} \frac{1}{s} \ln \sum_{v' \in \mathcal{V}_S} \exp \frac{s^2 v'}{2|S_i|^2}$
- 19 $\delta_i \leftarrow \delta / 2^i$
- 20 $\eta \leftarrow 2w_s + \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta_i} + \sqrt{(\ln \frac{3}{\delta_i} + 4|S_i|w_s) \ln \frac{3}{\delta_i}}}{|S_i|} + \sqrt{\frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta_i}}{2|S_i|}}$
- 21 **while** $\eta > \epsilon$
- 22 $\tilde{c}[u][v] \leftarrow \tilde{t}[u][v] / |S_i|, \forall (u, v) \in V^2$
- 23 **return** $d[u][v], \forall (u, v) \in V^2$

Theorem 7. Consider a sample $S_r = \{T_1, \dots, T_r\}$ of size r and let η_r be the value $\eta_r = 2w_s + \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta_r} + \sqrt{(\ln \frac{3}{\delta_r} + 4)|S_r|w_s} \ln \frac{3}{\delta_r}}{|S_r|} + \sqrt{\frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta_r}}{2|S_r|}}$, where $\delta_r = \delta/2^r$. The value r is the minimal $i \geq 1$ such that $\eta_i \leq \epsilon$ for the input graph $G = (V, E)$ and for fixed constants $0 < \epsilon, \delta < 1$. For each $(u, v) \in V^2$, Algorithm 2 returns with probability at least $1 - \delta$ the exact distance $d[u][v]$ and corresponding shortest path between the vertices u and v whenever p_{uv} has centrality at least ϵ . Additionally, the value of $\tilde{c}(u, v)$ is within ϵ error to the value of $c(u, v)$ with probability $1 - \delta$.

Proof. Let $i \geq 1$ be an iteration of the loop in 11–21 and let E_i be the event where $\sup_{(u,v) \in V^2} |\tilde{c}(u, v) - c(u, v)| \geq \eta_i$ in this iteration. We need event E_i happen with probability at most δ for some iteration i . That is, we need

$$\Pr(\exists i \geq 1 \text{ s.t. } E_i \text{ happens}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Pr(E_i) \leq \delta$$

where the first inequality comes from union bound. Setting $\Pr(E_i) = \delta/2^i$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Pr(E_i) = \delta \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} = \delta.$$

Let $S_r = \{T_1, \dots, T_r\}$ be the final sample obtained after the iteration r in the loop 11–21 where the stopping condition is satisfied, i.e., $\eta_r \leq \epsilon$. For each iteration i in 11–21, where $1 \leq i \leq r$, consider that for each $x \in V$, there is one Dijkstra tree $T_x \in \mathcal{T}$, and hence, $|\mathcal{T}| = n$. A vertex $x \in V$ is sampled with probability $1/n$; therefore, T_x is sampled with probability $1/n$ (line 14). The tree T_x is traversed by Algorithm 1, and the distances of every shortest path $p_{xy} \in S(T_x)$ are correctly and exactly computed, as shown in Lemma 1, Theorem 6 and Corollary 1.

Let $p_{uv} \in S(G)$ be a shortest path from u to v and let $S' \subseteq S_r$ be the set of trees such that $p_{uv} \in S(T'_x)$, where $T'_x \in S'$. If the tree sampled in line 14 of Algorithm 2 is in S' , then the value $\tilde{t}(u, v)$ has its value increased by 1 in line 3 of Algorithm 1, so at the end of r -th iteration in loop 11–21, $\tilde{c}(u, v) = \frac{\tilde{t}(u, v)}{|S_r|} = \frac{1}{|S_r|} \sum_{T'_x \in S'} 1 = \frac{1}{|S_r|} \sum_{T_i \in S} \mathbb{1}_{\tau_{uv}}(T_i) = \frac{1}{|S_r|} \sum_{T_i \in S} f_{uv}(T_i)$.

Since $\eta_r \leq \epsilon$, $L_S(f_{uv}) = \tilde{c}(u, v)$ and $L_U(f_{uv}) = c(u, v)$ (Theorem 4) for all $(u, v) \in V^2$ and $f_{uv} \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\Pr(|\tilde{c}(u, v) - c(u, v)| \leq \epsilon) \geq 1 - \delta$ (Theorem 2).

Now observe that every time that $\tilde{c}(u, v)$ is updated in Algorithm 1, $d(u, v)$ has the exact distance and the shortest path from u to v correctly computed. Also observe that for a shortest path p_{uv} , if its centrality value is $c(u, v) > \epsilon$, then Algorithm 1 outputs $\tilde{c}(u, v) > 0$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$ (otherwise the estimative $\tilde{c}(u, v) = 0$ is not within ϵ of $c(u, v)$). Therefore the probability that $d[u][v]$ (as well as $d[v][u]$) is exactly computed is $\geq 1 - \delta$. \square

The convex optimization in line 18 of Algorithm 2 is very efficient in practice [15], however its theoretical complexity analysis needs further investigation.

Therefore, for the sake of simplicity, we will give a time complexity analysis for a variant of Algorithm 2 using a fixed size sample.

Theorem 8. *Given an undirected weighted graph $G = (V, E)$ with $n = |V|$ and a sample of size $r = \lceil \frac{\epsilon}{c^2} 2 \lceil \lg n \rceil + 1 - \ln \delta \rceil$, the exact distance between the vertices u and v , for all $(u, v) \in V^2$, can be exactly computed, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, in running time $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log n)$.*

Proof. Consider a modification of Algorithm 2 that uses a fixed size sample S , with $|S| = r$, such that $r = \lceil \frac{\epsilon}{c^2} 2 \lceil \lg n \rceil + 1 - \ln \delta \rceil$. From Theorem 1, we have that a sample of size r guarantees that $|\tilde{c}(u, v) - c(u, v)| \leq \epsilon$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $(u, v) \in V^2$, and therefore $d[u][v]$ (and so $d[v][u]$) is exactly computed with probability at least $1 - \delta$ (Theorem 7). In this modification, lines 18, 19 and 20 are not computed anymore, since they are needed only for the progressive sampling approach.

Consider now that the algorithm only execute the inner loop in lines 13–17. We sample the vertex $x \in V$ in line 14 using the linear time algorithm of Vose (1991) [18]. Line 17 takes time $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ because Algorithm 1 makes $\mathcal{O}(n)$ recursive calls – one for each vertex – and the loop execution in line 1 takes time $\mathcal{O}(n)$ (the total number of neighbors inspections takes time $\mathcal{O}(m)$, which is absorbed by $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$). The loop in lines 13–17 runs r times and the Dijkstra algorithm which is executed in line 15 has running time $\mathcal{O}(m + n \log n)$, so the total running time is $\mathcal{O}(r \max(m + n \log n, n^2)) = \mathcal{O}(r(n^2)) = \mathcal{O}(\log n(n^2)) = \mathcal{O}(n^2 \log n)$. \square

4 Experimental Evaluation

The results in this paper are theoretically driven, in particular, a main theme in our work is clarifying what is a necessary number of samples of shortest path trees that are necessary to, with high probability, find a shortest path between every vertex with high shortest path centrality. However, given the practical interest of shortest path problems and since a main concern of recent work in sampling based algorithms is providing algorithms that are simple and perform well in practice, we perform preliminary experimental evaluation of our approach. At this point we implement the version of the algorithm with a fixed sample size given by Theorem 5. Two main metrics were considered: runtime and the number of shortest paths found by our algorithm. For the runtime, we compare our algorithm with the classic Floyd-Warshall algorithm for all pairs shortest paths. For the number of distances set, we evaluate the ϵ parameter change and its consequences on the fraction of shortest paths found by the algorithm.

We use Python 3.8 language in our implementations. For graph manipulations, we use the NetworkX library [5]. The Floyd-Warshall algorithm implementation present in NetworkX was used. The experiments were performed on a 2.8 Mhz Intel i7-4900MQ quad core with 12GB of RAM and Windows 10 64-bit operating system.


We evaluated two types of graphs: power law graphs and random Erds-Renyi graphs. Power law graphs were generated by the Barabasi-Albert model [2], with

each vertex creating two edges. Erds-Renyi graphs were generated by the $G_{n,p}$ model, with the probability of edges occurring $p = 0.01$. In either case, the generators of these graphs are in NetworkX library. In all graphs, we set the edge weights as a random number uniformly chosen in the interval $[0, 1]$.

In all experiments, the δ and c parameters remained fixed. We set $\delta = 0.1$ because modifying this value has little impact on the number r of samples as it is subject to the logarithm function. In addition, we set $c = 0.5$ as suggested by Lffler and Phillips (2009) [8]. For each distinct parameter setting, the results presented are for the average of five runs.


4.1 Runtime

In the case of runtime, we set the parameter ϵ to 0.05 which is enough for giving a small fraction of shortest paths missed by sampling algorithm (more details on the impact of ϵ is presented below). The experiments were performed with the number of vertices n in $\{100, 250, 500, 750, 1000, 1500, 2000\}$. The results for both power law and Erds-Renyi graphs are similar. Initially, for small values of n , the Floyd-Warshall algorithm has a slightly faster runtime. As n increases, however, execution times diverges, and our sampling algorithm runs faster.



4.2 Number of Shortest Paths Computed

The ϵ parameter directly influences the number of samples r of the sampling algorithm, which in turn influences the fraction of shortest paths found by the algorithm and the execution time. Our experiments tested $\epsilon \in \{0.04, 0.06, 0.08, 0.1\}$ on both power law and Erds-Renyi graphs. In these experiments, the size of the graph was fixed with $n = 1000$ vertices.



5 Concluding Remarks

In this paper we presented a $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log n)$ algorithm that for every pair of vertices (u, v) output an estimation for a measure $c(u, v)$, called the centrality of a shortest path between u and v . The output is within ϵ of the exact value with probability $1 - \delta$, for fixed constants $0 < \epsilon, \delta < 1$. We show that this algorithm can be adapted to compute a shortest path between every pair of vertices u to v with probability at least $1 - \delta$ whenever the shortest path centrality of (u, v) is at least ϵ . We performed a preliminary experimental evaluation of our algorithm on random power-law and Erds-Renyi graphs, considering a fixed size sample, that returned a small fraction of distances not computed, validating our theoretical results.

References

1. Anthony, M., Bartlett, P.L.: Neural Network Learning: Theoretical Foundations. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 1st edn. (2009)
2. Barabasi, A.L., Albert, R.: Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science* **286**(5439), 509–512 (1999)
3. Baswana, S., Kavitha, T.: Faster algorithms for all-pairs approximate shortest paths in undirected graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.* **39**(7), 2865–2896 (May 2010). <https://doi.org/10.1137/080737174>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/080737174>
4. Elkin, M., Gitlitz, Y., Neiman, O.: Almost shortest paths and pram distance oracles in weighted graphs. arXiv preprint: 1907.11422 (2019)
5. Hagberg, A.A., Schult, D.A., Swart, P.J.: Exploring network structure, dynamics, and function using NetworkX. In: Proceedings of the 7th Python in Science Conference (SciPy2008). pp. 11–15. Pasadena, CA USA (Aug 2008)
6. Li, Y., Long, P.M., Srinivasan, A.: Improved bounds on the sample complexity of learning. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* **62**(3), 516 – 527 (2001). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1006/jcss.2000.1741>, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022000000917410>
7. de Lima, A.M., da Silva, M.V.G., Vignatti, A.L.: Approximating the percolation centrality through sampling and pseudo-dimension. arXiv preprint: 1910.00494 (2019)

8. Löffler, M., Phillips, J.M.: Shape fitting on point sets with probability distributions. In: Algorithms - ESA 2009, 17th Annual European Symposium, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 7-9, 2009. Proceedings, pp. 313–324. Springer Berlin Heidelberg (2009)
9. Mitzenmacher, M., Upfal, E.: Probability and Computing: Randomization and Probabilistic Techniques in Algorithms and Data Analysis. Cambridge University Press, 2nd edn. (2017)
10. Mohri, M., Rostamizadeh, A., Talwalkar, A.: Foundations of Machine Learning. The MIT Press (2012)
11. Oneto, L., Ghio, A., Anguita, D., Ridella, S.: An improved analysis of the rademacher data-dependent bound using its self bounding property. *Neural Networks* **44**, 107 – 111 (2013). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2013.03.017>, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0893608013001020>
12. Pettie, S., Ramachandran, V.: Computing shortest paths with comparisons and additions. In: Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms. pp. 267–276. SODA '02, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, USA (2002), <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=545381.545417>
13. Provost, F., Jensen, D., Oates, T.: Efficient progressive sampling. In: Proceedings of the Fifth ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining. p. 2332. KDD 99, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (1999). <https://doi.org/10.1145/312129.312188>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/312129.312188>
14. Riondato, M., Kornaropoulos, E.M.: Fast approximation of betweenness centrality through sampling. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* **30**(2), 438–475 (2016)
15. Riondato, M., Upfal, E.: Abra: Approximating betweenness centrality in static and dynamic graphs with rademacher averages. *ACM Trans. Knowl. Discov. Data* **12**(5), 61:1–61:38 (Jul 2018)
16. Riondato, M., Upfal, E.: Mining frequent itemsets through progressive sampling with rademacher averages. In: Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining. p. 10051014. KDD 15, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2783258.2783265>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/2783258.2783265>
17. Shalev-Shwartz, S., Ben-David, S.: Understanding Machine Learning: From Theory to Algorithms. Cambridge University Press (2014)
18. Vose, M.D.: A linear algorithm for generating random numbers with a given distribution. *IEEE Transactions on software engineering* **17**(9), 972–975 (1991)
19. Williams, R.: Faster all-pairs shortest paths via circuit complexity. In: Proceedings of the Forty-sixth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing. pp. 664–673. STOC '14, ACM, New York, NY, USA (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2591796.2591811>, <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2591796.2591811>