This chapter presents methods for representing a graph and for searching a graph. Searching a graph means systematically following the edges of the graph so as to visit the vertices of the graph. A graph-searching algorithm can discover much about the structure of a graph. Many algorithms begin by searching their input graph to obtain this structural information. Several other graph algorithms elaborate on basic graph searching. Techniques for searching a graph lie at the heart of the field of graph algorithms.

Section 22.1 discusses the two most common computational representations of graphs: as adjacency lists and as adjacency matrices. Section 22.2 presents a simple graph-searching algorithm called breadth-first search and shows how to create a breadth-first tree. Section 22.3 presents depth-first search and proves some standard results about the order in which depth-first search visits vertices. Section 22.4 provides our first real application of depth-first search: topologically sorting a directed acyclic graph. A second application of depth-first search, finding the strongly connected components of a directed graph, is the topic of Section 22.5.

22.1 Representations of graphs

We can choose between two standard ways to represent a graph \( G = (V, E) \): as a collection of adjacency lists or as an adjacency matrix. Either way applies to both directed and undirected graphs. Because the adjacency-list representation provides a compact way to represent \textit{sparse} graphs—those for which \(|E|\) is much less than \(|V|^2\)—it is usually the method of choice. Most of the graph algorithms presented in this book assume that an input graph is represented in adjacency-list form. We may prefer an adjacency-matrix representation, however, when the graph is \textit{dense}—\(|E|\) is close to \(|V|^2\)—or when we need to be able to tell quickly if there is an edge connecting two given vertices. For example, two of the all-pairs
shortest-paths algorithms presented in Chapter 25 assume that their input graphs are represented by adjacency matrices.

The **adjacency-list representation** of a graph $G = (V, E)$ consists of an array $Adj$ of $|V|$ lists, one for each vertex in $V$. For each $u \in V$, the adjacency list $Adj[u]$ contains all the vertices $v$ such that there is an edge $(u, v) \in E$. That is, $Adj[u]$ consists of all the vertices adjacent to $u$ in $G$. (Alternatively, it may contain pointers to these vertices.) Since the adjacency lists represent the edges of a graph, in pseudocode we treat the array $Adj$ as an attribute of the graph, just as we treat the edge set $E$. In pseudocode, therefore, we will see notation such as $G.Adj[u]$. Figure 22.1(b) is an adjacency-list representation of the undirected graph in Figure 22.1(a). Similarly, Figure 22.2(b) is an adjacency-list representation of the directed graph in Figure 22.2(a).

If $G$ is a directed graph, the sum of the lengths of all the adjacency lists is $|E|$, since an edge of the form $(u, v)$ is represented by having $v$ appear in $Adj[u]$. If $G$ is
an undirected graph, the sum of the lengths of all the adjacency lists is \(2|E|\), since if \((u, v)\) is an undirected edge, then \(u\) appears in \(v\)’s adjacency list and vice versa. For both directed and undirected graphs, the adjacency-list representation has the desirable property that the amount of memory it requires is \(\Theta(V + E)\).

We can readily adapt adjacency lists to represent **weighted graphs**, that is, graphs for which each edge has an associated **weight**, typically given by a **weight function** \(w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\). For example, let \(G = (V, E)\) be a weighted graph with weight function \(w\). We simply store the weight \(w(u, v)\) of the edge \((u, v) \in E\) with vertex \(v\) in \(u\)’s adjacency list. The adjacency-list representation is quite robust in that we can modify it to support many other graph variants.

A potential disadvantage of the adjacency-list representation is that it provides no quicker way to determine whether a given edge \((u, v)\) is present in the graph than to search for \(v\) in the adjacency list \(\text{Adj}[u]\). An adjacency-matrix representation of the graph remedies this disadvantage, but at the cost of using asymptotically more memory. (See Exercise 22.1-8 for suggestions of variations on adjacency lists that permit faster edge lookup.)

For the **adjacency-matrix representation** of a graph \(G = (V, E)\), we assume that the vertices are numbered \(1, 2, \ldots, |V|\) in some arbitrary manner. Then the adjacency-matrix representation of a graph \(G\) consists of a \(|V| \times |V|\) matrix \(A = (a_{ij})\) such that

\[
a_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } (i, j) \in E \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

Figures 22.1(c) and 22.2(c) are the adjacency matrices of the undirected and directed graphs in Figures 22.1(a) and 22.2(a), respectively. The adjacency matrix of a graph requires \(\Theta(V^2)\) memory, independent of the number of edges in the graph.

Observe the symmetry along the main diagonal of the adjacency matrix in Figure 22.1(c). Since in an undirected graph, \((u, v)\) and \((v, u)\) represent the same edge, the adjacency matrix \(A\) of an undirected graph is its own transpose: \(A = A^T\). In some applications, it pays to store only the entries on and above the diagonal of the adjacency matrix, thereby cutting the memory needed to store the graph almost in half.

Like the adjacency-list representation of a graph, an adjacency matrix can represent a weighted graph. For example, if \(G = (V, E)\) is a weighted graph with edge-weight function \(w\), we can simply store the weight \(w(u, v)\) of the edge \((u, v) \in E\) as the entry in row \(u\) and column \(v\) of the adjacency matrix. If an edge does not exist, we can store a \texttt{NIL} value as its corresponding matrix entry, though for many problems it is convenient to use a value such as 0 or \(\infty\).

Although the adjacency-list representation is asymptotically at least as space-efficient as the adjacency-matrix representation, adjacency matrices are simpler, and so we may prefer them when graphs are reasonably small. Moreover, adjac-
Elementary Graph Algorithms

Cency matrices carry a further advantage for unweighted graphs: they require only one bit per entry.

**Representing attributes**

Most algorithms that operate on graphs need to maintain attributes for vertices and/or edges. We indicate these attributes using our usual notation, such as \( v.d \) for an attribute \( d \) of a vertex \( v \). When we indicate edges as pairs of vertices, we use the same style of notation. For example, if edges have an attribute \( f \), then we denote this attribute for edge \((u, v)\) by \((u, v).f\). For the purpose of presenting and understanding algorithms, our attribute notation suffices.

Implementing vertex and edge attributes in real programs can be another story entirely. There is no one best way to store and access vertex and edge attributes. For a given situation, your decision will likely depend on the programming language you are using, the algorithm you are implementing, and how the rest of your program uses the graph. If you represent a graph using adjacency lists, one design represents vertex attributes in additional arrays, such as an array \( d[1..|V|] \) that parallels the \( Adj \) array. If the vertices adjacent to \( u \) are in \( Adj[u] \), then what we call the attribute \( u.d \) would actually be stored in the array entry \( d[u] \). Many other ways of implementing attributes are possible. For example, in an object-oriented programming language, vertex attributes might be represented as instance variables within a subclass of a \texttt{Vertex} class.

**Exercises**

22.1-1

Given an adjacency-list representation of a directed graph, how long does it take to compute the out-degree of every vertex? How long does it take to compute the in-degrees?

22.1-2

Give an adjacency-list representation for a complete binary tree on 7 vertices. Give an equivalent adjacency-matrix representation. Assume that vertices are numbered from 1 to 7 as in a binary heap.

22.1-3

The **transpose** of a directed graph \( G = (V, E) \) is the graph \( G^T = (V, E^T) \), where \( E^T = \{(v, u) \in V \times V : (u, v) \in E \} \). Thus, \( G^T \) is \( G \) with all its edges reversed. Describe efficient algorithms for computing \( G^T \) from \( G \), for both the adjacency-list and adjacency-matrix representations of \( G \). Analyze the running times of your algorithms.
22.1-4
Given an adjacency-list representation of a multigraph \( G = (V, E) \), describe an \( O(V + E) \)-time algorithm to compute the adjacency-list representation of the “equivalent” undirected graph \( G' = (V, E') \), where \( E' \) consists of the edges in \( E \) with all multiple edges between two vertices replaced by a single edge and with all self-loops removed.

22.1-5
The square of a directed graph \( G = (V, E) \) is the graph \( G^2 = (V, E^2) \) such that \((u, v) \in E^2 \) if and only if \( G \) contains a path with at most two edges between \( u \) and \( v \). Describe efficient algorithms for computing \( G^2 \) from \( G \) for both the adjacency-list and adjacency-matrix representations of \( G \). Analyze the running times of your algorithms.

22.1-6
Most graph algorithms that take an adjacency-matrix representation as input require time \( \Omega(V^2) \), but there are some exceptions. Show how to determine whether a directed graph \( G \) contains a universal sink—a vertex with in-degree \(|V| - 1\) and out-degree 0—in time \( O(V) \), given an adjacency matrix for \( G \).

22.1-7
The incidence matrix of a directed graph \( G = (V, E) \) with no self-loops is a \(|V| \times |E| \) matrix \( B = (b_{ij}) \) such that
\[
 b_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
  -1 & \text{if edge } j \text{ leaves vertex } i, \\
   1 & \text{if edge } j \text{ enters vertex } i, \\
   0 & \text{otherwise}. 
\end{cases}
\]
Describe what the entries of the matrix product \( BB^T \) represent, where \( B^T \) is the transpose of \( B \).

22.1-8
Suppose that instead of a linked list, each array entry \( Adj[u] \) is a hash table containing the vertices \( v \) for which \((u, v) \in E\). If all edge lookups are equally likely, what is the expected time to determine whether an edge is in the graph? What disadvantages does this scheme have? Suggest an alternate data structure for each edge list that solves these problems. Does your alternative have disadvantages compared to the hash table?