

13.2 Relabel to Front

Algorithm 21 relabel-to-front(G, s, t)

```
1: initialize preflow
2: initialize node list  $L$  containing  $V \setminus \{s, t\}$  in any order
3: foreach  $u \in V \setminus \{s, t\}$  do
4:    $u.current-neighbour \leftarrow u.neighbour-list-head$ 
5:  $u \leftarrow L.head$ 
6: while  $u \neq null$  do
7:    $old-height \leftarrow \ell(u)$ 
8:   discharge( $u$ )
9:   if  $\ell(u) > old-height$  then // relabel happened
10:    move  $u$  to the front of  $L$ 
11:    $u \leftarrow u.next$ 
```

13.2 Relabel to Front

Lemma 1 (Invariant)

In Line 6 of the relabel-to-front algorithm the following invariant holds.

- 1. The sequence L is topologically sorted w.r.t. the set of admissible edges; this means for an admissible edge (x, y) the node x appears before y in sequence L .*
- 2. No node before u in the list L is active.*

Proof:

► Initialization:

1. In the beginning s has label $n \geq 2$, and all other nodes have label 0. Hence, no edge is admissible, which means that any ordering L is permitted.
2. We start with u being the head of the list; hence no node before u can be active

► Maintenance:

1.
 - Pushes do not create any new admissible edges. Therefore, if `discharge()` does not relabel u , L is still topologically sorted.
 - After relabeling, u cannot have admissible incoming edges as such an edge (x, u) would have had a difference $\ell(x) - \ell(u) \geq 2$ before the re-labeling (such edges do not exist in the residual graph).
Hence, moving u to the front does not violate the sorting property for any edge; however it fixes this property for all admissible edges leaving u that were generated by the relabeling.

13.2 Relabel to Front

Proof:

► Maintenance:

2. If we do a relabel there is nothing to prove because the only node before u' (u in the next iteration) will be the current u ; the discharge(u) operation only terminates when u is not active anymore.

For the case that we do not relabel, observe that the only way a predecessor could be active is that we push flow to it via an admissible arc. However, all admissible arcs point to successors of u .

Note that the invariant means that for $u = \text{null}$ we have a preflow with a valid labelling that does not have active nodes. This means we have a maximum flow.

13.2 Relabel to Front

Lemma 2

There are at most $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ calls to $\text{discharge}(u)$.

Every discharge operation without a relabel advances u (the current node within list L). Hence, if we have n discharge operations without a relabel we have $u = \text{null}$ and the algorithm terminates.

Therefore, the number of calls to discharge is at most $n(\#\text{relabels} + 1) = \mathcal{O}(n^3)$.

13.2 Relabel to Front

Lemma 3

The cost for all relabel-operations is only $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$.

A relabel-operation at a node is constant time (increasing the label and resetting *u .current-neighbour*). In total we have $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ relabel-operations.

13.2 Relabel to Front

Note that by definition a saturating push operation ($\min\{c_f(e), f(u)\} = c_f(e)$) can at the same time be a non-saturating push operation ($\min\{c_f(e), f(u)\} = f(u)$).

Lemma 4

*The cost for all saturating push-operations that are **not** also non-saturating push-operations is only $\mathcal{O}(mn)$.*

Note that such a push-operation leaves the node u active but makes the edge e disappear from the residual graph. Therefore the push-operation is immediately followed by an increase of the pointer $u.current-neighbour$.

This pointer can traverse the neighbour-list at most $\mathcal{O}(n)$ times (upper bound on number of relabels) and the neighbour-list has only $degree(u) + 1$ many entries (+1 for null-entry).

13.2 Relabel to Front

Lemma 5

The cost for all non-saturating push-operations is only $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$.

A non-saturating push-operation takes constant time and ends the current call to `discharge()`. Hence, there are only $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ such operations.

Theorem 6

The push-relabel algorithm with the rule relabel-to-front takes time $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$.