COS 423 Lecture 16 Dominators in Digraphs

© Robert E. Tarjan 2011

- *Flowgraph*: A directed graph with a start vertex *s* such that every vertex is reachable from *s*
- Vertex v dominates vertex w if $v \neq w$ and v is on every path from s to w.
- Domination is *anti-symmetric*: if *v* dominates *w*, then *w* does not dominate *v*.
- Domination is *transitive*: if *u* dominates *v* and *v* dominates *w*, then *u* dominates *w*.
- Domination is *complete*: if both *u* and *v* dominate *w*, then either *u* dominates *v* or *v* dominates *w*

Anti-symmetry, transitivity, and completeness imply that the dominators of any vertex w are totally ordered by domination. Thus there is a vertex v called the *immediate dominator* of w, denoted by *idom(w)*, that dominates w and is dominated by all other dominators of w.

The immediate dominators define a tree *D* rooted at *r* such that *idom(w)* is the parent of *w* in *D*. Vertex *v* dominates *w* iff *v* is a proper ancestor of *w* in *D*.

Flow graph



Dominator tree



Goal: given a flowgraph G = (V, E, s), find its dominator tree

Applications

Global code optimization: Movement of code to a dominating program block to reduce redundant computation

Circuit testing: Identification of pairs of equivalent line faults.

Theoretical biology: food web analysis

We assume n > 1. Since $m \ge n - 1$, n = O(m) and m > 0.

Naïve algorithm: For each vertex v ≠ s, delete v and find all vertices still reachable from s. Vertex v dominates all unreached vertices. Running time = O(nm) Delete 2: 5, 6, 7,8, 9 unreachable Delete 5: 6 unreachable



Dominator tree



Tree update algorithm (less naïve but no faster):

Let D be any spanning tree rooted at s p(x) = parent of x nca(v, w) = nearest common ancestor of v, w If for every arc (v, w), nca(v, w) is either w or p(w), stop. Otherwise, choose an arc (v, w) such that u = nca(v, w) is neither w nor p(w),

replace *p*(*w*) by *u*, and repeat.

Can represent D with just parent pointers. Each test of an arc takes O(n) time, each update takes O(1) time and reduces the depth of at least one node by at least $1 \rightarrow O(n^3m)$ time Can reduce time to $O(n^2m)$ by careful choice of arcs to test: fast in practice on small graphs Can reduce time to O(*nm*) by careful choice of arcs to test and representation of D by child sets as well as parent pointers



BFS tree



Dominator tree



Finding dominators faster?

O(m) is possible $O(m\alpha(n, \lceil m/n \rceil))$ is practical but a little complicated

Here: an O(*m*lg*n*)-time algorithm that uses DFS + finding minima on paths in the DFS tree

- We need a better way to characterize immediate dominators
- Do a DFS to form a DFS tree *T* rooted at *s*. Let p(v) be the parent of *v* in *T*, nca(v, w) the nearest common ancestor of *v*, *w*. Order the vertices in preorder.
- Let *sdom*(*v*), the *semi-dominator* of *v*, be the smallest vertex *u* such that there is a path from *u* to *v* all of whose vertices except *u* are no smaller than *v*

Let $v \neq s$. idom(v) is a proper ancestor of v in T Since p(v) is a candidate for sdom(v), $sdom(v) <_{pre} v$ Let P be a path from sdom(v) to v all of whose vertices excluding sdom(v) are no smaller than v sdom(v) is a proper ancestor of v by the preorder lemma (Lecture 14) P avoids all ancestors of v that are not ancestors of

sdom(v); thus idom(v) is an ancestor of sdom(v)

Let rdom(v), the *relative dominator* of v, be a vertex $x \neq sdom(v)$ on the path in T from sdom(v) to v such that sdom(x) is minimum (break a tie arbitrarily)

Dominators Lemma: If rdom(v) = v, then idom(v) = sdom(v). Also, idom(v) = idom(rdom(v))

Proof: Suppose *sdom*(*v*) does dominate *v*. Let *P* be a path from s to v that avoids sdom(v), let x be the last vertex on P less than sdom(v), and let y be the minimum vertex after x on P. Then x is a candidate for sdom(y), so sdom(y) $<_{pre}$ sdom(v) $<_{pre}$ y. But y is an ancestor of v by the preorder lemma, which implies that y is a candidate for rdom(v). Since $sdom(y) <_{pre}$ $sdom(v), rdom(v) \neq v$. This gives the first part of the lemma.

Proof (cont.): A path from s to rdom(v) can be extended to v by adding the tree path from rdom(v) to v. It follows that no proper descendant of *idom(rdom(v)*) dominates v. Suppose *idom(rdom(v)*) does not dominate v. Let *P* be a path from *s* to *v* that avoids *idom(rdom(v))*, let x be the last vertex on P less than *idom(rdom(v)*), and let y be the minimum vertex after x on P. Then x is a candidate for sdom(y), so $sdom(y) <_{pre}$ $idom(rdom(v)) <_{pre} y$. But y is an ancestor of v by the preorder lemma.

Proof(cont.): If y were an ancestor of rdom(v), then *idom(rdom(v)*) would not dominate rdom(v); thus y is a proper descendant of *rdom*(*v*). But then *y* is a candidate for rdom(v), which implies $sdom(rdom(v)) \leq_{pre}$ sdom(y) <_{pre} idom(rdom(v)), and again idom(rdom(v)) cannot dominate rdom(v), a contradiction. This gives the second part of the lemma.

Dominators algorithm

Compute sdom(v) for every vertex v ≠ s. Compute rdom(v) for every vertex v ≠ s. Set idom(s) = null. Visit vertices v ≠ s in an order such that p(v) is visited before v, e.g. preorder

visit(v): **if** rdom(v) = v **then** $idom(v) \leftarrow sdom(v)$ **else** $idom(v) \leftarrow idom(rdom(v))$



DFS tree and non-tree arcs

tree arcs forward arcs cross arcs back arcs



Semi-dominators



Relative dominators

9:2,9 8:2,5 7:2,5 6:5,6 5:2,5 4:2,3 3: 1, 2



2: 1, 2

Immediate dominators

9:2,9,2 8:2,5,2 7:2,5,2 6:5,6,5 5:2,5,2 4:2,3,1 3:1,2,1 2:1,2,1



Dominator tree



Correctness: From the dominators lemma; if $rdom(v) \neq v$, then rdom(v) is a proper ancestor of v, hence visited before v

How to compute semi-dominators and relative dominators?

The relative dominators are path-minima on *T*, with semi-dominators as weights

The computation of semi-dominators can also be done by finding path minima on *T* Indeed we can compute both semi-dominators

and relative dominators in one integrated path minima computation

For an arc (u, v), let z = nca(u, v)

If u = z, let r(u, v) = u.

If $u \neq z$, let r(u, v) be a vertex $x \neq z$ on the path in T from z to u such that sdom(x) is minimum (break a tie arbitrarily)

Lemma: $sdom(v) = \min_{pre} \{r(u, v) | (u, v) \in E\}$ **Proof**: Exercise

- This lemma allows us to compute semidominators in reverse preorder from path minima of known or previously computed values: If (u, v) is an arc such that u is not an ancestor of v, and $x \neq nca(u, v)$ is on the path in T from nca(u, v) to u, then $x >_{pre} v$, since x $\leq_{pre} v$ implies x is an ancestor of v.
- We visit the vertices in reverse preorder, maintaining a compressed version of the part of *D* visited so far: all (p(v), v) with *v* visited.

Computation of semi-dominators

for $v \in V$ do $a(v) \leftarrow$ null; for $v \in V - s$ in reverse preorder do $\{sdom(v) \leftarrow \min_{pre}\{sfind(u) | (u, v) \in E\};\ a(v) \leftarrow p(v); pmin(v) \leftarrow sdom(v)\}$

a(v): parent of v in compressed forest
pmin(v): path min of v in compressed forest

```
sfind(x):

if a(x) = null then return x

else {if a(a(x)) \neq null then

\{pmin(x) \leftarrow min_{pre}\{pmin(x), sfind(a(x)))\};

a(x) \leftarrow a(a(x));

return pmin(x)}
```

Computation of semi-dominators and relative dominators with optimization

for $v \in V$ do { $a(v) \leftarrow$ null; $R(v) \leftarrow$ { }}; for $v \in V - s$ in reverse preorder **do** {**for** $u \in R(v)$ **do** $rdom(u) \leftarrow sfind(u)$; $sdom(v) \leftarrow \min_{pre} \{sfind(u) | (u, v) \in E\};$ $a(v) \leftarrow p(v); pmin(v) \leftarrow sdom(v);$ if p(v) = sdom(v) then $rdom(v) \leftarrow v$ else $R(sdom(v) \leftarrow R(sdom(v) \cup \{v\});$ for $u \in R(s)$ do $rdom(u) \leftarrow sfind(u)$

3-pass dominators algorithm

Do a depth-first search. Number vertices in preorder and build DFS tree

- Compute *sdom* and *rdom* by visiting the vertices in reverse preorder
- Compute *idom* by visiting the vertces in preorder

Running time = O(*m*lg*n*): path compression with naïve linking

Faster Versions

 $O(m\alpha(n, \lceil m/n \rceil))$: Add linking by rank to the path min data structure (not entirely straightforward)

O(*m*): Build optimal algorithms for very small subproblems (much less straightforward)