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Appendix A

Algorithm Time Complexity

A.1 Running Time of Multi-Layer Path Finding

In both the Multi-Layer-Breadth-First and Multi-Layer-k-Shortest-Path algorithms (listings 7.1 and 7.4 respectively) the running time will mostly depend on the size of the queue $Q$. The best estimate we can give is to first estimate the length of the shortest path, and then estimate the number of paths of that length. Since the algorithms are basically a flooding mechanism, we assume that the path branches at each hop, and the number of branches after $i$ hops is $O(r^i)$, with $r$ the number of branches per hop. If we ignore all suppression mechanisms, as we should for the worst-case scenario, the queue length is proportional to the number of branches, $O(r^i)$. The number of branches per hop $r$ is roughly proportional to the average out-degree and to the number of possible labels $|\langle Lb \rangle|$ per layer. The average out-degree is the average number of adjacencies:

$$|\langle Adj \rangle| = \frac{|E_l|}{|V_l|}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.1)

Now we can estimate the queue length.

$$O(|Q|) = O(r^i) = O\left(\left(\frac{|E_l| \times |\langle Lb \rangle|}{|V_l|}\right)^{|V|}\right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.2)

$$= O\left(\left(\frac{|N| \times |A| + |L| \times |\langle Lb \rangle|}{|N| \times |A|}\right)^{|N| \times |A|}\right)$$

Assuming that our network is a small world network, the average path length is $O(\log(|V|))$ [p1]. While the estimate of the worst-case remain the
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same, the estimate for the *average* running time would reduce $i$ from $|V|$ to $\log(|V|)$:

$$O(|Q|) = O(r^i)$$

$$= O\left(\left(\frac{|E_i| \times |\langle Lb \rangle|}{|V|}\right)^{\log(|V|)}\right)$$

$$= O\left(\left(\frac{|N| \times |Y| + |L| \times |\langle Lb \rangle|}{|N| \times |Y|}\right)^{\log(|N| \times |Y|)}\right) \quad (A.3)$$

Such exponential behaviour is typical for a NP-complete problem, such as a path-constrained path finding algorithm.

A.2 Multi-Layer Dijkstra’s Algorithm

Listing A.1 shows MULTI-LAYER-DIJKSTRA, a variant of the Dijkstra algorithm applied to the graph $G_s$ as defined in section 7.5.

This algorithm is an improvement over Dijkstra’s algorithm [p11]. Dijkstra’s algorithm applied to the graph $G_s$ in figure 7.4 would find the path $A_{Eth} - B_{Eth} - B_{24c} - E_{24c} - D_{24c} - D_{Eth} - D_{3c7v} - E_{3c7v} - F_{3c7v} - F_{Eth} - C_{Eth}$ as shortest path from $A$ to $C$. This is not correct, due to the limited capacity between $D$ and $E$. The Multi-Layer-Dijkstra algorithm in listing A.1 would find the correct shortest path, $A_{Eth} - B_{Eth} - B_{24c} - E_{24c} - D_{24c} - D_{Eth} - D_{3c7v} - B_{3c7v} - E_{3c7v} - F_{3c7v} - F_{Eth} - C_{Eth}$.

Nevertheless, the Multi-Layer-Dijkstra algorithm is still imperfect. For example, while it finds the shortest path from $A$ to $C$, it will not find the shortest path from $C$ to $A$. The reason is that this algorithm does check for the used bandwidth, but it only keeps track of the bandwidth usage as a global variable, rather than per path. This means that it adds edges to the list of used bandwidth, even if that edge later turns out not be used anymore. This condition is too strict, resulting in false negatives, such as the above.

Lines 1-6 of the meta-code initialises all vertices and edges. Line 7 inserts all vertices in the queue $Q$. The main algorithm starts at line 8. Line 9 extracts the vertex $u$ from the queue that has the shortest weight (i.e., $d[u] \leq d[v]$ $\forall v \neq u \in Q$). Vertex $u$ can be regarded as the new scanning vertex towards destination $v_{dst}$. Consequently, we have to reduce the bandwidth of the last edge in the path to vertex $u$ with the amount of consumed bandwidth (which in this case we take from the edge parameter $B_e(e)$). Lines 13 and 14 make sure we only retrieve the shortest path between a source and a single destination (as
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The running time of algorithm A.1 is slightly longer than Dijkstra’s algorithm due to the extension in line 20, which re-inserts edges into the queue. If we
ignore this extension, the running time is:

$$
\mathcal{O}(\text{Algorithm A.1}) = \mathcal{O}(|V_s| \times \mathcal{O}(\text{Extract-Min}) + |E_s| \times \mathcal{O}(\text{Insert})) \quad \text{(A.4)}
$$

In here, \(\mathcal{O}(\text{Extract-Min})\) is caused by line 9 and \(\mathcal{O}(\text{Insert})\) is caused by line 21. If the graph is sufficiently sparse \((|E| < |V|^2)\) [p9], this equation reduces to

$$
\mathcal{O}(|V_s| \times \log(|V_s|) + |E_s| \times \mathcal{O}(1)) = \mathcal{O}(|V_s| \cdot \log(|V_s|) + |E_s|).
$$

Equation 7.34 estimates \(|E_s| \approx (|A| + |L|) \times |Y|\), and we assume that \(\mathcal{O}(|A|) = \mathcal{O}(|N| \times |Y|)\). Equation 7.29 gives the upper limit \(|V_s| \approx |N| \times |S| \approx |N| \times |Y| \times T^{|Y|}\) with \(T = \langle |T(y)| \rangle\) the average number of technologies for each stack.

The running time of algorithm A.1 with constant edge weights \(W_e(e)\) is:

$$
\mathcal{O}(\text{Algorithm A.1}) = \mathcal{O}(|E_s| + |V_s|)
= \mathcal{O}((|A| + |L|) \times |Y|) + |N| \times |Y| \times T^{|Y|}
= \mathcal{O}((|N| \times |Y| + |L|) \times |Y|) + |N| \times |Y| \times T^{|Y|}
\approx \mathcal{O}((|N| \times |Y| + |L|) \times T^{|Y|}) \quad \text{(A.5)}
$$

The running time of algorithm A.1 with variable edge weights \(W_e(e)\) is:

$$
\mathcal{O}(\text{Algorithm A.1}) = \mathcal{O}(|E_s| + |V_s| \cdot \log(|V_s|))
= \mathcal{O}((|A| + |L|) \times |Y|) + |N| \times |Y| \times T^{|Y|}
\times \log(|N| \times |Y| \times |Y| \times T^{|Y|})
= \mathcal{O}((|N| \times |Y| + |L|) \times |Y|) + |N| \times |Y| \times T^{|Y|}
\times (\log(|N|) + \log(|Y|) + |Y| \cdot \log(T))) \quad \text{(A.6)}
$$

### A.4 Running Time of Multi-Layer-Breadth-First

The rough estimate of the running time in the previous section does not provide many insights. In this section, we will assume that the segment of a shortest path is also a shortest path. This means we can abort any path if it contains a (node, adaptation stack) tuple that we encountered before. Such algorithm would be comparable to Multi-Layer-Dijkstra, as described above. This allows us to do a more thorough comparison of running times between path finding in \(G_l\) and path finding in \(G_s\).

If we can abort a path if the current vertex has been processed with the same adaptations stack \(s\), then each vertex is processed at most \(|S_y|\) times,
with $|S_y|$ the number of possible technology stacks for layer $Y_c(v)$ of vertex $v$. The worst-case of $|S_y|$ is $|S| |Y|$, or $\prod_{y \in Y} |T(y)|$ according to equation 7.26.

Recall that average adjacency can be found by dividing the number of edges by the number of vertices in a graph (equation A.1).

According to equation 7.35, the running time of algorithm 7.1 is:

$$O(\text{Algorithm 7.1}) = O(|Q|) \times O(\text{loop}) =$$

$$= O(|Q|) \times \left( O(\text{DEQUEUE}) + O(|adj|) \times O(\text{EXTEND-PATH}) \right)$$

$$= O(|Q|) \times \left( O(\text{DEQUEUE}) + \frac{O(|E_i|)}{O(|V_i|)} \times O(\text{EXTEND-PATH}) \right)$$

(A.7)

With the restriction in place, the queue size is limited to one adaptation stack per node. Since there are at most $|S|$ adaptations stacks, the upper limit of $|Q|$ is equal to

$$O(|Q|) = O(|N| \times |S|)$$

$$\lesssim O(|N| \times |Y| \times T^{|Y|})$$

(A.8)

$|Q|$ is equivalent to $|V_s|$, since $V_s$ is also determined by the number of adaptation stacks per node. We have seen in equations 7.25 and 7.27 that the estimate of $|S|$ is lower than its upper limit by a factor of $|Y|$. The estimate average of $|Q|$ is equal to

$$O(|Q|) = O(|N| \times |S|)$$

$$= O(|N| \times T^{|Y|})$$

(A.9)

These results apply to both the Multi-Layer-Breadth-First and Multi-Layer-k-Shortest-Path algorithm with restricted search space.

If we assume $O(|A|) = O(|N| \times |Y|)$, and use equation 7.12 as the estimate of $|V_i|$ and $|E_i|$, we can expand equation A.7:

$$O(\text{Algorithm 7.1}) = O(|Q|) \times \left( O(\text{DEQUEUE}) + \frac{O(|E_i|)}{O(|V_i|)} \times O(\text{EXTEND-PATH}) \right)$$

$$= O(|N| \times |Y| \times T^{|Y|}) \times$$

$$\left( O(\text{DEQUEUE}) + \frac{O(|A| + |L|)}{O(|N| \times |Y|)} \times O(\text{EXTEND-PATH}) \right)$$

$$= O(|N| \times |Y| \times T^{|Y|}) \times O(\text{DEQUEUE}) +$$

$$O((|N| \times |Y| + |L|) \times T^{|Y|}) \times O(\text{EXTEND-PATH})$$

(A.10)
The only operations in the path extension subroutine (algorithm 7.2) which have a running time larger than $O(1)$, are the operations on lines 6, 9 that checks for duplicate tuples (vertex, stack) using $R$, and the operation on line 22 which checks the number of labels per layer $⟨Lb⟩$. Both operations depend if $R$ and the labels can be sorted. If no sorting is possible, the running time is $O(⟨R⟩) = O(|Q|)$ and $O(⟨Lb⟩)$ respectively. If sorting is possible, the running time is $O(\log(|Q|))$ and $O(\log(|Lb|))$ respectively.

$$O(\text{Extend-Path}) = O(\log(|Q|) + \log(|Lb|)) \quad (A.11)$$

The original breadth-first search algorithm can only deal with edge lengths of 1 ($W_e(e) = 1$ for all $e$). The advantage is that the deque operation only takes $O(1)$, since the queue is sorted in order of path length. If we allow different $W_e(e)$, this function needs to be replaced with an EXTRACT MIN operation. The time complexity of this operation becomes $O(\log(|Q|))$, provided that the queue $Q$ is sorted using a Fibonacci heap [p9].

$$O(\text{dequeue operation}) = O(1) \quad (A.12)$$
$$O(\text{extract-min operation}) = O(\log(|Q|)) \quad (A.13)$$

The queue length $|Q|$ highly depends on how quickly the flooding principle is suppressed by the incompatibility check and duplicate stack check. The worst-case is given in equation A.8.

If we assume $W_e(e) = 1$, $O(\text{Extend-Path}) = O(\log(|Q|))$ (no labels), the worst-case running time for algorithm 7.1 becomes:

$$O(\text{Algorithm 7.1}) = O(|N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) \times O(\text{dequeue}) +$$
$$O(\langle |N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| + |L| \rangle \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) \times O(\text{Extend-Path})$$
$$= O(\langle |N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]} \rangle \times O(1) +$$
$$O(\langle |N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| + |L| \rangle \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) \times O(\log(|Q|))$$
$$\approx O(\langle |N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| + |L| \rangle \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) \times O(\log(|N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]})$$

$$\approx O(\langle |N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| + |L| \rangle \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) \times O(\log(|N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]})$$

$$\approx O(\langle |N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| + |L| \rangle \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) \times O(\log(|N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]})$$

We can now calculate the worst-case running time of algorithm 7.1 for
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variable edge weights $W_e(e)$:

$$\mathcal{O}(\text{Algorithm 7.1}) = \mathcal{O}(|N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) \times \mathcal{O}(\text{dequeue}) +$$

$$\mathcal{O}(|N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) \times \mathcal{O}(\text{Extend-Path})$$

$$= \mathcal{O}(|N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) \times \mathcal{O}(\text{dequeue}) +$$

$$\mathcal{O}(|N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) \times \mathcal{O}(\log(|Q|)) +$$

$$\mathcal{O}(|N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) \times \mathcal{O}(\log(|Q|) + \log(|lb|))$$

$$\approx \mathcal{O}(|N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) \times \mathcal{O}(\log(|Q|) + \log(|lb|))$$

$$= \mathcal{O}(|N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) \times \mathcal{O}(\log(|Q|) + \log(|lb|))$$

(A.15)

Even so, the estimated average running time of algorithm 7.1 is:

$$\mathcal{O}(\text{Algorithm 7.1}) = \mathcal{O}(|Q|) \times \mathcal{O}(\text{dequeue}) +$$

$$\mathcal{O}(|N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) \times \mathcal{O}(\text{Extend-Path})$$

$$= \mathcal{O}(|Q|) \times \mathcal{O}(\log(Q)) +$$

$$\mathcal{O}(|N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) \times \mathcal{O}(\log(Q) + \log(|lb|))$$

$$= \mathcal{O}(|N| \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) \times \mathcal{O}(\log(|N| \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) +$$

$$\mathcal{O}(|N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) \times \mathcal{O}(\log(|N| \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) + \log(|lb|))$$

$$\approx \mathcal{O}(|N| \times |\mathcal{Y}| \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) \times \mathcal{O}(\log(|N| \times T^{[\mathcal{Y}]}) + \log(|lb|))$$

(A.16)

A.5 Running Time of Multi-Layer-k-Shortest-Path

The running time of Multi-Layer-k-Shortest-Path (algorithm 7.4) is roughly comparable to the running time of Multi-Layer-Breadth-First (algorithm 7.1) as it is basically the same algorithm.

The only difference in the running time is caused by two factors. First, Multi-Layer-k-Shortest-Path reduces the search space by using the estimate path length. This reduces the average running time by aborting path that are unfeasible due to their length. At the same time, this change increases the
worst-case running time, because in the worst-case, no paths are aborted, and
the running of Dijkstra’s algorithm adds to the running time.

The second difference stems between the two algorithms from the fact
that Multi-Layer-k-Shortest-Path operates on a larger graph than Multi-Layer-
Breadth-First. While this may seem worse in terms of number of vertices, the
running time is nearly equivalent in terms of devices and technology layers.
In fact, any algorithm running on \( G_s \) is slightly faster than the equivalent
algorithm running on \( G_l \). The reason is that \( G_s \) contains more intrinsic in-
formation. For example, the loop check (lines 6-9 in algorithm 7.1, line 6 in
algorithm 7.5) is more expensive in \( G_l \) than in \( G_s \), since it has to search through
a list of possible adaptations in \( G_l \), while the adaptation function is immedi-
ately obvious from the vertex in \( G_s \). So, while the creation of the graph \( G_s \) is
more computational intensive than the creation of the graph \( G_l \), this drawback
is a benefit when running the algorithm. Finally, \( G_s \) may be slightly more ef-
ficient, since \( G_s \) can collapse multiple links on the same edge, while this is not
done in \( G_l \). Again, this advantage during the algorithm running time is offset
by a disadvantage when generating the graph \( G_s \).

The worst-case running time of Multi-Layer-k-Shortest-Path is:

\[
O(\text{Algorithm 7.4}) = O(|V_s|) + O(|Q|) \times (O(\text{EXTRACT-MIN}) +
O(|adj|) \times (O(\text{FEASIBLE}) + O(\text{ENQUEUE})))
\]  
(A.17)

If again, we assume that \( O(|Q|) = O(|V_s|) \leq |N| \times |S| \), and further assume
\( O(\text{EXTRACT-MIN}) = O(\log(Q)) \), \( O(\text{ENQUEUE}) = O(1) \), and \( O(\text{FEASIBLE}) =
O(|p|) = O(\log(V_s)) \) then we can specify the worst-case running time for
\textsc{Multi-Layer-k-Shortest-Path}.

\[
O(\text{Algorithm 7.4}) = O(|V_s|) + O(|V_s|) \times (O(\log(V_s)) +
O(\mathcal{E}_s) \times (O(\log(V_s)) + O(1)))
\]  
\[
\approx O(|V_s|) \times O(\log(V_s)) + O(|\mathcal{E}_s|) \times O(\log(V_s))
\]  
\[
= O((|V_s| + |\mathcal{E}_s|) \times \log(V_s))
\]  
\[
= O((|N| \times |Y| \times T^{|Y|} + (|N| \times |Y| + |L|) \times T^{|Y|}) \times
\log(|N| \times |Y| \times T^{|Y|}))
\]  
\[
\approx O((|N| \times |Y| + |L|) \times T^{|Y|} \times \log(|N| \times |Y| \times T^{|Y|}))
\]  
(A.18)

The estimated average running time for \textsc{Multi-Layer-k-Shortest-Path}
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is

\[ O(\text{Algorithm 7.4}) = O((|V_s| + |E_s|) \times \log(V_s)) \]

\[ = O((|N| \times T^{3|Y|} + (|N| + \frac{|L|}{|Y|}) \times T^{3|Y|}) \times \log(|N| \times T^{3|Y|})) \]

\[ \approx O((|N| + \frac{|L|}{|Y|}) \times T^{3|Y|} \times \log(|N| \times T^{3|Y|})) \]

(A.19)