DV format: <Destination, Path-cost, NextHop>

Example: Let’s consider the routes from (C to A) and (D to A).

Event 1: Converged state
Event 2: Router B failed, i.e., both links (B,C) and (B,D) are down simultaneously.
Event 3:
C updates the route from its old database (which contains an advertisement from D) to <A,3,D>.
C shares this route to D.
D updates its route with this recent advertisement from C.
D’s current route becomes <A,4,C>. D shares this route back to C and this starts the “count to infinity”.

Case A:
No split-horizon.
No poison reverse.
Event 3:
C updates the route from its old database (which contains an old advertisement from D) to <A,3,D>. (Note that D’s old route <A,2,B> was not learnt from C, so it shared it with C even when split-horizon is applied.)
C DOES NOT advertise this route (i.e., <A,3,D>) to D due to the Split-horizon rule.
However, D updates the route from its old database (which contains an old advertisement from C) to <A,3,C>.
D DOES NOT advertise this route to C due to the Split-horizon rule.
This prevents count to infinity, but does not stop routing loop as both C and D’s routes depend on each other.
In practical implementations, routers will time-out old database to eventually get rid of this inconsistency.
Event 3:
C updates the route from its old database (which contains an old advertisement from D) to <A, 3, D>
C advertises the poisoned route <A, inf., D> to D due to Poisoned-reverse rule.
This advertisement from C changes D’s database indicating “cost to reach A via C is inf.”
D finds no path to A. D considers A unreachable (correct behavior).
This prevents count to infinity, as well as prevents the routing loop.

Case C:
With poison reverse.
(this means Split-horizon with poisoned reverse)