## Lecture Overview

- The importance of being balanced
- AVL trees
  - Definition
  - Balance
  - Insert
- Other balanced trees
- Data structures in general

# Readings

CLRS Chapter 13. 1 and 13. 2 (but different approach: red-black trees)

# Recall: Binary Search Trees (BSTs)

- rooted binary tree
- each node has
  - key
  - left pointer
  - right pointer
  - parent pointer

See Fig. 1



Figure 1: Heights of nodes in a BST



Figure 2: BST property

- BST property (see Fig. 2).
- <u>height</u> of node = length (# edges) of longest downward path to a leaf (see CLRS B.5 for details).

## The Importance of Being Balanced:

- BSTs support insert, min, delete, rank, etc. in O(h) time, where h = height of tree (= height of root).
- h is between  $\lg(n)$  and n: Fig. 3).





• balanced BST maintains  $h = O(\lg n) \Rightarrow$  all operations run in  $O(\lg n)$  time.

#### AVL Trees:

#### Definition

AVL trees are self-balancing binary search trees. These trees are named after their two inventors G.M. Adel'son-Vel'skii and E.M. Landis  $^1$ 

An AVL tree is one that requires heights of left and right children of every node to differ by at most  $\pm 1$ . This is illustrated in Fig. 4)



Figure 4: AVL Tree Concept

In order to implement an AVL tree, follow two critical steps:

- Treat <u>nil</u> tree as height -1.
- Each node stores its height. This is inherently a <u>DATA STRUCTURE AUGMENTATION</u> procedure, similar to augmenting subtree size. Alternatively, one can just store difference in heights.

A good animation applet for AVL trees is available at this link. To compare Binary Search Trees and AVL balancing of trees use code provided here.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Original Russian article: Adelson-Velskii, G.; E. M. Landis (1962). "An algorithm for the organization of information". Proceedings of the USSR Academy of Sciences 146: 263266. (English translation by Myron J. Ricci in Soviet Math. Doklady, 3:12591263, 1962.)

#### **Balance:**

The balance is the worst when every node differs by 1. Let  $N_h = \min (\sharp \text{ nodes}).$ 

$$\Rightarrow N_h = N_{h-1} + N_{h-2} + 1$$

$$> 2N_{h-2}$$

$$\Rightarrow N_h > 2^{h/2}$$

$$\Rightarrow h < \frac{1}{2} \lg h$$

Alternatively:

$$N_h > F_n \qquad (n^{th} \text{ Fibonacci number})$$
  
In fact,  $N_h = F_{n+2} - 1 \qquad (\text{simple induction})$   

$$F_h = \frac{\phi^h}{\sqrt{5}} \qquad (\text{rounded to nearest integer})$$
  
where  $\phi = \frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \approx 1.618 \qquad (\text{golden ratio})$   
 $\implies \max h \approx \log_{\phi}(n) \approx 1.440 \log(n)$ 

### **AVL Insert:**

- 1. insert as in simple BST
- 2. work your way up tree, restoring AVL property (and updating heights as you go).

### Each Step:

- suppose x is lowest node violating AVL
- assume x is right-heavy (left case symmetric)
- if x's right child is right-heavy or balanced: follow steps in Fig. 5
- else follow steps in Fig. 6
- then continue up to x's grandparent, greatgrandparent ...



Figure 5: AVL Insert Balancing



Figure 6: AVL Insert Balancing



Example: An example implementation of the AVL Insert process is illustrated in Fig. 7

Figure 7: Illustration of AVL Tree Insert Process

Comment 1. In general, process may need several rotations before an Insert is completed. Comment 2. Delete(-min) harder but possible.

## **Balanced Search Trees:**

There are many balanced search trees.

AVL Trees	Adel'son-Velsii and Landis 1962
B-Trees/2-3-4 Trees	Bayer and McCreight $1972$ (see CLRS $18$ )
$BB[\alpha]$ Trees	Nievergelt and Reingold 1973
Red-black Trees	CLRS Chapter 13
Splay-Trees	Sleator and Tarjan 1985
Skip Lists	Pugh 1989
Scapegoat Trees	Galperin and Rivest 1993
Treaps	Seidel and Aragon 1996

**Note 1.** Skip Lists and Treaps use random numbers to make decisions fast with high probability.

Note 2. Splay Trees and Scapegoat Trees are "amortized": adding up costs for several operations  $\implies$  fast on average.

#### Splay Trees

Upon access (search or insert), move node to root by sequence of rotations and/or doublerotations (just like AVL trees). Height can be linear but still  $O(\lg n)$  per operation "on average" (amortized)

Note: We will see more on amortization in a couple of lectures.

#### Optimality

- For BSTs, cannot do better than  $O(\lg n)$  per search in worst case.
- In some cases, can do better e.g.
  - in-order traversal takes  $\Theta(n)$  time for n elements.
  - put more frequent items near root

A Conjecture: Splay trees are O(best BST) for every access pattern.

• With fancier tricks, can achieve  $O(\lg \lg u)$  performance for integers  $1 \cdots u$  [Van Ernde Boas; see 6.854 or 6.851 (Advanced Data Structures)]

### **Big Picture**:

Abstract Data Type(ADT): interface spec.

e.g. Priority Queue:

- Q = new-empty-queue()
- Q.insert(x)
- x = Q.deletemin()

vs.

Data Structure (DS): algorithm for each op.

There are many possible DSs for one ADT. One example that we will discuss much later in the course is the "heap" priority queue.

Source: http://ocw.mit.edu/courses/electrical-engineering-and-computer-science/6-006-introduction-to-algorithms-spring-2008/lecture-notes/lec4.pdf