

cse332-13wi-lec06-Dictionaries-day2.cp3



CSE 332: Data Abstractions

Lecture 6: Dictionaries; Binary Search Trees

Ruth Anderson
Winter 2013

Announcements

- **Project 1** – phase B due Tues Jan 22th, 11pm via catalyst
- **Homework 1** – due NOW!! ✓
- **Homework 2** – due Friday Jan 25th at *beginning* of class
- No class on Monday Jan 21th

Today

- Dictionaries
- Trees

1/18/2013

3

Where we are

Studying the absolutely essential ADTs of computer science and classic data structures for implementing them

ADTs so far:

1. Stack: `push, pop, isEmpty, ...`
2. Queue: `enqueue, dequeue, isEmpty, ...`
3. Priority queue: `insert, deleteMin, ...`

Next:

4. Dictionary (a.k.a. Map): associate keys with values
 - probably the most common, way more than priority queue

The Dictionary (a.k.a. Map) ADT

Data:

- set of (key, value) pairs
- keys must be comparable

Operations:

- `insert(key, val)` :
– places (key, val) in map
(If key already used, overwrites existing entry)
- `find(key)` :
– returns val associated with key
- `delete(key)`

`insert (rea, Ruth Anderson)`



`find (kainby87)`



`HyeIn Kim,...`



– ...

We will tend to emphasize the keys, but don't forget about the stored values!

1/18/2013

5

Comparison: Set ADT vs. Dictionary ADT

The Set ADT is like a Dictionary without any values

- A key is *present* or not (no repeats)

For `find`, `insert`, `delete`, there is little difference

- In dictionary, values are “just along for the ride”
- So *same data-structure ideas* work for dictionaries and sets
 - Java HashSet implemented using a HashMap, for instance

Set ADT may have other important operations

- `union`, `intersection`, `is_subset`, etc.
- Notice these are binary operators on sets
- We will want different data structures to implement these operators

A Modest Few Uses for Dictionaries

Any time you want to store information according to some key and be able to retrieve it efficiently – a **dictionary** is the ADT to use!

– Lots of programs do that!

- Networks: router tables
- Operating systems: page tables
- Compilers: symbol tables
- Databases: dictionaries with other nice properties
- Search: inverted indexes, phone directories, ...
- Biology: genome maps
- ...

Simple implementations

For dictionary with n key/value pairs

	insert	find	delete
• Unsorted linked-list	$O(1)$	$O(n)$	$O(n)$
• Unsorted array	$O(1)$	$O(n)$	$O(n)$
• Sorted linked list	$O(n)$	$O(n)$	$O(n)$
• Sorted array	$O(n)$	$O(\log n)$	$O(n)$

We'll see a Binary Search Tree (BST) probably does better, but not in the worst case unless we keep it balanced

Simple implementations

For dictionary with n key/value pairs

	insert	find	delete
• Unsorted linked-list	$O(1)^*$	$O(n)$	$O(n)$
• Unsorted array	$O(1)^*$	$O(n)$	$O(n)$
• Sorted linked list	$O(n)$	$O(n)$	$O(n)$
• Sorted array	$O(n)$	$O(\log n)$	$O(n)$

We'll see a Binary Search Tree (BST) probably does better, but not in the worst case unless we keep it balanced

*Note: If we do not allow duplicates values to be inserted, we would need to do $O(n)$ work to check for a key's existence before insertion

Lazy Deletion (e.g. in a sorted array)

10	12	24	30	41	42	44	45	50
✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓

A general technique for making `delete` as fast as `find`:

- Instead of actually removing the item just mark it deleted

Plusses:

- Simpler
- Can do removals later in batches
- If re-added soon thereafter, just unmark the deletion

Minuses:

- Extra *space* for the “is-it-deleted” flag
- Data structure full of deleted nodes wastes *space*
- `find` $O(\log m)$ *time* where m is data-structure size ($m \geq n$)
- May complicate other operations

Better Dictionary data structures

Will spend the next several lectures looking at dictionaries with three different data structures

1. AVL trees

- Binary search trees with *guaranteed balancing*

2. B-Trees

- Also always balanced, but different and shallower
- B!=Binary; B-Trees generally have large branching factor

3. Hashtables

- Not tree-like at all

Skipping: Other balanced trees (red-black, splay)


Why Trees?

Trees offer speed ups because of their branching factors

- Binary Search Trees are structured forms of *binary search*


Binary Search

find(4)



Binary Search Tree

Our goal is the performance of binary search in a tree representation



Why Trees?

Trees offer speed ups because of their branching factors

- Binary Search Trees are structured forms of *binary search*

Even a basic BST is fairly good


	Insert	Find	Delete
Worse-Case	$O(n)$	$O(n)$	$O(n)$
Average-Case	$O(\log n)$	$O(\log n)$	$O(\log n)$

Binary Trees

- Binary tree is empty or
 - a root (*with data*)
 - a left subtree (*maybe empty*)
 - a right subtree (*maybe empty*)
- Representation:

Data	
left pointer	right pointer

- For a dictionary, data will include a key and a value



Binary Tree: Some Numbers

Recall: height of a tree = longest path from root to leaf (count # of edges)

For binary tree of height h :

– max # of leaves:

$$2^h$$

– max # of nodes:

$$2^{h+1} - 1$$

– min # of leaves:

$$1$$

– min # of nodes:

$$h+1$$



Perfect
tree



Binary Trees: Some Numbers

Recall: height of a tree = longest path from root to leaf (count edges)

For binary tree of height h :

- max # of leaves: 2^h
- max # of nodes: $2^{(h+1)} - 1$
- min # of leaves: 1
- min # of nodes: $h + 1$

*For n nodes, we cannot do better than $O(\log n)$ height,
and we want to avoid $O(n)$ height*

Calculating height

What is the height of a tree with root `root`?

```
int treeHeight(Node root) {  
  
    ???  
  
}
```

Calculating height

What is the height of a tree with root `r`?

```
int treeHeight(Node root) {  
    if(root == null)  
        return -1;  
    return 1 + max(treeHeight(root.left),  
                   treeHeight(root.right));  
}
```


Running time for tree with n nodes: $O(n)$ – single pass over tree

Note: non-recursive is painful – need your own stack of pending nodes; much easier to use recursion's call stack

Tree Traversals

A *traversal* is an order for visiting all the nodes of a tree

- *Pre-order*: root, left subtree, right subtree
- *In-order*: left subtree, root, right subtree
- *Post-order*: left subtree, right subtree, root



(an expression tree)

Tree Traversals

A *traversal* is an order for visiting all the nodes of a tree

- *Pre-order*: root, left subtree, right subtree


$+ * 2 4 5$

- *In-order*: left subtree, root, right subtree

$2 * 4 + 5$

- *Post-order*: left subtree, right subtree, root

$2 4 * 5 +$




(an expression tree)

More on traversals

```
void inOrdertraversal(Node t) {
    if(t != null) {
        traverse(t.left);
        process(t.element);
        traverse(t.right);
    }
}
```

pre
post



Sometimes order doesn't matter

- Example: sum all elements

Sometimes order matters


- Example: print tree with parent above indented children (pre-order)
- Example: evaluate an expression tree (post-order)

```



A
  B
    D
    E
  C
    F
    G
    
```

Binary Search Tree

- Structural property (“binary”)
 - each node has ≤ 2 children
 - result: keeps operations simple
- Order property
 - all keys in left subtree smaller than node’s key
 - all keys in right subtree larger than node’s key
 - result: easy to find any given key




Are these BSTs?




1/18/2013

25

Are these BSTs?




1/18/2013



26


Find in BST, Recursive



```

Data find(Key key, Node root){
    if(root == null)
        return null;
    if(key < root.key)
        return find(key,root.left);
    if(key > root.key)
        return find(key,root.right);
    return root.data;
}
    
```


Find in BST, Iterative




```
Data find(Key key, Node root) {  
    while(root != null  
        && root.key != key) {  
        if(key < root.key)  
            root = root.left;  
        else(key > root.key)  
            root = root.right;  
        }  
    if(root == null)  
        return null;  
    return root.data;  
}
```

Other “finding operations”

- Find *minimum* node
- Find *maximum* node
- Find *predecessor* of a non-leaf
- Find *successor* of a non-leaf
- Find *predecessor* of a leaf
- Find *successor* of a leaf



Insert in BST




insert (13)
insert (8)
insert (31)

(New) insertions happen
only at leaves – easy!

1. Find
2. Create a new node

Deletion in BST




Why might deletion be harder than insertion?

Deletion

- Removing an item disrupts the tree structure
- Basic idea:
 - **find** the node to be removed,
 - Remove it
 - “fix” the tree so that it is still a binary search tree
- Three cases:
 - node has no children (leaf)
 - node has one child
 - node has two children


Deletion – The Leaf Case

`delete(17)`




Deletion – The One Child Case

`delete(15)`



Deletion – The Two Child Case



What can we replace 5 with?

Deletion – The Two Child Case

Idea: Replace the deleted node with a value guaranteed to be between the two child subtrees


Options:

- *successor* from right subtree: `findMin(node.right)`
- *predecessor* from left subtree: `findMax(node.left)`
 - These are the easy cases of predecessor/successor

Now delete the original node containing *successor* or *predecessor*

- Leaf or one child case – easy cases of delete!


Delete Using Successor



findMin(right sub tree) \rightarrow 7

delete (5)

Delete Using Predecessor




findMax(left sub tree) \rightarrow 2

delete (5)

BuildTree for BST


- We had `buildHeap`, so let's consider `buildTree`
- Insert keys 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 into an empty BST
 - If inserted in given order, what is the tree?
 - What big-O runtime for this kind of sorted input?
 - Is inserting in the reverse order any better?



1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5


BuildTree for BST

- We had `buildHeap`, so let's consider `buildTree`
- Insert keys 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 into an empty BST
 - If inserted in given order, what is the tree?
 - What big-O runtime for this kind of sorted input?
 - Is inserting in the reverse order any better?



BuildTree for BST

- Insert keys 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 into an empty BST
- What we if could somehow re-arrange them
 - median first, then left median, right median, etc.
 - 5, 3, 7, 2, 1, 4, 8, 6, 9
- What tree does that give us?
- What big-O runtime?




BuildTree for BST

- Insert keys 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 into an empty BST
- What we if could somehow re-arrange them
 - median first, then left median, right median, etc.
 - 5, 3, 7, 2, 1, 4, 8, 6, 9

– What tree does that give us?

– What big-O runtime?

$O(n \log n)$, definitely better



Give up on BuildTree for BST

The median trick will guarantee a $O(n \log n)$ build time, but it is not worth the effort.

Why?

- Subsequent inserts and deletes will eventually transform the carefully balanced tree into the dreaded list
- Then everything will have the $O(n)$ performance of a linked list

Balanced BST

Observation

- BST: the shallower the better!
- For a BST with n nodes inserted in arbitrary order
 - Average height is $O(\log n)$ – see text for proof
 - Worst case height is $O(n)$
- Simple cases such as inserting in key order lead to the worst-case scenario

Solution: Require a **Balance Condition** that

1. ensures depth is always $O(\log n)$ – strong enough!
2. is easy to maintain – not too strong!


Potential Balance Conditions

1. Left and right subtrees of the *root* have equal number of nodes
2. Left and right subtrees of the *root* have equal *height*

Potential Balance Conditions


1. Left and right subtrees of the *root* have equal number of nodes

Too weak!
Height mismatch example:



2. Left and right subtrees of the *root* have equal *height*

Too weak!
Double chain example:



1/18/2013

46


Potential Balance Conditions

3. Left and right subtrees of every node have equal number of nodes
4. Left and right subtrees of every node have equal *height*

Potential Balance Conditions

3. Left and right subtrees of every node have equal number of nodes

Too strong!
Only perfect trees ($2^n - 1$ nodes)



4. Left and right subtrees of every node have equal *height*

Too strong!
Only perfect trees ($2^n - 1$ nodes)

The AVL Balance Condition

Left and right subtrees of *every node*
have *heights differing by at most 1*

Definition: **balance**(*node*) = height(*node*.left) – height(*node*.right)

AVL *property*: **for every node x , $-1 \leq \text{balance}(x) \leq 1$**

- Ensures small depth
 - Will prove this by showing that an AVL tree of height h must have a number of nodes *exponential* in h
- Easy (well, efficient) to maintain
 - Using single and double rotations