

Algorithms and Datastructures

Balanced Trees (AVL-Trees, (a,b)-Trees, Red-Black-Trees)

Prof. Dr. Rolf Backofen

Bioinformatics Group / Department of Computer Science

Algorithms and Datastructures, January 2017

Structure

Balanced Trees

- Motivation

- AVL-Trees

- (a,b)-Trees

 - Introduction

 - Runtime Complexity

- Red-Black Trees

Balanced Trees

Motivation

Binary search tree:

- ▶ With `BinarySearchTree` we could perform an `lookup` or `insert` in $O(d)$, with d being the `depth` of the tree
- ▶ Best case: $d = O(\log n)$
 - ▶ If the keys are inserted randomly
- ▶ Worst case: $d = O(n)$
 - ▶ if the keys are inserted in ascending / descending order
(20, 19, 18, ...)

Balanced Trees

Motivation



Gnarley trees:

► <http://people.ksp.sk/~kuko/bak>



Figure: Binary search tree with random insert [Gna]



Figure: Binary search tree with descending insert [Gna]

Balanced Trees

Motivation

Balanced trees:

- ▶ We do not want to rely on certain properties of our **key set**
- ▶ We explicitly want a depth of $O(\log n)$
- ▶ We **rebalance** the tree from time to time

Balanced Trees

Motivation

How do we get a depth of $O(\log n)$?

- ▶ **AVL-Tree:**

- ▶ Binary tree with 2 children per node
- ▶ Balancing via “rotation”

- ▶ **(a,b)-Tree or B-Tree:**

- ▶ Node have between a and b children
- ▶ Balancing through **splitting** and **merging** nodes
- ▶ Used in data bases and file systems

- ▶ **Red-Black-Tree:**

- ▶ Binary tree with “black” and “red” nodes
- ▶ Balancing through “rotation” and “recoloring”
- ▶ Can be interpreted as (2, 4)-tree
- ▶ Used in C++ `std::map`, Java `SortedMap`

Balanced Trees

AVL-Tree

AVL-Tree:

- ▶ Gregory Maximovich **A**delson-**V**elskii, Yevgeniy Mikhailovlovich **L**andis (1963)
- ▶ Search tree with modified **insert** and **remove** operations while satisfying a **depth** condition
- ▶ Prevents degeneration of the search tree
- ▶ Height difference of left and right subtree is at maximum one
- ▶ With that the height of the search tree is always $O(\log n)$
- ▶ We can perform all basic operations in $O(\log n)$

Balanced Trees

AVL-Tree



Figure: Example of an AVL-Tree

Balanced Trees

AVL-Tree




Figure: **Not** an AVL-Tree

Balanced Trees

AVL-Tree



Figure: Another example of an AVL-Tree

Balanced Trees

AVL-Tree - Rebalancing

Rotation:




Figure: Before rotating




Figure: After rotating

- ▶ Central operation of **rebalancing**
- ▶ After rotation to the right:
 - ▶ Subtree **A** is a layer higher and subtree **C** a layer lower
 - ▶ The parent child relations between nodes **x** and **y** have been swapped

Balanced Trees

AVL-Tree - Rebalancing

AVL-Tree:

- ▶ If a height difference of ± 2 occurs on an **insert** or **remove** operation the tree is rebalanced
- ▶ Many different cases of rebalancing
- ▶ **Example:** **insert** of 1, 2, 3, ...
- ▶ <http://people.ksp.sk/~kuko/bak>




Figure: Inserting 1, ..., 10 into an AVL-tree [Gna]

Balanced Trees

AVL-Tree - Summary

Summary:

- ▶ Historical the first search tree providing guaranteed `insert`, `remove` and `lookup` in $O(\log n)$
- ▶ However not amortized update costs of $O(1)$
- ▶ Additional memory costs: We have to save a height difference for every node
- ▶ Better (and easier) to implement are (a,b) -trees

(a,b)-Trees

Introduction

(a,b)-Tree:

- ▶ Also known as **b-tree** (b for “balanced”)
- ▶ Used in data bases and file systems

Idea:

- ▶ Save a varying number of elements per node
- ▶ So we have space for elements on an **insert** and balance operation

(a,b)-Trees

Introduction

(a,b)-Tree:

- ▶ All leaves have the same depth
- ▶ Each inner node has $\geq a$ and $\leq b$ nodes
(Only the root node may have less nodes)



- ▶ Each node with n children is called “node of degree n ” and holds $n - 1$ sorted elements
- ▶ Subtrees are located “between” the elements
- ▶ We require: $a \geq 2$ and $b \geq 2a - 1$

(a,b)-Trees

Introduction

(2,4)-Tree:



Figure: Example of an (2,4)-tree

- ▶ (2,4)-tree with depth of 3
- ▶ Each node has between 2 and 4 children (1 to 3 elements)

(a,b)-Trees

Introduction

Not an (2,4)-Tree:



Figure: **Not** an (2,4)-tree

- ▶ Invalid sorting
- ▶ Degree of node too large / too small
- ▶ Leaves on different levels

(a,b)-Trees

Implementation - Lookup

Searching an element: (lookup)

- ▶ The same algorithm as in [BinarySearchTree](#)
- ▶ Searching from the root downwards
- ▶ The keys at each node set the path

BST AVL tree **B tree** Red-black tree AA tree Skiplist Max Heap Min Heap Treap Scapegoat tree Splay tree

Display

Control

50

☐ Pause ☐ Small

#Nodes: 22; #Keys: 37 = 56% full; Height: 4

Text

Search
Found.

(a,b)-Trees

Implementation - Insert

Inserting an element: (`insert`)

- ▶ Search the position to insert the key into
- ▶ This position will always be an leaf
- ▶ Insert the element into the tree
- ▶ **Attention:** Nodes can have one element too many (Degree $b + 1$)
- ▶ Then we **split** the node

(a,b)-Trees

Implementation - Insert

Inserting an element: (`insert`)



Figure: Splitting a node

- ▶ If the degree is higher than $b + 1$ we split the node
 - ▶ This results in a node with $\text{ceil}(\frac{b-1}{2})$ elements, a element for the parent node, and a node with $\text{floor}(\frac{b-1}{2})$ elements
 - ▶ That's why we have the limit $b \geq 2a - 1$

(a,b)-Trees

Implementation - Insert

Inserting an element: (`insert`)

- ▶ If the degree is higher than $b + 1$ we split the node
- ▶ Now the parent node can be of a higher degree than $b + 1$
- ▶ We `split` the parent nodes the same way
- ▶ If the node to split is the root we split it and create a new root node
(The tree is now one level deeper)

(a,b)-Trees

Implementation - Remove

Removing an element: (`remove`)

- ▶ Search the element in $O(\log n)$ time
- ▶ **Case 1:** The element is contained by a leaf, remove it
- ▶ **Case 2:** The element is contained by an inner node
 - ▶ Search the `successor` in the right subtree
 - ▶ The `successor` is always contained by a leaf
 - ▶ Replace the element with its `successor` and delete the `successor` from the leaf
- ▶ **Attention:** The leaf might be too small (degree of $a - 1$)
⇒ We `rebalance` the tree

(a,b)-Trees

Implementation - Remove

Removing an element: (remove)

- ▶ **Attention:** The leaf might be too small (degree of $a - 1$)
⇒ We **rebalance** the tree
- ▶ **Case a:** If the left or right neighbour node has a degree greater than a we **borrow** one element from this node



Figure: Borrowing an element

(a,b)-Trees

Implementation - Remove

Removing an element: (`remove`)

- ▶ **Attention:** The leaf might be too small (degree of $a - 1$)
⇒ We **rebalance** the tree

- ▶ **Case b:** We **combine** the node with its right or left neighbour




Figure: Combining two nodes

(a,b)-Trees

Implementation - Remove

Removing an element: (remove)

- ▶ Now the parent node can be of degree $a - 1$
- ▶ We combine parent nodes the same way
- ▶ If the root has only one child left we take the child as new root
(The tree shrinks one level)

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity

Runtime complexity of **lookup**, **insert** and **remove**:

- ▶ All operations in $O(d)$ with d being the depth of the tree
- ▶ Each node (except the root) has more than a children
 $\Rightarrow n \geq a^{d-1}$ and $d \leq 1 + \log_a n = O(\log_a n)$
- ▶ If we look closer:
 - ▶ **lookup** always takes $\Theta(d)$
 - ▶ **insert** and **remove** often require only $O(1)$ time
 - ▶ Only in the **worst case** we have to **split** or **combine** all nodes on a path up to the root
 - ▶ We want to analyse in detail
 - ▶ Therefore instead of $b \geq 2a - 1$ we need $b \geq 2a$.
 - ▶ Here is a counter-example for (2,3)-trees, analysis of (2,4)-trees

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - Counter-example for (2,3)-Tree

(2,3)-Tree:

- Before executing `delete(11)`



Figure: Normal (2,3)-Tree

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - Counter example for (2,3)-Tree

(2,3)-Tree:

- ▶ Executing `delete(11)`




Figure: (2,3)-Tree - Delete step 1

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - Counter example for (2,3)-Tree

(2,3)-Tree:

- ▶ Executing `delete(11)`



Figure: (2,3)-Tree - Delete step 2

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - Counter example for (2,3)-Tree

(2,3)-Tree:

- ▶ Executing `delete(11)`




Figure: (2,3)-Tree - Delete step 3

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - Counter example for (2,3)-Tree

(2,3)-Tree:

- ▶ Executed `delete(11)`




Figure: (2,3)-Tree - Delete step 4

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - Counter example for (2,3)-Tree

(2,3)-Tree:

- ▶ Executing `insert(11)`




Figure: (2,3)-Tree - Insert step 1

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - Counter example for (2,3)-Tree

(2,3)-Tree:

- ▶ Executing `insert(11)`




Figure: (2,3)-Tree - Insert step 2

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - Counter example for (2,3)-Tree

(2,3)-Tree:

- ▶ Executing `insert(11)`




Figure: (2,3)-Tree - Insert step 3

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - Counter example for (2,3)-Tree

(2,3)-Tree:

- ▶ Executed `insert(11)`




Figure: (2,3)-Tree - Insert step 4

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - Counter example for (2,3)-Tree

(2,3)-Tree:

- ▶ We are exactly where we started
- ▶ If $b = 2a - 1$ then we can create a sequence of **insert** and **remove** operations where each operation costs $O(\log n)$
- ▶ We need $b \geq 2a$ instead of $b \geq 2a - 1$




Figure: (2,3)-Tree

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - (2,4)-Tree

(2,4)-Tree:

- ▶ If all nodes have 2 children we have to combine the nodes up to the root on a remove operation
 - ▶ If all nodes have 4 children we have to split the nodes up to the root on a insert operation
 - ▶ If all nodes have 3 children it takes some time to reach one of the previous two states
- ⇒ **Nodes of degree 3 are harmless**
- Neither an insert nor a remove operation trigger rebalancing operations

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - (2,4)-Tree

(2,4)-Tree:

- ▶ **Idea:**
 - ▶ After an expensive operation the tree is in a stable state
 - ▶ It takes some time until the next expensive operation occurs
- ▶ Like with dynamic arrays:
 - ▶ **Reallocation** is expensive but it takes some time until the next expensive operation occurs
 - ▶ If we **overallocate** clever we have an amortized runtime of $O(1)$

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - (2,4)-Tree

Terminology:

- ▶ We analyze a sequence of n operations
- ▶ Let Φ_i be the potential of the tree after the i -th operation
- ▶ n_3 is the number of nodes with degree 3

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - (2,4)-Tree

Example:

- Nodes of degree 3 are highlighted



Figure: Tree with potential $\phi = 4$

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - (2,4)-Tree

Terminology:

- ▶ Let c_i be the costs = runtime of the i -th operation
- ▶ We will show:
 - ▶ Each operation can maximally destroy one harmless node
 - ▶ For each further step, that incurs cost, the operation creates a further harmless node
- ▶ The costs for operation i are coupled to the difference of the potential levels

$$c_i \leq A \cdot \underbrace{(\Phi_i - \Phi_{i-1})} + B, \quad A > 0 \text{ and } B > A$$

Number of harmless (degree 3) nodes at operation i . Can be -1 , but not smaller than -1

- ▶ With that each operation has an amortized cost of $O(1)$

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - (2,4)-Tree

Case 1: i -th operation is an **insert** operation on a full node




Figure: Splitting a node on **insert**

- ▶ Each splitted node creates a node of **degree 3**
- ▶ The parent node receives an element from the splitted node
- ▶ If the parent node is also full we have to split it too

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - (2,4)-Tree

Case 1: i -th operation is an **insert** operation on a full node

- ▶ Let m be the number of nodes split
- ▶ The potential rises by m
- ▶ If the “stop-node” is of **degree 3** then the potential goes down by one

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_i &\geq \Phi_{i-1} + m - 1 \\ \Rightarrow m &\leq \Phi_i - \Phi_{i-1} + 1\end{aligned}$$

Costs: $c_i \leq A \cdot m + B$

$$\begin{aligned}\Rightarrow c_i &\leq A \cdot (\Phi_i - \Phi_{i-1} + 1) + B \\ c_i &\leq A \cdot (\Phi_i - \Phi_{i-1}) + \underbrace{A + B}_{B'}\end{aligned}$$

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - (2,4)-Tree

Case 2: i -th operation is an **remove** operation

► **Case 2.1:** Inner node

- Searching the successor in a tree is $O(d) = O(\log n)$
- Normally the tree is coupled with a doubly linked list
⇒ We can find the successor in $O(1)$



Figure: Tree with doubly linked list

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - (2,4)-Tree

Case 2: i -th operation is an **remove** operation

- ▶ **Case 2.1:** Borrowing a node
 - ▶ Creates no additional operations
 - ▶ Case 2.1.1: Potential rises by one



Figure: Borrowing an element case 2.1.1

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - (2,4)-Tree

Case 2: i -th operation is an **remove** operation

- ▶ **Case 2.1:** Borrowing a node
 - ▶ Creates no additional operations
 - ▶ Case 2.1.2: Potential lowers by one




Figure: Borrowing an element case 2.1.2

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - (2,4)-Tree

Case 2: i -th operation is an **remove** operation

► **Case 2.2:** Merging a node




Figure: Merging two nodes

- Potential rises by one
- Parent node has one element less after the operation
- This operation propagates upwards until a node of degree > 2 or a degree 2 node, which can borrow from a neighbour
- The potential rises by m
- If the “stop-node” is of **degree 2** then the potential eventually goes down by one
- Same costs as **insert**

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - (2,4)-Tree - Lemma

Lemma:

- We know:

$$c_i \leq A \cdot (\phi_i - \phi_{i-1}) + B, \quad A > 0 \text{ and } B > A$$

- With that we can conclude:

$$\sum_{i=0}^n c_i = O(n)$$

(a,b)-Trees

Runtime Complexity - (2,4)-Tree - Lemma - Proof

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=0}^n c_i &\leq \underbrace{A \cdot (\phi_1 - \phi_0) + B}_{\leq c_1} + \underbrace{A \cdot (\phi_2 - \phi_1) + B}_{\leq c_1} + \cdots + \underbrace{A \cdot (\phi_n - \phi_{n-1})}_{\leq c_n} \\ &= A \cdot (\phi_n - \phi_0) + B \cdot n && | \text{ telescope sum} \\ &= A \cdot \phi_n + B \cdot n && | \text{ we start with an empty tree} \\ &< A \cdot n + B \cdot n = O(n) && | \text{ number of degree 3 nodes} \\ &&& | \text{ number of nodes}\end{aligned}$$

Red-Black-Trees

Introduction

Red-Black Tree:

- ▶ Binary tree with red and black nodes
- ▶ Number of black nodes on path to leaves is equal
- ▶ Can be interpreted as (2,4)-tree (also named 2-3-4-tree)
- ▶ Each (2,4)-tree-node is a small red-black-tree with a black root node

Red-Black-Trees

Introduction




Figure: Example of an red-black-tree [Gna]

► General

[CRL01] Thomas H. Cormen, Ronald L. Rivest, and Charles E. Leiserson.

Introduction to Algorithms.

MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass, 2001.

[MS08] Kurt Mehlhorn and Peter Sanders.

Algorithms and data structures, 2008.

<https://people.mpi-inf.mpg.de/~mehlhorn/ftp/Mehlhorn-Sanders-Toolbox.pdf>.

► Gnarley Trees

[Gna] Gnarley Trees

<https://people.ksp.sk/~kuko/gnarley-trees/>

► **AVL-Tree**

[Wik] [AVL tree](#)

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AVL_tree

► **(a,b)-Tree**

[Wika] [2-3-4 tree](#)

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2%E2%80%933%E2%80%934_tree

[Wikb] [\(a,b\)-tree](#)

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/\(a,b\)-tree](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/(a,b)-tree)

► Red-Black-Tree

[Wik] [Red-black tree](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Red%E2%80%9993black_tree)

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Red%E2%80%9993black_tree