

## AVL Search Tree

Test cases are reused from `Binary_Search_Tree()`, but modified to fit a balanced BST. Cases of left/right heavy are all considered in the test, including the new height when balanced.

The recursions for `insert_element()` and `remove_element()` are drastically modified to accommodate the `__balance()` method required for AVL Tree. In this case, the return invocation for both recursion points towards to the `__balance()` method to finalize the tree for proper output. Regardless, the general structure for `insert_element()` and `remove_element()` methods remains the same as project 4.

**`__balance()`,  $O(1)$ :** In worst case scenario, only three main nodes are involved in the rotation of the tree itself. As a consequent, the `_right_rotate()` and `_left_rotate()` methods are also in constant time. `__balance()` consists of conditionals to determine if the tree is either left/right heavy. The height of individual node is called upon by the `_get_balance()` ( $O(1)$ ) method under `BST_Node` class, where the information is stored under the `self.height` attribute of each node.

**Fraction and sorting:** Under the `Fraction` class, `Binary_Search_Tree` and `randint` are imported. First, an empty list is created so that x number of fractions can be appended (in this case, 10). `randint` is used to create random fractions, which are reduced automatically under the `__init__` constructor. To avoid the chances of having repeated fractions under the list, the range of `randint` is extended (from 1 to 500) so that it is very unlikely that two fractions will be the same in the list, as to avoid value error when insert into the `Binary_Search_Tree`. Then, each fraction is inserted into the tree, where it is automatically sorted based on BST rules. Finally, the `to_list()` method was invoked to output the in\_order traversal, giving a sorted list of fractions. This sorting method is highly effective since its worst case scenario is wholly dependent on the method with the worst time complexity, `to_list()`,  $O(n)$ . Compared to selection and insertion sort, this sorting method is by far the best.

**`get_height()`,  $O(1)$ :** In order to keep this public method constant, the height is stored under the `Binary Search Tree` `__init__` constructor as `self.__tr` attribute so that every time the `insert_element()` or `remove_element()` method is called, a private `_height()` method is invoked so that the height can be recursively calculated under the `insert_element()` and `remove_element()` methods. Although this will impact the performance of the mentioned two methods, the work-around guarantees the `get_height()` method to be constant time since it will only return an already stored-value under the attribute `self.height`. For the performance of `_get_height()`, the recursion forces the interpreter to visit every single node within the tree, therefore giving the worst case performance of  $O(n)$ .

**`insert_element()`,  $O(\log_2(n))$  as worst case, ignoring `_get_height()` invocation:** The `insert_element()` invokes the main `_insert_recursion()` method. In this method, the recursion traverses and compares values either on the left or right side of the root. Since this is a binary search tree, the time complexity for this private method is  $O(\log_2(n))$ . The base case where the root node is empty is no longer covered under the public method.

**remove\_element(),  $O(\log_2(n))$  as worst case, ignoring \_get\_height():** The method takes on a similar nature as to **insert\_element()**, but there are now more cases to be considered, like when the removed node has left/right child or two children. The method also invokes the private **\_remove\_recursion()** method to consider the cases. The time performance is accounted for which side the value is located, giving the recursion method  $O(\log_2(n))$ .

Each depth-first traversal (**in\_order()**, **pre\_order()**, and **post\_order()**) are organized so that it takes two private methods to invoke the recursion and produce the desired string formatting. For example, for the **in\_order()** method, the content invokes the **\_in\_order()** private method, where the base case is considered and begins the string concatenations and formatting. To get the desired ordering of the node values, another private method, **\_in\_order\_rec()**, is invoked within the **\_in\_order()** method, leading to the recursion of the string format. Essentially, the order of the recursion is extremely important, but it all begins at the root node. Depending upon the type of depth-first, the recursion can concatenate the node value depending on the node.left or node.right value, it can enter the recursion again, but this time, the node attributes (left or right) becomes the “root node” in this traversal. This gives the worst-case time complexity of  **$O(n)$** :

“For a Graph, the complexity of a depth-first traversal is  $O(n + m)$ , where  $n$  is the number of nodes, and  $m$  is the number of edges. Since a binary search tree is also a Graph, the same applies here. The complexity of each of these depth-first traversals is  $O(n+m)$ . Since the number of edges that can originate from a node is limited to 2 in the case of a Binary Tree, the maximum number of total edges in a Binary Tree is  $n-1$ , where  $n$  is the total number of nodes. Thus, the complexity then becomes  $O(n + n-1)$ , which is  $O(n)$ ”.<sup>i</sup>

Similarly, the **to\_list()** method also has a worst case complexity of  $O(n)$ .

**breadth\_first(),  $O(n)$ :** This method is not a recursion, but rather uses ADT Queue from the previous project to implement horizontal traversal on the binary search tree. The method first enqueues the self.\_\_root and then considers its subtree from left to right. If there is a value, add the value to the string. The time complexity is  $O(n)$  since the method visits every node once.

---

<sup>i</sup> <https://stackoverflow.com/questions/4547012/complexities-of-binary-tree-traversals>