

Lecture 6: Data Structures III

COMP526: Efficient Algorithms

Updated: October 22, 2024

Will Rosenbaum

University of Liverpool

Announcements

- 1. Third Quiz, due Friday
	- Similar format to before
	- Covers fundamental data structures (Lectures 4–6)
	- Quiz is **closed resource**
		- No books, notes, internet, etc.
		- Do not discuss until after submission deadline (Friday night, after midnight)
- 2. Programming Assignment (Draft) Posted
	- Due Wednesday, 13 November
- 3. Attendance Code:

Meeting Goals

- Finish up heaps
	- Give an efficient array-backed PRIORITYQUEUE
- Introduce two more ADTs:
	- ORDEREDSET
	- MAP
- Introduce binary search trees
- Discuss balanced binary search trees

Heaps

Last Time: Priority Queues and Heaps

Priority Queues, Formally

Heap Implementation

- *S* is the state of the queue, initially $S = \emptyset$
- *S.INSERT* $(x, p(x))$: *S* = $x_0x_1 \cdots x_ix_{i+1} \cdots x_{n-1} \rightarrow$ $x_0 x_1 \cdots x_i x x_{i+1} \cdots x_{n-1}$
	- where $p(x_i) \leq p(x)$ $p(x_{i+1})$
- $S.MIN()$: returns x_0 where $S = x_0 x_1 \cdots x_{n-1}$
- *S.REMOVEMIN* $()$ *:* $xS \rightarrow S$ *.* returns *x*

- INSERT via BUBBLEUP procedure
- REMOVEMIN via TRICKLEDOWN procedure
- **Issue:** using NODEs incurs overhead
	- locality of reference
	- storing additional references

Question. How can we represent heaps as arrays?

A Clue: Number the Vertices

PollEverywhere Question

Suppose a vertex is assigned a label $i > 0$ in this numbering of the vertices. What is the label of *i*'s parent in the labeling?

pollev.com/comp526

Arrays as Heaps

Associate numbering of tree vertices as array indexes!

Complete binary tree representation

- If $i > 0$, then i 's parent has index $|(i-1)/2|$
- *i*'s left child has $index 2*i*+1$
- *i*'s right child has $index 2*i*+2$

Array representation

Example: Array BUBBLEUP

We can apply heap procedures directly to the array without reference to the tree itself!

- If *i* > 0, then *i*'s parent has index $|(i - 1)/2|$
- *i*'s left child has index $2i + 1$
- *i*'s right child has index $2i + 2$
- 1: **procedure** INSERT(p)
- 2: $v \leftarrow$ new vertex storing *p*
- 3: $u \leftarrow$ first vtx with < 2 children
- 4: add *v* as *u*'s child
- 5: PARENT $(v) \leftarrow u$
- 6: **while** $value(v) < value(u)$ and $u \neq \perp$ **do**
- 7: SWAP(*value*(*v*),*value*(*u*))
- 8: $v \leftarrow u$

9:
$$
u \leftarrow \text{PARENT}(v)
$$

- 10: **end while**
- 11: **end procedure**

Ω 2 1 3 2 13 3 10 4 6 5 66 6 39 7 42 8 17 9 96 10 70 11 89 12 95 13 98 14

Example. INSERT(4)

Array Backed Operations

Using arrays, we can define INSERT and REMOVEMIN much more cleanly!

- 1: **procedure** INSERT(p) 2: $i \leftarrow n$ \triangleright *n* is heap size 3: $a[i] \leftarrow p$ 4: $n \leftarrow n+1$ 5: $j \leftarrow \lfloor (i-1)/2 \rfloor$ \triangleright *j* is *i*'s parent 6: while $i > 0$ and $a[i] < a[i]$ do 7: SWAP(*a*,*i*,*j*) 8: $i \leftarrow j$ 9: $j \leftarrow |(i-1)/2|$ 10: **end while** 11: **end procedure** 9: *i* ← *j*
- 1: **procedure** REMOVEMIN
	- 2: $m \leftarrow a[0]$

$$
3: \qquad a[0] \leftarrow a[n-1]
$$

4:
$$
n \leftarrow n-1
$$

$$
5: \qquad i \leftarrow 0
$$

6: $j \leftarrow \text{argmin} \{a[2i+1], a[2i+2]\}$

7: while
$$
j < n
$$
 and $a[i] > a[j]$ do

$$
8: \qquad \text{SWAP}(a, i, j)
$$

$$
i \leftarrow j
$$

10:
$$
j \leftarrow \arg\min\{a[2i+1], a[2i+2]\}
$$

- 11: **end while**
- 12: **return** *m*

13: **end procedure**

Both of these operations still complete after *O*(log*n*) iterations

• very little overhead, since only array operations are used!

Ordered Sets and Maps

Adding Order to Elements

Question. What made our operations on heaps efficient?

• **Answer:** Order! We can order/compare priorities.

Two more ADT with **ordered** elements:

Ordered Sets store a collection (set) of *distinct* elements from an ordered universe.

- CONTAINS(*x*) check if the set contains $x' = x$ and return x'
- ADD(*x*) add *x* to the set if *x* was not present
- REMOVE (x) remove *x* if *x* was present

Maps*^a* store a collection of *values* with associated ordered *keys* with array-like access.

- PUT(*k*,*v*) set the value associated with key *k* to *v*
- GET(*k*) return the value associated with key *k*
- REMOVE(*k*) remove the pair associated with *k*
- CONTAINS(*k*) check if the map contains a value associated with *k*

*^a*Aka: associative arrays, dictionaries (Python dict), symbol table

Ordered Sets vs Maps

Ordered Sets

- CONTAINS(*x*) check if the set contains $x' = x$ and return x'
- ADD(*x*) add *x* to the set if *x* was not present
- REMOVE (x) remove *x* if *x* was present

Maps

- PUT(*k*,*v*) set the value associated with key *k* to *v*
- GET(*k*) return the value associated with key *k*
- REMOVE(*k*) remove the pair associated with *k*
- CONTAINS(*k*) check if the map contains a value associated with *k*

PollEverywhere Question

If we are given an ORDEREDSET implementation, how could we use it to implement a MAP?

Ordered Sets via Arrays

ORDEREDSETs can be implemented by arrays:

- Maintain a sorted array $a = [x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ with each $x_i \le x_{i+1}$.
- ADD(*x*) and REMOVE(*x*) implemented in Θ(*n*) worst case time
	- To ADD find index *i* such that $x_i \leq x \leq x_{i+1}$
	- Shift elements x_j with $j \geq i+1$ to next index
		- This uses Θ(*n*) time
	- Set $a[i+1] \leftarrow x$

Example. How to ADD(42)?

Question. How can we implement CONTAINS(*x*) more quickly?

Efficient Search

Idea. Binary Search:

- Start at the *middle index j*
	- $x \leq a[i] \implies \text{index of } x \text{ must}$ be $i \leq j$
	- otherwise *i* > *j*
- Apply procedure to remaining interval with half excluded
	- compare *x* to midpoint of remaining interval
	- eliminate half of the interval
- Repeat

1: **procedure** BINARYSEARCH(x)

- 2: $i \leftarrow 0, k \leftarrow n-1$
- 3: $j \leftarrow \lfloor (i+k)/2 \rfloor$ 4: while $i < j$ do
- 5: **if** $x \le a[i]$ **then**
- 6: $k \leftarrow j$ 7: **else**
- 8: $i \leftarrow j$ 9: **end if**
- 10: **end while**
- 11: **return** *i*
- 12: **end procedure**

Efficiency of Binary Search

PollEverywhere

What is the (worst case) running time of BINARYSEARCH on an array of length *n*?

pollev.com/comp526

- 1: **procedure** BINARYSEARCH(x)
- 2: $i \leftarrow 0, k \leftarrow n-1$
- 3: $j \leftarrow |(i+k)/2|$
- 4: **while** $i < j$ **do**
- 5: **if** $x \leq a[i]$ **then**

6:
$$
k \leftarrow j
$$

- 7: **else**
- 8: $i \leftarrow j$
- 9: **end if**
- 10: **end while**
- 11: **return** *i*
- 12: **end procedure**

Efficiency of Binary Search

Proposition

The worst-case running time of BINARYSEARCH is Θ(log*n*).

Proof.

- Consider the value of *k* −*i*.
- After *ℓ* iterations of the loop, have $k - i \leq \frac{n}{2^{\ell}}$ $\frac{n}{2^{\ell}}$ (induction)
- Termination when *k* −*i* < 1

•
$$
\ell = \lceil \log n \rceil + 1 \implies \frac{n}{2^{\ell}} \le 1
$$

1: **procedure** BINARYSEARCH(x)

$$
2: \qquad i \leftarrow 0, k \leftarrow n-1
$$

$$
3: \qquad j \leftarrow \lfloor (i+k)/2 \rfloor
$$

4: **while** $i < j$ **do**

5: if
$$
x \le a[j]
$$
 then

6:
$$
k \leftarrow j
$$

7: **else**

8:
$$
i \leftarrow j
$$

- 9: **end if**
- 10: **end while**
- 11: **return** *i*
- 12: **end procedure**

Making All Operations Efficient?

A Nagging Question

For ORDEREDSETs, we can perform all operations in *o*(*n*) time?

- Array implementation only gives CONTAINS in *O*(log*n*) time
- Other operations are Θ(*n*)
- This seems harder than efficient PRIORITYQUEUE as elements can be added *and* removed from anywhere in the data structure

Up next: A solution in two parts

- 1. Binary Search Trees
- 2. Balancing Binary Trees

Binary Search Trees

Binary Search Tree Definition

Definition

Suppose *T* is a binary tree and every vertex *v* in *T* has an associated value. We say *T* is a **binary search tree** (**BST**) if for every vertex (value) *v*:

- 1. every *left descendant u* satisfies $u \le v$,
- 2. every *right descendant w* satisfies $w \ge v$.

BST Search

Question

Given a BST *T*, how can we search for a value *x* in *T*?

CONTAINS(19)?

BST Search

Ouestion

Given a BST *T*, how can we search for a value *x* in *T*?

- 1: **procedure** CONTAINS(*x*)
- 2: $v =$ tree root
- 3: **while** $v \neq x$ and $v \neq \perp$ **do**
- 4: **if** $x < v$ then
- 5: $v \leftarrow \text{LEFTCHILD}(v)$
- 6: **else**
- 7: $v \leftarrow \text{RIGHTCHILD}(v)$
- 8: **end if**
- 9: **end while**
- 10: **return** ν
- 11: **end procedure**

PollEverywhere

What is the (worst case) running time of CONTAINS on a tree with *n* vertices?

pollev.com/comp526

BST CONTAINS **Efficiency**

Observation

The (worst-case) running time of CONTAINS on *T* is Θ(*h*) where *h* is the **height** of *T*

• *h* is the length of the longest path from root to any leaf in *T*

The height of *T* can be:

- As small as log*n*
- As large as *n*−1

The Moral

The efficiency of CONTAINS depends on the structure of *T*.

Question

How could we ADD(19) to the following BST so it remains a BST?

Observation. To ADD(*x*), we should add a new vertex wherever the CONTAINS(*x*) execution fails to find *x*.

Adding in Pseudocode

25

Adding in Pseudocode

PollEverywhere Question

Describe a sequence of ADD(*x*) operations starting from an empty BST such that every operation takes $\Omega(n)$ time.

pollev.com/comp526

BST Remove

Question

How could we remove an element from a BST?

Case 1: A leaf. Just remove it!

BST Remove

Question

How could we remove an element from a BST?

Case 2: A vertex *v* **with single child**. Splice! Set *v*'s child to be its parent's child.

BST Remove

Question

How could we remove an element from a BST?

Case 3: A vertex *v* **with two children**.

- 1. Find *next smallest* value *w*.
- 2. Copy *w*'s value to *v*.
- 3. Remove *w*

So Far. . .

. . . we've implemented

- CONTAINS(*x*)
- $ADD(x)$
- REMOVE(*x*)

for ORDEREDSETs.

But we haven't improved *efficiency*

- All of these operations can cost as much as Θ(*n*)
	- efficiency depends on previous operations performed!

Idea. We can *restructure* BSTs.

- Goal: ensure that the BST has small **height**.
- After each update, check and update tree structure.
	- maintain BST property
	- updates performed efficiently

Balanced Binary Trees

Distinguishing the Good from the Bad

Height Balanced Trees

Definition (Left and Right Height)

Let ν be a vertex in a tree. We define:

- $h(\perp) = -1$
- $h(v) = 1 + \max(h(\text{LEFTCHILD}(v)), h(\text{RIGHTCHILD}(v)))$
- $h_{\ell}(v) = h(\text{LEFTCHILD}(v))$
- $h_r(v) = h(RIGHTCHILD(v))$

Height Balanced Trees

Definition (Left and Right Height)

Let ν be a vertex in a tree. We define:

- $h(\perp) = -1$
- $h(v) = 1 + \max(h(\text{LEFTCHILD}(v)), h(\text{RIGHTCHILD}(v)))$
- $h_{\ell}(v) = h(\text{LEFTCHILD}(v))$
- $h_r(v) = h(RIGHTCHILD(v))$

Def. (Height Balanced)

We call a tree **height balanced** if for every vertex v , $|h_{\ell}(v) - h_r(v)| \leq 1$.

Properties of Height Balanced Trees

Proposition

Suppose T is a height balanced tree of height h . Then T has $n \geq 2^{h/2}$ vertices.

Proof.

Let *M*(*h*) denote the minimum size of a height balanced tree of height *h*.

- Observe that $M(0) = 1$, $M(1) = 2$.
- In general $M(h) \ge 1 + M(h-1) + M(h-2)$
	- one subtree of the root is a height balanced tree of height *h*−1
	- other subtree is height balanced with height at least *h*−2
- So *M*(*h*) ≥ 2*M*(*h*−2)
- Inductive argument $\implies M(h) \ge 2^{h/2}$.

Properties of Height Balanced Trees

Proposition

Suppose *T* is a height balanced tree of height *h*. Then *T* has *n* ≥ 2 *h*/2 vertices.

Consequences.

If *T* is a height balanced tree with *n* vertices, then its height *h* satisfies $h \leq 2 \log n$

- =⇒ CONTAINS(*x*) takes time *O*(log*n*)
- \implies ADD(*x*) takes time $O(\log n)$
- \implies REMOVE(*x*) takes time $O(\log n)$

Maintaining Height Balance

Our Strategy. Maintain a BST that is height balanced **for any sequence of operations performed**.

- No one is *forcing* us to keep the tree structure determined by our ADD/REMOVE operations
	- there are many valid BSTs that store the same collection of elements!
- Starting from a balanced tree, ADD(*x*) may introduce imbalance.
- If imbalance is introduced try to fix it:
	- find closest unbalanced vertex to *x* and correct its balance
	- look for other imbalance and correct it

For next time. Think about how you could implement this strategy.

- *Where* could imbalance occur? And how much?
- What *local* operations can fix the imbalance?
- What is the worst-case running time of restoring balance?

Next Time: Sorting

- Finishing Balanced BSTs
- The Sorting Task
- Efficient Sorting by Divide and Conquer

Scratch Notes