Announcements

• HW2 due Wednesday
• Help sessions this week
  – Monday & Thursday: Binary Search Trees and AVL Trees
• Last lecture: Binary Search Trees
• Today… AVL Trees
Review: Binary Search Tree (BST)

- **Structure** property (binary tree)
  - Each node has $\leq 2$ 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
**BST: Efficiency of Operations?**

- Problem: operations may be inefficient if BST is unbalanced.

- Find, insert, delete
  - $O(n)$ in the worst case

- BuildTree
  - $O(n^2)$ in the worst case

How?
How can we make a BST efficient?

Observation
• BST: the shallower the better!

Solution: Require and maintain a Balance Condition that
1. Ensures depth is always $O(\log n)$ – strong enough!
2. Is efficient to maintain – not too strong!

• When we build the tree, make sure it’s balanced.
• BUT…Balancing a tree only at build time is insufficient because sequences of operations can eventually transform our carefully balanced tree into the dreaded list 😞
• So, we also need to also keep the tree balanced as we perform operations.
**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:*

---
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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: \( \text{balance}(\text{node}) = \text{height}(\text{node}.\text{left}) - \text{height}(\text{node}.\text{right}) \)

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

- Ensures small depth
  - This is because an AVL tree of height \( h \) must have a number of nodes exponential in \( h \)
    Thus height must be \( \log(\text{number of nodes}) \).

- Efficient to maintain
  - Using single and double rotations
The **AVL Tree Data Structure**

An AVL tree is a **self-balancing** binary search tree.

**Structural properties**

1. **Binary tree** property (same as BST)
2. **Order** property (same as for BST)

1. **Balance property:**
   balance of every node is between -1 and 1

Result: **Worst-case** depth is $O(\log n)$

- Named after inventors Adelson-Velskii and Landis (AVL)
  - First invented in 1962
Is this an AVL tree?

Yes! Because the left and right subtrees of every node have heights differing by at most 1
Is this an AVL tree?

Nope! The left and right subtrees of some nodes (e.g. 1, 4, 6) have heights that differ by more than 1.
What do AVL trees give us?

• If we have an AVL tree, then the number of nodes is an exponential function of the height.

• Thus the height is a log function of the number of nodes!

• And thus find is $O(\log n)$

But as we insert and delete elements, we need to:
1. Track balance
2. Detect imbalance
3. Restore balance
An AVL Tree

Track height at all times!
AVL tree operations

• **AVL find:**
  – Same as BST find

• **AVL insert:**
  – First BST insert, *then* check balance and potentially “fix” the AVL tree
  – Four different imbalance cases

• **AVL delete:**
  – The “easy way” is lazy deletion
  – Otherwise, do the deletion and then check for several imbalance cases (we will skip this)
**Insert: detect potential imbalance**

1. Insert the new node as in a BST (a new leaf)
2. For each node on the path from the root to the new leaf, the insertion may (or may not) have changed the node’s height
3. So after insertion in a subtree, detect height imbalance and perform a *rotation* to restore balance at that node

All the action is in defining the correct *rotations* to restore balance

Fact that an implementation can ignore:
- There must be a *deepest* element that is imbalanced after the insert (all descendants still balanced)
- After rebalancing this deepest node, every node is balanced
- So at most one node needs to be rebalanced
Case #1: Example

Insert(6)
Insert(3)
Insert(1)

Third insertion violates balance property
  • happens to be at the root

What is the only way to fix this?
Fix: Apply "Single Rotation"

- **Single rotation**: The basic operation we’ll use to rebalance
  - Move child of unbalanced node into parent position
  - Parent becomes the “other” child (always okay in a BST!)
  - Other subtrees move in only way BST allows (next slide)

AVL Property violated at node 6

Child’s new-height = old-height-before-insert
The example generalized: Left of Left

- Insertion into left-left grandchild causes an imbalance
  - 1 of 4 possible imbalance causes (other 3 coming up!)
- Creates an imbalance in the AVL tree (specifically a is imbalanced)
The general left-left case

- So we *rotate* at *a*
  - Move left child of unbalanced node into parent position
  - Parent becomes the right child
  - Other sub-trees move in the only way BST allows:
    - using BST facts: X < b < Y < a < Z

- A single rotation restores balance at the node
  - To same height as before insertion, so ancestors now balanced
Another example: \texttt{insert}(16)
The general right-right case

- Mirror image to left-left case, so you rotate the other way
  - Exact same concept, but needs different code
Two cases to go

Unfortunately, single rotations are not enough for insertions in the left-right subtree or the right-left subtree

Simple example: \texttt{insert(1)}, \texttt{insert(6)}, \texttt{insert(3)}
  
  – First wrong idea: single rotation like we did for left-left

Violates order property!
Two cases to go

Unfortunately, single rotations are not enough for insertions in the left-right subtree or the right-left subtree.

Simple example: insert(1), insert(6), insert(3)
- Second wrong idea: single rotation on the child of the unbalanced node

Still unbalanced!
Sometimes two wrongs make a right 😊

- First idea violated the order property
- Second idea didn’t fix balance
- But if we do both single rotations, starting with the second, it works! (And not just for this example.)
- **Double rotation:**
  1. Rotate problematic child and grandchild
  2. Then rotate between self and new child
The general right-left case
Comments

- Like in the left-left and right-right cases, the height of the subtree after rebalancing is the same as before the insert
  - So no ancestor in the tree will need rebalancing
- Does not have to be implemented as two rotations; can just do:

Easier to remember than you may think:
- Move c to grandparent’s position
- Put a, b, X, U, V, and Z in the only legal positions for a BST
The last case: left-right

- Mirror image of right-left
  - Again, no new concepts, only new code to write
Insert, summarized

- Insert as in a BST
- Check back up path for imbalance, which will be 1 of 4 cases:
  - Node’s left-left grandchild is too tall
  - Node’s left-right grandchild is too tall
  - Node’s right-left grandchild is too tall
  - Node’s right-right grandchild is too tall
- Only one case occurs because tree was balanced before insert
- After the appropriate single or double rotation, the smallest-unbalanced subtree has the same height as before the insertion
  - So all ancestors are now balanced
Example
Insert a 6

What’s the deepest node that is unbalanced?

What’s the case?

What do we do?

left-left
Insert a 6
Insert a 13
What is the deepest unbalanced node?

Insert a 14
Insert a 14

What is the deepest unbalanced node?
Which of the four cases is this?
Still left-left!
Single rotation
Insert a 14
Now efficiency

- Worst-case complexity of **find**: $O(\log n)$
  - Tree is balanced

- Worst-case complexity of **insert**: $O(\log n)$
  - Tree starts balanced
  - A rotation is $O(1)$ and there’s an $O(\log n)$ path to root
  - Tree ends balanced

- Worst-case complexity of **buildTree**: $O(n \log n)$

Takes some more rotation action to handle **delete**...
Pros and Cons of AVL Trees

Arguments for AVL trees:

1. All operations logarithmic worst-case because trees are always balanced
2. Height balancing adds no more than a constant factor to the speed of insert and delete

Arguments against AVL trees:

1. More difficult to program & debug [but done once in a library!]
2. More space for height field
3. Asymptotically faster but rebalancing takes a little time
4. If amortized (later) logarithmic time is enough, use splay trees (also in the text)
Practice

Insert 30, 20, 15, 10, 25, 40, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Which is the deepest unbalanced node?

Which case is it?

left-right
(left child of unbalanced node, right side of that left child)

Can you do it?