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Announcements
• Project 2 – posted later this afternoon
• Homework 2 – due Friday Jan 21st at beginning of class, see clarifications posted

Today
• Dictionaries
  – AVL Trees

The AVL Balance Condition
Left and right subtrees of every node have equal heights differing by at most 1
Define: balance(x) = height(x.left) – height(x.right)
AVL property: −1 ≤ balance(x) ≤ 1, for every node x
• Ensures small depth
  – Will prove this by showing that an AVL tree of height
    h must have a lot of (i.e. Θ(2^h)) nodes
• Easy to maintain
  – Using single and double rotations

The AVL Tree Data Structure
Structural properties
1. Binary tree property
   (0, 1, or 2 children)
2. Heights of left and right subtrees of every node differ by at most 1
Result:
   Worst case depth of any node is: O(log n)
Ordering property
  – Same as for BST
An AVL tree?

Proving Shallowness Bound

Let \( S(h) \) be the min # of nodes in an AVL tree of height \( h \)

Claim: \( S(h) = S(h-1) + S(h-2) + 1 \)

Solution of recurrence: \( S(h) = \Theta(2^h) \) (like Fibonacci numbers)

AVL tree of height \( h=4 \) with the min # of nodes

The shallowness bound

Let \( S(h) \) = the minimum number of nodes in an AVL tree of height \( h \)

- If we can prove that \( S(h) \) grows exponentially in \( h \), then a tree with \( n \) nodes has a logarithmic height

• Step 1: Define \( S(h) \) inductively using AVL property
  - \( S(-1)=0, S(0)=1, S(1)=2 \)
  - For \( h \geq 2, S(h) = 1+S(h-1)+S(h-2) \)

• Step 2: Show this recurrence grows really fast
  - Similar to Fibonacci numbers
  - Can prove for all \( h \), \( S(h) > \phi^h - 1 \) where \( \phi \) is the golden ratio, \((1+\sqrt{5})/2\), about 1.62
  - Growing faster than 1.6\(^h\) is “plenty” exponential

Before we prove it

- Good intuition from plots comparing:
  - \( S(h) \) computed directly from the definition
  - \((1+\sqrt{5})/2 \)^\(h\)

- \( S(h) \) is always bigger
- Graphs aren’t proofs, so let’s prove it

The Golden Ratio

\[ \phi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} = 1.62 \]

This is a special number

• Aside: Since the Renaissance, many artists and architects have proportioned their work (e.g., length:height) to approximate the golden ratio: If \((a+b)/a = a/b\), then \(a = \phi b\)

• We will need one special arithmetic fact about \( \phi \):

\[
\begin{align*}
\phi^2 &= (1+\sqrt{5})/2 \cdot (1+\sqrt{5})/2 \\
&= 1 + 2\cdot(\sqrt{5}/2) + 5/4 \\
&= (6 + 2\cdot\sqrt{5} + 5)/4 \\
&= (3 + 5\cdot\sqrt{5}/2)/2 \\
&= 1 + (1 + 5\cdot\sqrt{5}/2)/2 \\
&= 1 + \phi
\end{align*}
\]

The proof

\[ S(-1)=0, S(0)=1, S(1)=2 \]

For \( h \geq 2, S(h) = 1+S(h-1)+S(h-2) \)

Theorem: For all \( h \geq 0 \), \( S(h) > \phi^h - 1 \)

Proof: By induction on \( h \)

Base cases:
- \( S(0) = 1 > \phi^0 - 1 = 0 \)
- \( S(1) = 2 > \phi^1 - 1 = 0.62 \)

Inductive case (\( k > 1 \)):

Show \( S(k+1) > \phi^{k+1} - 1 \) assuming \( S(k) > \phi^k - 1 \) and \( S(k-1) > \phi^{k-1} - 1 \)

\[ S(k+1) = 1 + S(k) + S(k-1) \]

by definition of \( S \)

\[ > 1 + \phi^{k-1} - 1 + \phi^{k-1} - 1 \]

by induction

\[ = \phi^k \cdot (\phi + 1) - 1 \]

by arithmetic (factor \( \phi^{k-1} \))

\[ = \phi^k \cdot \phi - 1 \]

by special property of \( \phi \)

\[ = \phi^{k+1} - 1 \]

by arithmetic (add exponents)
Good news

Proof means that if we have an AVL tree, then \( \text{find} \) is \( O(\log n) \).

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

Is this tree AVL balanced?
How about after insert(30)?

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, like insert we do the deletion and then have several imbalance cases

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 recursive 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 makes it a bit easier:
- 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

AVL tree insert

Let \( x \) be the node where an imbalance occurs.
Four cases to consider. The insertion is in the
1. left subtree of the left child of \( x \).
2. right subtree of the left child of \( x \).
3. left subtree of the right child of \( x \).
4. right subtree of the right child of \( x \).

Idea: Cases 1 & 4 are solved by a single rotation.
Cases 2 & 3 are solved by a double rotation.

Case #1 Example

Insert(6)
Insert(3)
Insert(1)
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)
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The example generalized

• Node imbalanced due to insertion somewhere in left-left grandchild increasing height
  – 1 of 4 possible imbalance causes (other three coming)
• First we did the insertion, which would make a imbalanced
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The general left-left case

• Node imbalanced due to insertion somewhere in left-left grandchild increasing height
  – 1 of 4 possible imbalance causes (other three coming)
• So we rotate at a, using BST facts: X < b < Y < a < Z
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Another example: insert(16)
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The general right-right case

- Mirror image to left-left case, so you rotate the other way
  - Exact same concept, but need 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: `insert(1), insert(6), insert(3)`
- First wrong idea: single rotation like we did for left-left

Sometimes two wrongs make a right ☺

- First idea violated the BST 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

Case #3 Example

- `insert(1)`
- `insert(6)`
- `insert(3)`
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:

```
X
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h
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Z
```

Easier to remember than you may think:
Move c to grandparent's position and then put a, b, X, U, V, and Z in the right places to get a legal BST

The last case: left-right

• Mirror image of right-left
  – Again, no new concepts, only new code to write

```
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```

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

Now efficiency

Have argued rotations restore AVL property but do they produce an efficient data structure?

• Worst-case complexity of find: $O(\log n)$
• Worst-case complexity of insert: $O(\log n)$
  – A rotation is $O(1)$ and there's an $O(\log n)$ path to root
  – (Same complexity even without one-rotation-is-enough fact)
• Worst-case complexity of buildTree: $O(n \log n)$

Will take some more rotation action to handle delete...
More Examples…

Insert into an AVL tree: a b e c d

Single and Double Rotations:
Inserting what integer values would cause the tree to need a:
1. single rotation?
2. double rotation?
3. no rotation?

Easy Insert
Insert(3)

Hard Insert
Insert(33)

Single Rotation
**Hard Insert**

Insert(18)

```
3
/   \
10   
/     \
5     15
/       \
2       3
```

Unbalanced?

How to fix?

**Single Rotation (oops!)**

```
3
/   \      \   /
10    15  3   10
/ \   / \   / \ /
5  2  3  2  3  18 0
/   \   \   \   \   \
20 17 12 11  17 12 0
```

**Double Rotation (Step #1)**

```
3
/   \      \   /
10    15  3   10
/ \   / \   / \ /
5  2  3  3  2  15 11
/   \   \   \   \   \
20 17 12 11 15 12 11
```

**Double Rotation (Step #2)**

```
3
/   \      \   /
10    15  3   10
/ \   / \   / \ /
5  2  3  3  2  15 11
/   \   \   \   \   \
20 17 12 11 15 12 11
```

How to fix?