2-3 Trees continued Other Self-Balancing Search Trees

CS 311 Data Structures and Algorithms Lecture Slides Friday, November 15, 2024

Glenn G. Chappell Department of Computer Science University of Alaska Fairbanks ggchappell@alaska.edu © 2005-2024 Glenn G. Chappell Some material contributed by Chris Hartman

Unit Overview Tables & Priority Queues

Topics

- ✓ Introduction to Tables
- ✓ Priority Queues
- Binary Heap Algorithms
- ✓ Heaps & Priority Queues in the C++ STL
- (part) 2-3 Trees
 - Other self-balancing search trees
 - Hash Tables
 - Prefix Trees
 - Tables in the C++ STL & Elsewhere

Review

Our problem for most of the rest of the semester:

- Store: A collection of data items, all of the same type.
- Operations:
 - Access items [single item: retrieve/find, all items: traverse].
 - Add new itern [insert].
 - Eliminate existing item [delete].
- Time & space efficiency are desirable.

Note the three primary single-item operations: **retrieve, insert, delete.** We will see these over & over again.

A solution to this problem is a **container**.

In a generic container, client code can specify the value type.

A **Table** allows for arbitrary key-based look-up.Three single-item operations: retrieve, insert, delete by key.A Table implementation typically holds **key-value pairs**.



Three ideas for improving efficiency:

- 1. Restricted Table \rightarrow Priority Queues
- 2. Keep a tree balanced \rightarrow Self-balancing search trees
- 3. Magic functions \rightarrow Hash Tables

Unit Overview Tables & Priority Queues

Topics		
✓ ■	Introduction to Tables <	- Several lousy implementations
√ ∎	Priority Queues	
✓ ■	Binary Heap Algorithms	Idea #1: Restricted Table
✓ ■	Heaps & Priority Queues in the C++ STL	
(part) 🛛	2-3 Trees	Idea #2, Keep a tree balanced
	Other self-balancing search trees	
•	Hash Tables	Idea #3: Magic functions
	Prefix Trees	- A special-purpose
1.1	Tables in the C++ STL & Elsewhere	implementation: "the Radix Sort of Table implementations"

Overview of Advanced Table Implementations

We cover the following advanced Table implementations.

- Self-balancing search trees
 - To make things easier, allow more children (?):
 - (part) 2-3 Tree
 - Up to 3 children
 - 2-3-4 Tree
 - Up to 4 children
 - Red-Black Tree
 - Binary Tree representation of a 2-3-4 Tree
 - Or back up and try for a strongly balanced Binary Search Tree again:

AVL Tree

Alternatively, forget about trees entirely:

Hash Table

- Finally, "the Radix Sort of Table implementations":
 - Prefix Tree

Idea #2: Keep a tree balanced

> Later, we cover other self-balancing search trees: B-Trees, B+ Trees.

Idea #3: Magic functions

Review 2-3 Trees [1/5]

A Binary-Search-Tree style node is a **2-node**.

- A node with 2 subtrees & 1 key.
- The key lies between the keys in the two subtrees.

In a 2-3 Tree we also allow a node to be a **3-node**.

- A node with 3 subtrees & 2 keys.
- Each of the 2 keys lies between the keys in the corresponding pair of consecutive subtrees.

Later, we will look at 2-3-4 Trees, which can also have **4-nodes**.



Review 2-3 Trees [2/5]

- A **2-3 Search Tree** (generally just **2-3 Tree**) is a tree with the following properties [John Hopcroft 1970].
 - Each node is either a 2-node or a 3-node.
 The associated order properties hold.
 - Each node either has its full complement of children, or else is a leaf.
 - All leaves lie in the same level.

To **traverse** in a 2-3 Tree:

- Use the appropriate generalization of inorder traversal.
- Items are visited in sorted order.

To **retrieve** by key in a 2-3 Tree:

 Begin at the root and go down, using the order properties, until either the key is found, or it is clearly not in the tree.



Review 2-3 Trees [3/5]

To insert in a 2-3 Tree:

- Find the leaf that the new item should go in.
- If it fits, then simply put it in that node.

 Otherwise, there is an over-full node (shown in blue). Split it, and move the middle item up. Either recursively insert this item in the parent, or else create a new root, if there is no parent.



Do **insert 20** in the following 2-3 Tree. Draw the resulting tree.



Answer on next slide.

Review 2-3 Trees [5/5] (Try It!)

Do **insert 20** in the following 2-3 Tree. Draw the resulting tree. **Answer**





2-3 Trees

continued

2-3 Trees Delete Algorithm [1/10]

Deleting from a 2-3 Tree is similar to inserting, but a bit more complicated.

- As with inserting, we search, start at a leaf, and work our way up.
 - Simply delete from a leaf, if possible.

 - If that does not work, then do a *rotation*, if possible. If neither works, then bring an item from the parent down. This is like "deleting" from the parent. Recursively apply the delete procedure to the parent, dragging subtrees along as appropriate. If we end up "deleting" the root, then the height of the tree goes down by one.
- I call these three **easy case**, **semi-easy case**, and **hard case**, respectively.

Observation. We can always start our deletion at a leaf.

- If the item to be deleted is not in a leaf, then swap it with its successor in the sorted traversal order.
 - It must have a successor, which must be a leaf. (Why?)

This swap operation comes *before* the recursive deletion procedure.

Example 1. Delete 25.

20

Easy Case



CS 311 Fall 2024

2-3 Trees Delete Algorithm [3/10]

Semi-Easy Case

- If the item to be deleted is in a node that contains no other item and if, next to this node, there is a sibling that contains 2 items, we can perform a **rotation** using the parent:
 - Bring an item up from the nearby sibling.
 - Bring the parent down.
 - Drag along subtrees as appropriate.

Example 2. Delete 8.



2-3 Trees Delete Algorithm [4/10]

Hard Case

- If the item to be deleted is in a node with no other item, and there are no nearby 2-item siblings, then we bring down an item from the parent and place it in a nearby sibling node.
- Bringing down an item requires recursively applying the delete procedure on the next level up, dragging subtrees along as needed.

Example 3. Delete 7.



Above, "delete" 4 from the tree consisting of the top two levels. 4's node has another item in it, so this is *easy case*; simply get rid of 4 in the parent (one level down, it goes in the node with 2).

2-3 Trees Delete Algorithm [5/10]

In a recursive "delete", where do *orphaned subtrees* go? In each example, we "delete" 40. One of its subtrees is going away, and it is moving down.

Two hard case examples.

- Q. What happens to other subtree of 40?
- A. Make it a subtree of the item we bring down.

A semi-easy case example.

- 30 comes down to replace 40. 20 goes up.
- Q. What to do with the right subtree of 20?
- A. Make it the left subtree of 30.



2-3 Tree **Delete** Algorithm (outline)

- Find the node holding the given key.
 - If it turns out that the given key is not in the tree, then act accordingly.
- If the above node is not a leaf, then swap its item with its successor in the traversal ordering. Continue with the deletion procedure: delete the given key from its new (leaf) node.
- 3 Cases
 - **Easy Case** (item shares a node with another item). Delete item. Done.
 - Semi-Easy Case (otherwise: item has a consecutive sibling holding 2 items). Do rotation: sibling item up, parent down, to replace the item to be deleted. Done.
 - Hard Case (otherwise). Eliminate the node holding the item, and move item from the parent down, adding it to consecutive sibling node. If the parent is the root, then reduce the height of the tree. Otherwise, eliminate the item from the parent by recursively applying the deletion procedure—dragging subtrees along.

A few more examples.

Example 4. Delete 1.

- 1 is hard case, so we bring down the parent (recursively "delete" 2) and join it with 3 in a single node.
- 2 is semi-easy case, so rotate (6 to 4 to 2).
- The 5 node is orphaned. Make it the right child of the 4 node.



2-3 Trees Delete Algorithm [8/10]

Example 5. Delete 2.

• 2 is easy case.



Example 6. Delete 3.

- 3 is hard case. We need to bring down 4 and join it with 5.
- 4 is *hard case*. We need to bring down 6 and join it with 8.
- 6 is the root. Reduce the height of the tree.
- The 4-5 node is orphaned. Make it the left child of the new root.



CS 311 Fall 2024

Do **delete 20** in the following 2-3 Tree. Draw the resulting tree.



Answer on next slide.

Do **delete 20** in the following 2-3 Tree. Draw the resulting tree. **Answer**





Fact. A 2-3 Tree with *n* keys must have height less than $\log_2(n + 1)$. So the maximum height, given *n*, is $\Theta(\log n)$. And each single-item operation follows a single root-leaf path.

What is the order of the following 2-3 Tree operations?

- Traverse
 - Θ(n) [as usual].
- Retrieve
 - Θ(log n).
- Insert
 - Θ(log *n*).
- Delete
 - Θ(log *n*). ←

This is the first time we have seen an insert-by-key that handles an *arbitrary key* and is faster than linear time *even if we disallow multiple equivalent keys*.

This is the first time we have seen a delete-by-key that handles an *arbitrary key* and is faster than linear time.

This is what we are looking for.

A 2-3 Tree is a good basis for an implementation of a Table.

2024-11-15

CS 311 Fall 2024

2-3 Trees In Practice

- Q. When are 2-3 Trees used in practice?
- A. Pretty much never.
- When we consider how to implement a Table, a 2-3 Tree is a good choice. But it is never quite the *best* choice. In every situation, there is some other implementation that is at least a bit better.
- Q. Why, then, are we studying 2-3 Trees in such detail?
- A. Some of the self-balancing search trees that are actually used in Table implementations are based on 2-3 Trees, but have added complexity. Studying 2-3 Trees helps us understand them.
- We will not study these other self-balancing search trees in detail. Rather, we will note that they are just like 2-3 Trees, except ...

Other Self-Balancing Search Trees

- A 2-3 Tree is a kind of **self-balancing search tree**. There are many other kinds.
- These are mostly *not* strongly balanced Binary Search Trees, but most of them do place limits on height in a way that allows for retrieve, insert, and delete to be logarithmic-time operations.
- We look briefly at the following self-balancing search trees, all of which have $\Theta(\log n)$ retrieve, insert, and delete.
 - 2-3-4 Trees
 - Very much like 2-3 Trees, but allowing 4-nodes.
 - Red-Black Trees
 - Binary Search Tree representation of a 2-3-4 Tree. Not strongly balanced. Each node also holds a Boolean value.
 - AVL Trees
 - Actual strongly balanced Binary Search Trees, but with a bit of extra data in each node, telling which subtree has greater height.

Suppose we generalize a 2-3 Tree slightly, by allowing 4-nodes. The result is a **2-3-4 Search Tree** (generally just **2-3-4 Tree**) [Rudolf Bayer 1972].



In all other ways, the definition of a 2-3-4 Tree is exactly like that of a 2-3 Tree.

Insert & delete algorithms for 2-3-4 Trees are very similar to those for 2-3 Trees.

They tend to be just a little faster, on average.

We can increase the efficiency of 2-3-4 Tree operations by representing the tree using a Binary Search Tree plus a little more information. The result is a **Red-Black Tree** [Leonidas J. Guibas & Robert Sedgewick 1978].

Consider the 4-node on the left, below. We can represent this part of the 2-3-4 Tree using only 2-nodes if we add two new nodes (shown in **red**).



The ordering property of the 2-3-4 Tree translates into the ordering property of a Binary Search Tree.

Other Self-Balancing Search Trees Red-Black Trees — Idea [2/3]



We can also apply this process to a 3-node—in two different ways.



30

2024-11-15

A **Red-Black Tree** is a Binary-Tree representation of a 2-3-4 Tree.

- A RBT is a Binary Search Tree in which each node is **red** or **black**.
- Think of **black** nodes as representing 2-3-4 Tree nodes.
- Red nodes are extras needed since each node only holds one item.



The leaves are no longer all at the same level. However, given a node, every path from it down to a leaf goes through the same number of **black** nodes. Also, no red node has a red child.

2024-11-15

Implementations of Red-Black Trees vary a bit.

- I have presented red and black nodes.
- A node's color might be stored with the pointer to it in the parent node: red and black **pointers**.
 - The root is always black, so it does not matter whether the root's color is stored somewhere.
- Some implementations add null nodes.
 - Null nodes are black and have no data.
 - All leaves are null nodes, and all null nodes are leaves.
 - This may allow for slightly faster insert & delete algorithms. It is an example of a time-space trade-off.



5

12

14

5

9

3

Red-Black Trees are a very good choice for in-memory Tables, when worst-case performance is important.

 Red-Black Trees, or variations, are the usual implementation for C++ STL sorted Tables: std::map, std::set, etc.

How do we use Red-Black Trees?

- Traverse & retrieve are exactly as for Binary Search Trees.
- Insert & delete are complicated, and will not be covered. They involve rotations.
- The 2-3-4 Tree → Red-Black Tree conversion shows where Red-Black Trees come from; but in practice, we *never* do the conversion.

Why do we use Red-Black Trees?

- Because they tend to be just a little more efficient than 2-3-4 Trees, which are just a little more efficient than 2-3 Trees.
- All three have Θ(log n) insert, delete, and retrieve.

A Red-Black Tree is a Binary Search Tree (with extra data in each node), but it is generally *not* strongly balanced.



So the maximum height is $\Theta(\log n)$, which means that the retrieve, insert, and delete operations are $\Theta(\log n)$ time.

Recall the question we began with: are there fast insert & delete algorithms for a strongly balanced Binary Search Tree that maintain the strongly balanced property?

Let's answer: no, such algorithms are impossible without adding information to the tree.

However, we have seen that this fact is not really important. There are structures that are just as good as strongly balanced Binary Search Trees, and for which algorithms maintaining the structure do exist: 2-3 Trees, 2-3-4 Trees, Red-Black Trees, and others that we have not covered.

However, it turns out that we *can* efficiently maintain the strongly balanced property of a Binary Search Tree if we add a small amount of information to each node. The result is an *AVL Tree*.

50

30

10

Recall: a Binary Tree is **strongly balanced**, if, for each node in the tree, its two subtrees have heights differing by at most 1.

An **AVL Tree** is a strongly balanced Binary Search Tree in which each node has an extra piece of information: its **balance**:

left high [\leftarrow], right high [\rightarrow], or even [=].



Storing the balance in each node allows for logarithmic-time insert & delete algorithms that maintain the required properties.

AVL Trees were the first kind of self-balancing search trees to be developed [Georgy M. Adelson-Velsky & Yevgeniy M. Landis 1962].

We will not cover all the details of the AVL Tree algorithms. We note that they are based on **rotation** operations.

- Rotation is pictured below. For nodes labeled A, C, E, the subtrees of which they are the roots are moved along with them.
- We have seen this before, in the "semi-easy case" of the 2-3 Tree delete algorithm.



Using rotations, as above, along with a fancier version (the *double rotation*), we can design $\Theta(\log n)$ insert and delete algorithms that maintain the strongly balanced property.

Note that, by the strongly balanced property, retrieve is also $\Theta(\log n)$ for an AVL Tree.

2024-11-15

CS 311 Fall 2024

Example of AVL Tree insert: Do Binary Search Tree insert, then proceed up to the root, adjusting balances & rotating as needed.

Below we illustrate Insert 5.



All of these self-balancing search trees give Table implementations in which retrieve, insert, and delete by key are $\Theta(\log n)$.

- Generally, the **Red-Black Tree** is agreed to have the best *overall* performance, for in-memory datasets with many insert & delete operations, when worst-case performance is important.
- A Red-Black Tree, or some variation, is the usual implementation for std::map, std::set, and other STL sorted containers.
- Above, the word "overall" is important. For example, an AVL Tree has a faster retrieve operation than a Red-Black Tree, since it tends to have smaller height. (But a sorted array has an even faster retrieve, using Binary Search.)

This ends our coverage of self-balancing search trees—for now.

Later, when we look at **external data**, we will cover another kind of self-balancing search tree: **B-Trees**.

- B-Trees are similar to 2-3 Trees and 2-3-4 Trees, but nodes can be larger. For example, a B-Tree node might contain 50 keys.
- Using large nodes can greatly increase efficiency when a Table is stored on a **block-access device**—like a disk.
- We will also look at a B-Tree variant called a B+ Tree, which is used to store directory information in many modern file systems.