Self-Balancing Trees

Thomas Schwarz

Self-Balancing Trees

- Binary search trees are unbalanced
- Heaps are ideally balanced but do not support searches
- Self-balancing trees:
	- Create search trees that are almost balanced
	- Fundamental Idea:
		- When a tree becomes too unbalanced after insertion or deletion
			- Restructure in a very limited way

Thomas Schwarz

- Georgy Adelson-Velsky & Evgenii Landis 1962
- First self-balancing binary search tree
	- For all nodes: Define a balance factor:
		- Height: Maximum of depth of leaves
		- Height of left sub-tree minus height of right sub-tree
			- Empty tree has height 0

• Example for balancing

- AVL insight:
	- Keeping all balances equal to zero is impossible
		- But we can keep them in $\{-1,0,1\}$.
	- We do so by special operations on the nodes that have become unbalanced

- AVL insertion:
	- Normal binary search tree insertion
		- Start at the root and compare values
			- Accordingly, move to the left or the right child
			- Insert where the corresponding child does not exist
		- Balancing condition can only be violated along this path

• AVL Insertion: After inserting 37

• AVL Insertion: Balances change only on the insertion path

- When pathing through node 100 (or 50):
	- Cannot decide if balance is becomes bad

• Therefore: Push nodes on a stack:

- The balancing repair uses "rotations"
	- We take two or three nodes, reorder them and their sub-trees
	- Have to make many case distinctions

- How can we obtain an unbalance?
	- Only by inserting into a left or right child
		- Assume balance in a node is 1
			- Left sub-tree has larger height
		- Now we insert into the left sub-tree

- Case 1: A has balance 2, because of insertion into left child
	- B has balance of 1
	- C can have a balance of -1, 0, or 1

- Right rotation:
- Check that it is well ordered and that balances are correct \bigcap_{A} 2 B C 1 0 T1 T2 $T4$ / $T3$ A 0 B C 0 0 T4 \setminus / T3 \setminus / T2 \setminus / T1

- Case 2:
	- Subtree in B has increased height
	- Inserted into subtree rooted in C
	- Balance in C is 0, -1, 1

• Double rotate (A with B and B with C)

- Can the sub-tree in B have balance 0?
	- NO!
		- If T3 changed height, height in B would not have changed
			- Either balance in B would have been set to 2 or both T3 and T2 have same height
		- If T2 changed height, height of B would not have changed

• Analogous operations if the right sub-tree increased in height

- After insertion and a rotation, the new top node has always balance 0
- The new sub-tree has not changed height compared to before insertion
- This means, only one rotation is ever necessary!

- Deletions:
	- Do the normal deletion from the tree
		- Remainder:
			- We first find the node to be deleted.
				- If the node has no or only one child, we can delete it.
				- Otherwise find the in-order successor
					- Go right than left-left-left-...
					- Swap contents and then delete successor

- Once we delete a node:
	- Go back on the path to the node
	- Use the same rotations in order to balance the node
	- But now, balancing can change the height of a subtree before deletion and after deletion cum rotate
	- So, we cannot stop after a single rotate but need to go up all the way to the root to insure balances

Need to adjust balance in root

- We can update balances based on
	- type of rotation
	- the balances of the trees

- Performance:
	- We now: maximum number of nodes in a tree of height *h* is
		- $1 + 2^1 + 2^2 + \ldots + 2^h = 2^{h+1} 1$
	- What is the minimum number of nodes in a tree of height *h*?
	- Call this number n_h

- What is the minimum number of nodes in a tree of height *h*
	- At the root, one subtree has height one less than the other:

•
$$
h_n = 1 + h_{n-1} + h_{n-2}
$$

- What is the minimum number of nodes in a tree of height ? *h*
	- For $h=1$

•
$$
n_0 = 1
$$
 $n_1 = 2$

• Recursion:

•
$$
n_h = 1 + n_{h-1} + n_{h-2}
$$
 $n_0 = 1$ $n_1 = 2$

• Can be solved via the Fibonacci series:

$$
\bullet \ (n_h + 1) = (n_{h-1} + 1) + (n_{h-2} + 1)
$$

• Can be solved exactly or approximately

$$
n_h \approx 1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} (\frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2})^{h+3}
$$

- Reversely:
	- Sparsest ALV tree with n nodes has height $\approx 1.44 \log_2(n+1) - 1.33$
	- Fullest AVL tree with *n* nodes has height $\log_2(n+1) - 1$

- Insertion:
	- Proportional to height of tree
- Deletion:
	- Proportional to height of tree