

# Unit #6: AVL Trees

CPSC 221: Basic Algorithms and Data Structures

Anthony Estey, Ed Knorr, and Mehrdad Oveis

2016W2

# Unit Outline

- ▶ Binary search trees
- ▶ Balance implies shallow (shallow is good)
- ▶ How to achieve balance
- ▶ Single and double rotations
- ▶ AVL tree implementation


# Learning Goals

- ▶ Compare and contrast balanced/unbalanced trees.
- ▶ Describe and apply rotation to a BST to achieve a balanced tree.
- ▶ Recognize balanced binary search trees (among other tree types you recognize, e.g., heaps, general binary trees, general BSTs).

# Dictionary ADT Implementations

Worst Case time	insert	find	delete (after find)
Linked list			
Unsorted array			
Sorted array			
Hash table			

# Binary Search in a Sorted List



```
int bSearch(int A[], int key, int i, int j) {  
    if (j < i) return -1;  
    int m = (i + j) / 2;  
    if (key < A[m]) return bSearch(A, key, i, m-1);  
    else if (key > A[m]) return bSearch(A, key, m+1, j);  
    else return m;  
}
```

# Binary Search Tree as Dictionary Data Structure


## Binary tree property

- ▶ each node has  $\leq 2$  children


## Search tree 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



# In-, Pre-, Post-Order Traversal



In-order: 2, 5, 7, 9, 10, 15, 17, 20, 30

Pre-order:

Post-order:

# Beauty is Only $O(\log n)$ Deep

Binary Search Trees are fast if they're shallow.

Know any shallow trees?


- ▶ perfectly complete
- ▶ perfectly complete except the last level (like a heap)
- ▶ anything else?

What matters here?

*Siblings should have about the same height.*



# Balance



$$\text{balance}(x) = \text{height}(x.\text{left}) - \text{height}(x.\text{right})$$

$$\text{height}(\text{NULL}) = -1.$$

If for all nodes  $x$ ,

- ▶  $\text{balance}(x) = 0$  then perfectly balanced.
- ▶  $|\text{balance}(x)|$  is small then balanced enough.
- ▶  $-1 \leq \text{balance}(x) \leq 1$  then tree height  $\leq c \lg n$  where  $c < 2$ .


# AVL (Adelson-Velsky and Landis) Tree

## Binary tree property

- ▶ each node has  $\leq 2$  children

## Search tree property

- ▶ all keys in left subtree smaller than node's key
- ▶ all keys in right subtree larger than node's key




## Balance property


- ▶ For all nodes  $x$ ,  $-1 \leq \text{balance}(x) \leq 1$

Result: height is  $\Theta(\log n)$ .

Is this an AVL tree?




# An AVL Tree




# How Do We Stay Balanced?

Suppose we start with a balanced search tree (an AVL tree),




and insert 5




It's no longer an AVL tree. What can we do?

**ROTATE!**


# Rotation Animation



# Rotation Animation




# Rotation Animation







# Rotation Animation



# Rotation Animation




# Single Rotation



# Single Rotation


`rotateRight` is shown. There's also a symmetric `rotateLeft`.




After rotation, subtree's height is the same as before insert.  
So heights of ancestors don't change.  
So?

# Double Rotation

Start with




and insert 6



A single rotation won't fix this.


**DOUBLE ROTATE!**

# Double Rotation



# Double Rotation

`doubleRotateLeft` is shown. There's also a symmetric `doubleRotateRight`.



insert occurred here or here


Either  $x$  or  $y$  increased to height  $h-1$  after insert.

After rotation, subtree's height is the same as before insert.

So height of ancestors doesn't change.

# Insert Algorithm

1. Find location for new key.
2. Add new leaf node with new key.
3. Go up tree from new leaf searching for imbalance.
4. At lowest unbalanced ancestor:




The case names are the first two steps on the path from the unbalanced ancestor to the new leaf.




# Insert: No Imbalance

Insert(3)




# Insert: Imbalance Case RR


Insert(33)



# Case RR: rotateLeft




# Single Rotation Code




```
void rotateLeft( Node *& a ) {  
    Node * b = a->right;  
    a->right = b->left;  
    b->left = a;  
    updateHeight(a);  
    updateHeight(b);  
    a = b;  
}
```

# Insert: Imbalance Case RL


Insert(18)



# Case RL: doubleRotateLeft




# Double Rotation Code



```
void doubleRotateLeft( Node *& a ) {  
    rotateRight(a->right);  
    rotateLeft(a);  
}
```

# Delete

1. Delete as for general binary search tree. (This way we reduce the problem to deleting a node with 0 or 1 child.)
2. Go up tree from deleted node searching for imbalance (and fixing heights).
3. Fix **all** unbalanced ancestors (bottom-up)





# Thinking about AVL trees

## Observations

- ▶ AVL trees are binary search trees that allow only slight imbalance
- ▶ Worst-case  $O(\log n)$  time for find, insert, and delete
- ▶ Elements (even siblings) may be scattered in memory

## Realities

- ▶ For large data sets, disk accesses dominate runtime

Could we have perfect balance if we relax binary tree restriction?