

**2-3 trees,
AA trees,
B-trees**

Announcement

Consultation times – 10-12, room ES61!

- Monday 9th May
- Thursday 12th May
- Thursday 19th May
- Monday 23rd May

No plan – just come and ask questions

P.S. don't forget there are exercises on the website!

2-3 trees

In a binary tree, each node has two children

In a *2-3 tree*, each node has either 2 children (a *2-node*) or 3 (a *3-node*)


A 2-node is a normal BST node:

- One data value x , which is greater than all values in the left subtree and less than all values in the right subtree


A 3-node is different:

- *Two* data values x and y
- All the values in the left subtree are less than x
- All the values in the middle subtree are between x and y
- All the values in the right subtree are greater than y

2-3 trees




2-node



3-node

An example of a 2-3 tree:



Why 2-3 trees?

With a 2-3 tree we can maintain the invariant:





- *The tree is always **perfectly** balanced!*

Invariant: all children of each node *always* have the same height


- In particular, any non-leaf 2-node has 2 children
- Any non-leaf 3-node has 3 children

This wasn't possible with binary search trees


Which of these are 2-3 trees?



Which of these are 2-3 trees?




Only this one
(why?)




Insertion into a 2-3 tree

To insert a value (e.g. 4) into a 2-3 tree, we start by doing a normal insertion...



Insertion into a 2-3 tree


To fix the balance invariant, we *absorb* the bad node into its parent!



Insertion into a 2-3 tree

Now suppose we want to insert 3.


We'll absorb it into its parent as before...



Insertion into a 2-3 tree

We get a 4-node, which is not allowed!


We fix this by a method called *splitting*.



Splitting a 4-node


To get rid of a 4-node, we *split* it into several 2-nodes!

This creates an extra level in the tree. We will fix this by absorbing the red node into its parent.



Insertion into a 2-3 tree


After splitting, we absorb the “extra level” node into its parent.



Insertion into a 2-3 tree


We restored the invariant!

Let's try inserting 18.




Insertion into a 2-3 tree

First add and absorb.
We got a 4-node, split it.




Insertion into a 2-3 tree

Absorb the extra node into the parent.




Insertion into a 2-3 tree

We got a 4-node again, so split and absorb.



Insertion into a 2-3 tree

Done! (If we insert even more, eventually the root will split, which adds a new level to the tree.)



2-3 insertion algorithm

Insert the new node into the tree

Then alternate 2 steps:

- *absorb* the node into its parent, move up to the parent
- if the node is a 4-node, *split* it into 2-nodes

Stop once you don't need to split

2-3 trees, summary

2-3 trees do not use rotation, unlike balanced BSTs – instead, they keep the tree perfectly balanced

- Invariant maintained using *absorption* (to remove unwanted nodes) and *splitting* (to eliminate 4-nodes)

Complexity is $O(\log n)$, as tree is perfectly balanced

Conceptually much simpler than AVL trees!

But implementation is really annoying :(

- See `TwoThree.hs`


AA trees

AA trees

AA trees implement a 2-3 tree using a BST!

A 2-node becomes a BST node

A 3-node becomes *two* BST nodes:



We'll always translate a 3-node into a node and its *right child*

AA trees, the plan

An AA tree is really a 2-3 tree, but we store it in a binary search tree

- A bit like what we did for binary heaps

We'll need to add extra information to the nodes, and invariants, so that:


- Any AA tree must correspond to a 2-3 tree
- We can tell whether each node in the tree is a 2-node, or part of a 3-node

Then we can adapt 2-3 insertion to AA trees!

- For searching, we can just use BST search

AA trees

We store with each node a *level*, which is the height of the corresponding 2-3 tree node




Notice that x and y have the same level. That's how we can tell they represent a 3-node.

Our invariant will talk about levels.

AA trees


If a node has the same level as its parent, we'll draw them next to each other.



This emphasises the levels in the tree.

2-3 trees as AA trees


Here was the 2-3 tree from before...



2-3 trees as AA trees

...and here is the corresponding AA tree!

We can identify the 2- and 3-nodes by looking at the level of the nodes (how?)



AA trees

We can translate a 2-3 tree to an AA tree

And, by looking at the levels, we can go the other way


- If a node has the same level as its right child, the two nodes together make a 3-node
- Otherwise it's a 2-node

Now we need an invariant to check that:

- We only have 2-nodes and 3-nodes
- The levels match the heights in the 2-3 tree
- The 2-3 tree is perfectly balanced

AA tree invariant, a first attempt

An AA tree only contains subtrees of the following shape:



Notice that the level of x/y must be exactly one more than the level of $A/B/C$

(we consider null to have a level of 0 – this means a leaf must have a level of 1)

AA tree invariant, part 1

It turns out to be better to break this invariant into pieces, so that it says something about each BST node


First, the level of a child node in the BST must be either:

- equal to the level of its parent, or
- one less than the level of its parent

(where the level of null is 0)

AA tree invariant, part 2

If a node has the same level as its child, it must be the root of a 3-node.




So we can say:


- A node's level must be greater than its left child:
 $\text{level}(\text{node}) > \text{level}(\text{node.left})$
- And also greater than its right-right grandchild:
 $\text{level}(\text{node}) > \text{level}(\text{node.right.right})$

AA tree – not allowed

Bad: malformed 3-node (left child at same height)



Bad: 4-node (right grandchild at same height)



We'll get these trees during insertion!

AA tree invariant, summary

We consider the level of null to be 0


For each node in the tree, the following must hold:

- The node's children must have a level either equal to or one less than the node itself
- $\text{level}(\text{node}) > \text{level}(\text{node.left})$
($x \leftarrow y$ not allowed)
- $\text{level}(\text{node}) > \text{level}(\text{node.right.right})$
($x \rightarrow y \rightarrow z$ not allowed)


This implies that any leaf node has a level of 1

We also have the normal BST invariant!


Why is this not an AA tree?



Why is this not an AA tree?




Why is this not an AA tree?



Why is this not an AA tree?


Leaf nodes have left child null (height 0), so their height should be 1



AA tree insertion

To insert into an AA tree, we start with a normal BST insertion. The new node is a leaf so we give it a level of 1. Note that its parent also has level 1 (why?)

If we are lucky the parent was a 2-node and we insert into the right of it, giving a 3-node:




Otherwise, the invariant is broken.
But there are only two ways it can break!

Case 1: skew

Here, we have inserted into the *left* of a 2-node, breaking the invariant.

We can fix it by doing a right rotation!



This operation is called *skew*.

We do it whenever the new node is the left child of its parent.


Case 2: split

Here, insertion created a 4-node.

We can split it into 2-nodes!


Notice that y 's level increases – may break the invariant one level up.

So continue up recursively!



All other cases: skew and split

Insertion can also create a 4-node like this:





But, if we do a skew, this turns into the previous kind of 4-node!

To cover all the cases we just have to:
first skew if the left child is bad,
then split if the right grandchild is bad

Example: the quick brown fox...


Insert “quick” into “the”



Left child at
same level!
Skew to fix it
(rotate right)


Example: the quick brown fox...

Insert "brown"





Example: the quick brown fox...


Insert "fox"



Insert "jumps"




split "brown"



Split moves "fox" up

Example: the quick brown fox...



AA trees – looking back

There are only two ways that insertion can break the invariant

- Making a left child with the same height as its parent – skew it
- Making a 4-node – split it

Why skew then split? Because skewing ensures there's only one possible way to represent a 4-node

When we split, the level of the top node increases – this corresponds to absorption in a 2-3 tree

AA trees – implementation


The level is stored as part of each node.

Looking at the diagrams, the level changes when you do a *split* – so make sure to do this

Easiest way to implement it:

have separate functions for skew and split, call them from insert. But first skew then

split, to take care of this case:



AA versus AVL trees

AA trees have a weaker invariant than AVL trees (less balanced) – but still $O(\log n)$ running time

Advantage: less work to maintain the invariant (top-down insertion – no need to go up tree afterwards), so insertion and deletion are cheaper

Disadvantage: lookup will be slower if the tree is less balanced


- But no difference in practice

B-trees

B-trees generalise 2-3 trees:

- In a B-tree of order k , a node can have k children
- Each non-root node must be at least half-full
- A 2-3 tree is a B-tree of order 3


Insertion also based on splitting!



Why B-trees

B-trees are used for disk storage in databases:

- Hard drives read data in *blocks* of typically ~4KB
- For good performance, you want to minimise the number of blocks read
- This means you want: 1 tree node = 1 block
- B-trees with k about 1024 achieve this



Red-black trees (not on exam)

Instead of 2-3 trees, we can use *2-3-4 trees*

- 2-node, 3-nodes and 4-nodes
(or B-tree with $k = 4$)

There's a more efficient insertion algorithm for them, called top-down insertion!

- See Wikipedia page for more information

We can implement them using BSTs, using the same ideas as AA trees. This is called a *red-black tree*, the fastest balanced BST

- Gets complicated because of lots of cases

Summary

2-3 trees: allow 2 or 3 children per node

- Possible to keep perfectly balanced
- Slightly annoying to implement

AA trees – 2-3 trees implemented using a BST

- Similar performance to AVL trees, but much simpler
- Fewer cases to consider, because the invariant can only break in two ways

B-trees: generalise 2-3 trees to k children

- If k is big, the height is very small – useful for on-disk trees e.g. databases