# **Binary Search Trees**

Instructors: Sam McCauley and Dan Barowy

April 20, 2022

# Admin

- Sign up to be a TA! Deadline Friday
  - End of the form asks to list professors; pretty much anyone you've had is probably fine
  - If you want we can have a brief conversation where I say I'm OK with you putting my name down
- Lab 8 tomorrow: please read over the lab and create a design document before your lab
  - We'll actually collect them this week
  - Very important to get a head start on the lab
- We'll briefly discuss course registration Friday
- Any questions?

## **Tree Iterators**

# Implementing Tree Iterators

- Goal: implement the traversals above as an iterator
- Can do next() and hasNext() on demand
- Problem: want to get values on demand (should be updated as the tree is updated)
  - Don't want to traverse the tree, store all tree values, and then dispense them one by one
  - Instead: each call to next() should go to the next node in the tree we want to output
- Challenge: implementing a recursive traversal piece-by-piece
- To think about: what data structure helps with recursion?



• Visits the node, then recursively traverses the left child, then the right child



- Visits the node, then recursively traverses the left child, then the right child
- Keep track of the current node we're traversing



- Visits the node, then recursively traverses the left child, then the right child
- Keep track of the current node we're traversing
- What happens when we hit a leaf?



- Visits the node, then recursively traverses the left child, then the right child
- Keep track of the current node we're traversing
- What happens when we hit a leaf?
- Could backtrack by following pointers; might get confusing



- Visits the node, then recursively traverses the left child, then the right child
- Keep track of the current node we're traversing
- What happens when we hit a leaf?
- Could backtrack by following pointers; might get confusing
- Instead: maintain nodes to visit on a stack!

 Stack maintains the non-empty BinaryTree<E> objects that we still need to traverse

- Stack maintains the non-empty BinaryTree<E> objects that we still need to traverse
- So next():

- Stack maintains the non-empty BinaryTree<E> objects that we still need to traverse
- So next():
  - pops the top item off the stack

- Stack maintains the non-empty BinaryTree<E> objects that we still need to traverse
- So next():
  - pops the top item off the stack
  - Stores its value to be returned

- Stack maintains the non-empty BinaryTree<E> objects that we still need to traverse
- So next():
  - pops the top item off the stack
  - Stores its value to be returned
  - Pushes its right child onto the stack if nonempty

- Stack maintains the non-empty BinaryTree<E> objects that we still need to traverse
- So next():
  - pops the top item off the stack
  - Stores its value to be returned
  - Pushes its right child onto the stack if nonempty
  - Pushes its left child onto the stack if nonempty

- Stack maintains the non-empty BinaryTree<E> objects that we still need to traverse
- So next():
  - pops the top item off the stack
  - Stores its value to be returned
  - Pushes its right child onto the stack if nonempty
  - Pushes its left child onto the stack if nonempty
- hasNext()?

- Stack maintains the non-empty BinaryTree<E> objects that we still need to traverse
- So next():
  - pops the top item off the stack
  - Stores its value to be returned
  - Pushes its right child onto the stack if nonempty
  - Pushes its left child onto the stack if nonempty
- hasNext()?
  - Just returns if the stack is empty



• A little less clear how to keep the stack: want to output the root only after the left side is completed; then output the right side



- A little less clear how to keep the stack: want to output the root only after the left side is completed; then output the right side
- In other words: want to output the root after the left child has been completely traversed



- A little less clear how to keep the stack: want to output the root only after the left side is completed; then output the right side
- In other words: want to output the root after the left child has been completely traversed
- Seems like we want the root at the very bottom of the stack. We'll keep it at the bottom of the stack as we traverse the left subtree; then when we pop the root off we'll output its value and traverse the right child



- A little less clear how to keep the stack: want to output the root only after the left side is completed; then output the right side
- In other words: want to output the root after the left child has been completely traversed
- Seems like we want the root at the very bottom of the stack. We'll keep it at the bottom of the stack as we traverse the left subtree; then when we pop the root off we'll output its value and traverse the right child
- Nice idea, but it takes some care. Let's be a bit more specific

• To begin: push root onto the stack, then push its left child onto the stack, and so on

- To begin: push root onto the stack, then push its left child onto the stack, and so on
- On a call to next():

- To begin: push root onto the stack, then push its left child onto the stack, and so on
- On a call to next():
  - pop node from stack; store its value to be returned

- To begin: push root onto the stack, then push its left child onto the stack, and so on
- On a call to next():
  - pop node from stack; store its value to be returned
  - Push its right child onto the stack if nonempty

- To begin: push root onto the stack, then push its left child onto the stack, and so on
- On a call to next():
  - pop node from stack; store its value to be returned
  - Push its right child onto the stack if nonempty
  - Push the left child of this right child onto the stack, and its left child, and so on

- To begin: push root onto the stack, then push its left child onto the stack, and so on
- On a call to next():
  - pop node from stack; store its value to be returned
  - Push its right child onto the stack if nonempty
  - Push the left child of this right child onto the stack, and its left child, and so on
- hasNext(): return if the stack is nonempty

- To begin: push root onto the stack, then push its left child onto the stack, and so on
- On a call to next():
  - pop node from stack; store its value to be returned
  - Push its right child onto the stack if nonempty
  - Push the left child of this right child onto the stack, and its left child, and so on
- hasNext(): return if the stack is nonempty
- Let's look at the code



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Stack is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree

Stack: 18 9 5



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Stack is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree

Stack: 18 9



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Stack is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree

Stack: 18 12



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Stack is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree

Stack: 18



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Stack is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree

#### Stack: 24 22



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Stack is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree

#### Stack: 24



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Stack is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree

Stack: 30 29



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Stack is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree

#### Stack: 30
# In-order Traversal



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Stack is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree

Stack: 35

# In-order Traversal



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Stack is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree

#### Stack:

# In-order Traversal



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Stack is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree • Same idea as in-order traversal

• Same idea as in-order traversal

• Output the node when popping from the stack

• Same idea as in-order traversal

• Output the node when popping from the stack

• If you pop a node, and it's the left child of its parent, push the parent's right child (and leftmost descendants) onto the stack





















• Level-order traversal is not recursive!

- Level-order traversal is not recursive!
- How do we keep track of what nodes to visit next?

- Level-order traversal is not recursive!
- How do we keep track of what nodes to visit next?
- Key insight: the order we visit nodes at a given "level" is the same order we visited their parents

- Level-order traversal is not recursive!
- How do we keep track of what nodes to visit next?
- Key insight: the order we visit nodes at a given "level" is the same order we visited their parents
- So the *first* parents to be visited have the *first* children that are visited

- Level-order traversal is not recursive!
- How do we keep track of what nodes to visit next?
- Key insight: the order we visit nodes at a given "level" is the same order we visited their parents
- So the *first* parents to be visited have the *first* children that are visited
- ... Can we use a queue?

• To begin: push root onto the queue

- To begin: push root onto the queue
- next():

- To begin: push root onto the queue
- next():
  - Dequeue node off the queue; store its value to be returned

- To begin: push root onto the queue
- next():
  - Dequeue node off the queue; store its value to be returned
  - Enqueue its non-empty children onto the queue

- To begin: push root onto the queue
- next():
  - Dequeue node off the queue; store its value to be returned
  - Enqueue its non-empty children onto the queue
- hasNext(): return if queue is empty

- To begin: push root onto the queue
- next():
  - Dequeue node off the queue; store its value to be returned
  - Enqueue its non-empty children onto the queue
- hasNext(): return if queue is empty
- Let's look at the code



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Queue is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree

Queue: 9 24



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Queue is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree

Queue: 24 5 12



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Queue is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree

Queue: 5 12 22 30



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Queue is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree

Queue: 12 22 30



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Queue is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree

Queue: 22 30



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Queue is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree

Queue: 30



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Queue is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree

Queue: 29 35



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Queue is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree

Queue: 35



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Queue is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree

#### Queue:
#### Level-order Traversal



Nodes that we have already traversed are marked in green. The node we are currently traversing is marked in orange. Queue is labelled with the *values* of the nodes, but in reality the objects stored are of type BinaryTree

#### Queue:

# **Binary Search Trees**

• Goal: store items in a tree such that we can implement methods like add() and contains() efficiently

- Goal: store items in a tree such that we can implement methods like add() and contains() efficiently
- Don't want to traverse the entire tree

- Goal: store items in a tree such that we can implement methods like add() and contains() efficiently
- Don't want to traverse the entire tree
- In an OrderedVector we store items in order to allow for efficient binary search

- Goal: store items in a tree such that we can implement methods like add() and contains() efficiently
- Don't want to traverse the entire tree
- In an OrderedVector we store items in order to allow for efficient binary search
  - Though add() is still slow

- Goal: store items in a tree such that we can implement methods like add() and contains() efficiently
- Don't want to traverse the entire tree
- In an OrderedVector we store items in order to allow for efficient binary search
  - Though add() is still slow
- How can we do something similar for trees?

• For *every* node *n* in a binary search tree with value *v*:

• For *every* node *n* in a binary search tree with value *v*:

• All values  $v_\ell$  of nodes that are descendants of the left child have values  $v_\ell \leq v$ 

• For *every* node *n* in a binary search tree with value *v*:

• All values  $v_\ell$  of nodes that are descendants of the left child have values  $v_\ell \leq v$ 

• All values  $v_r$  of nodes that are descendants of the right child have values  $v_r > v$ 



Is this a binary search tree?



Is this a binary search tree? (It has the same elements!)



Is this a binary search tree?



Is this a binary search tree?

No: note that all right descendants must be greater than the node



• How can I search for an element (say 14)?



- How can I search for an element (say 14)?
- Recursively!



- How can I search for an element (say 14)?
- Recursively!
- Idea: we can look at a node and know immediately if the element we're searching for is a descendant of the left child, or of the right child



- How can I search for an element (say 14)?
- Recursively!
- Idea: we can look at a node and know immediately if the element we're searching for is a descendant of the left child, or of the right child
- Recurse on the appropriate node



- How can I search for an element (say 14)?
- Recursively!
- Idea: we can look at a node and know immediately if the element we're searching for is a descendant of the left child, or of the right child
- Recurse on the appropriate node
- If we find the element, or if we hit an empty node, we're done

• How can I add an element (say 23)?



- How can I add an element (say 23)?
- Recursively!





- How can I add an element (say 23)?
- Recursively!
- Idea: we can look at a node and know immediately if the element we're adding should be a descendant of the left child, or of the right child



- How can I add an element (say 23)?
- Recursively!
- Idea: we can look at a node and know immediately if the element we're adding should be a descendant of the left child, or of the right child
- Recurse on the appropriate node



- How can I add an element (say 23)?
- Recursively!
- Idea: we can look at a node and know immediately if the element we're adding should be a descendant of the left child, or of the right child
- Recurse on the appropriate node
- If we hit an empty node, replace it with the element we want to add



- How can I add an element (say 23)?
- Recursively!
- Idea: we can look at a node and know immediately if the element we're adding should be a descendant of the left child, or of the right child
- Recurse on the appropriate node
- If we hit an empty node, replace it with the element we want to add



 How can I add something to a BST that's already in the tree



- How can I add something to a BST that's already in the tree
- For example: add 9 to this tree



- How can I add something to a BST that's already in the tree
- For example: add 9 to this tree
- Idea: first, find the element. Then, find an empty leaf where the new element can go



- How can I add something to a BST that's already in the tree
- For example: add 9 to this tree
- Idea: first, find the element. Then, find an empty leaf where the new element can go
- Rightmost descendant of left child



- How can I add something to a BST that's already in the tree
- For example: add 9 to this tree
- Idea: first, find the element. Then, find an empty leaf where the new element can go
- Rightmost descendant of left child

# **Implementing a Binary Search Tree**

• Need some kind of way to compare elements

- Need some kind of way to compare elements
- What are our options?

- Need some kind of way to compare elements
- What are our options?
  - Store Comparable items, or use a Comparator

- · Need some kind of way to compare elements
- What are our options?
  - Store Comparable items, or use a Comparator
  - The structure5 BinarySearchTree<E> assumes comparable items, but also allows a Comparator to be used...how?

• Let's say we have an item of type E that implements Comparable<E>
- Let's say we have an item of type E that implements Comparable<E>
- That means we can already compare items of type E

- Let's say we have an item of type E that implements Comparable<E>
- That means we can already compare items of type E
- But, we want the flexibility to compare them other ways using a Comparator<E>

- Let's say we have an item of type E that implements Comparable<E>
- That means we can already compare items of type E
- But, we want the flexibility to compare them other ways using a Comparator<E>
- The NaturalComparator<E> implements Comparator<E>, and compares items using their compareTo() method

- Let's say we have an item of type E that implements Comparable<E>
- That means we can already compare items of type E
- But, we want the flexibility to compare them other ways using a Comparator<E>
- The NaturalComparator<E> implements Comparator<E>, and compares items using their compareTo() method
- That way, we can write code assuming we always have a comparator; if we want we can replace it with a different comparator

- Let's say we have an item of type E that implements Comparable<E>
- That means we can already compare items of type E
- But, we want the flexibility to compare them other ways using a Comparator<E>
- The NaturalComparator<E> implements Comparator<E>, and compares items using their compareTo() method
- That way, we can write code assuming we always have a comparator; if we want we can replace it with a different comparator
- Let's look at the code

• We'll assume our items are comparable. But, another constructor takes a Comparator to allow us to compare the items

• We'll assume our items are comparable. But, another constructor takes a Comparator to allow us to compare the items

• Let's look at how these constructors work

• The BinaryTree class was recursive

- The BinaryTree class was recursive
- On the other hand, BinarySearchTree is made up of BinaryTrees

- The BinaryTree class was recursive
- On the other hand, BinarySearchTree is made up of BinaryTrees
- Allows us to keep track of the number of items, a comparator, etc.

- The BinaryTree class was recursive
- On the other hand, BinarySearchTree is made up of BinaryTrees
- Allows us to keep track of the number of items, a comparator, etc.
- Now: let's look at the code to locate an item, or to add it to the tree

## Finding an element in a binary search tree



- Idea: we can look at a node and know immediately if the element we're searching for is a descendant of the left child, or of the right child
- Recurse on the appropriate node
- If we find the element, or if we hit an empty node, we're done
- Let's look at the code

### Adding an element to a binary search tree



- Idea: we can look at a node and know immediately if the element we're adding should be a descendant of the left child, or of the right child
- Recurse on the appropriate node
- If we hit an empty node, replace it with the element we want to add
- If adding a duplicate element, find rightmost descendant of left child of current location

# Tree Vocabulary

Descendant: A node n' is a descendant of node n if there exists a sequence of nodes n = n<sub>1</sub>, n<sub>2</sub>, ..., n<sub>i</sub> = n' such that for all 1 ≤ j < i, n<sub>j</sub> is a child of n<sub>j+1</sub>. (Ancestor is the opposite)

- Descendant: A node n' is a descendant of node n if there exists a sequence of nodes n = n<sub>1</sub>, n<sub>2</sub>, ..., n<sub>i</sub> = n' such that for all 1 ≤ j < i, n<sub>j</sub> is a child of n<sub>j+1</sub>. (Ancestor is the opposite)
- Siblings: Two nodes are siblings if they share the same parent

- Descendant: A node n' is a descendant of node n if there exists a sequence of nodes n = n<sub>1</sub>, n<sub>2</sub>, ..., n<sub>i</sub> = n' such that for all 1 ≤ j < i, n<sub>j</sub> is a child of n<sub>j+1</sub>. (Ancestor is the opposite)
- Siblings: Two nodes are siblings if they share the same parent
- Subtree: A subset of the nodes in a tree that themselves form a tree (possibly with a different root node)

- Descendant: A node n' is a descendant of node n if there exists a sequence of nodes n = n<sub>1</sub>, n<sub>2</sub>, ..., n<sub>i</sub> = n' such that for all 1 ≤ j < i, n<sub>j</sub> is a child of n<sub>j+1</sub>. (Ancestor is the opposite)
- Siblings: Two nodes are siblings if they share the same parent
- Subtree: A subset of the nodes in a tree that themselves form a tree (possibly with a different root node)
- Interior node: a node that is not a leaf

*Path*: the unique shortest sequence of edges between two nodes n<sub>1</sub> and n<sub>2</sub>.
 Each successive edge in the path must share one of its nodes with the previous edge.

- *Path*: the unique shortest sequence of edges between two nodes n<sub>1</sub> and n<sub>2</sub>.
  Each successive edge in the path must share one of its nodes with the previous edge.
- *Full Tree*: A tree where every leaf has the same depth *h*, and every internal node has exactly two children

- *Path*: the unique shortest sequence of edges between two nodes n<sub>1</sub> and n<sub>2</sub>.
  Each successive edge in the path must share one of its nodes with the previous edge.
- *Full Tree*: A tree where every leaf has the same depth *h*, and every internal node has exactly two children
- *Complete Tree*: A full tree with 0 or more of the rightmost leaves of depth *h* removed

• How much time does a call to locate() take?

- How much time does a call to locate() take?
  - Worst case

- How much time does a call to locate() take?
  - Worst case
  - Definitely not worse than O(n) (we never look at a node multiple times)

- How much time does a call to locate() take?
  - Worst case
  - Definitely not worse than O(n) (we never look at a node multiple times)
  - Is there a tree where it's actually *O*(*n*)? Yes; let's try to create an example on the board

- How much time does a call to locate() take?
  - Worst case
  - Definitely not worse than O(n) (we never look at a node multiple times)
  - Is there a tree where it's actually *O*(*n*)? Yes; let's try to create an example on the board
- Let's say we have a tree of height *h*. How long does a call to locate() take in terms of *h*?

- How much time does a call to locate() take?
  - Worst case
  - Definitely not worse than O(n) (we never look at a node multiple times)
  - Is there a tree where it's actually *O*(*n*)? Yes; let's try to create an example on the board
- Let's say we have a tree of height *h*. How long does a call to locate() take in terms of *h*?
  - Each time we call the method the height of the node increases by one, so O(h)

- How much time does a call to locate() take?
  - Worst case
  - Definitely not worse than O(n) (we never look at a node multiple times)
  - Is there a tree where it's actually *O*(*n*)? Yes; let's try to create an example on the board
- Let's say we have a tree of height *h*. How long does a call to locate() take in terms of *h*?
  - Each time we call the method the height of the node increases by one, so O(h)
  - If we have time: how can we prove this by induction?

• How much time does a call to add() take?

• How much time does a call to add() take?

• O(n) in a tree of size n

• How much time does a call to add() take?

• O(n) in a tree of size n

• O(h) in a tree of height h

• How many nodes are in a full tree of depth h?

• How many nodes are in a full tree of depth *h*?

• How can we sort using a Binary Search Tree?

• How many nodes are in a full tree of depth h?

• How can we sort using a Binary Search Tree?

• How much time does this take?

#### Making Binary Search Trees More Efficient

• Goal: ensure that our BST has small height

#### Making Binary Search Trees More Efficient

- Goal: ensure that our BST has small height
- What should our goal be for height?
## Making Binary Search Trees More Efficient

- Goal: ensure that our BST has small height
- What should our goal be for height?
- Complete trees are optimal; what is their height?

## Making Binary Search Trees More Efficient

- Goal: ensure that our BST has small height
- What should our goal be for height?
- Complete trees are optimal; what is their height?
- *O*(log *n*)

## Making Binary Search Trees More Efficient

- Goal: ensure that our BST has small height
- What should our goal be for height?
- Complete trees are optimal; what is their height?
- *O*(log *n*)
- Can we design our Binary Search Tree so that it maintains height  $O(\log n)$ ?