Dynamic Trees

- Goal: maintain a forest of rooted trees with costs on vertices.
  - Each tree has a root, every edge directed towards the root.
- Operations allowed:
  - link(v, u): creates an edge between v (a root) and u.
  - cut(v, u): deletes edge (v, u).
  - findcost(v): returns the cost of vertex v.
  - findroot(v): returns the root of the tree containing v.
  - findmin(v): returns the vertex u of minimum cost in the path from v to the root (if there is a tie, choose the closest to the root).
  - addcost(v, x): adds x to the cost of all vertices from v to root.

Dynamic Trees

An example (two trees):

Dynamic Trees

- link(q, e)

Dynamic Trees

- cut(q)

Dynamic Trees

- findmin(s) = b
- findroot(s) = a
- findcost(s) = 2
- addcost(s, 3)

Obvious Implementation

- A node represents each vertex;
- Each node x points to its parent p(x):
  - cut, split, findroot: constant time.
  - findroot, findmin, addcost: linear time on the size of the path.
- Acceptable if paths are small, but O(n) in the worst case.
- Cleverer data structures achieve O(log n) for all operations.
Simple Paths

- We start with a simpler problem:
  - Maintain set of paths that can be:
    - split: cuts a path in two;
    - concatenate: links endpoints of two paths, creating a new path.
  - Operations allowed:
    - findcost(v): returns the cost of vertex v;
    - addcost(x, y): add x to the cost of vertices in path containing y;
    - findmin(v): returns minimum-cost path containing v.

Simple Paths as Lists

- Natural representation: doubly linked list.
  - Constant time for findcost.
  - Constant time for concatenate and split if endpoints given, linear
time otherwise.
  - Linear time for findmin and addcost.
- Can we do it $O(\log n)$ time?

Simple Paths as Binary Trees

- Alternative representation: balanced binary trees.
  - Leaves vertices in symmetric order.
  - Internal nodes: subpaths between extreme descendants.

Simple Paths: Maintaining Costs

- Keeping costs:
  - First idea: store $\text{cost}(x)$ directly on each vertex;
  - Problem: addcost takes linear time (must update all vertices).

- Better approach: store $\Delta \text{cost}(x)$ instead:
  - Root: $\Delta \text{cost}(x) = \text{cost}(x)$
  - Other nodes: $\Delta \text{cost}(x) = \text{cost}(x) - \text{cost}(p(x))$
Simple Paths: Maintaining Costs

- Costs:
  - addcost: constant time (just add to root)
  - Finding cost(x) is slightly harder: \( O(d(x)) \)

Simple Paths: Finding Minima

- Still have to implement findmin:
  - Storing mincost(x), the minimum cost in subpath with root r.
    - findmin runs in \( O(\log n) \) time, but addcost is linear.
Splaying

- Simpler alternative to balanced binary trees: splaying.
  - Does not guarantee that trees are balanced in the worst case.
  - Guarantee \( O(\log n) \) access in the amortized sense.
  - Makes the data structure much simpler to implement.

- Basic characteristics:
  - Does not require any balancing information;
  - On an access to \( u \):
    - Moves \( u \) to the root;
    - Roughly halves the depth of other nodes in the access path.
    - Based entirely on rotations.
  - Other operations (insert, delete, join, split) use splay.

---

Dynamic Trees

Splaying

- Three restructuring operations:

  ![Diagram of splaying operations](image)

---
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An Example of Splaying
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Dynamic Trees

End result:
**Amortized Analysis**

- Bounds the running time of a sequence of operations.
- Potential function \( \Phi \) maps each configuration to real number.
- Amortized time to execute each operation:
  - \( \psi \): amortized cost of the \( i \)-th operation;
  - \( \Phi \): potential of the data structure (twice the sum of all ranks);
- Total time for \( m \) operations:
  \[
  \sum_{i=1}^{m} \psi_i = \sum_{i=1}^{m} (\Phi_i - \Phi_{i-1}) + \Phi_0 - \Phi_m + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \psi_i.
  \]

**Amortized Analysis of Splaying**

- Definitions:
  - \( s(x) \): size of node \( x \) (number of descendants, including \( x \));
    - At most \( n \), by definition.
  - \( r(x) \): rank of node \( x \), defined as \( \log s(x) \);
    - At most \( \log n \), by definition.
  - \( \Phi \): potential of the data structure (twice the sum of all ranks).
    - At most \( n \log n \), by definition.
- Access Lemma [ST85]: The amortized time to splay a tree with root \( r \) at a node \( x \) is at most
  \[
  \Theta(r(x)) - r(x) + 1 = O(\log(s(r(x))/s(x))).
  \]

**Proof of Access Lemma**

- Access Lemma [ST85]: The amortized time to splay a tree with root \( r \) at a node \( x \) is at most
  \[
  \Theta(r(x)) - r(x) + 1 = O(\log(s(r(x))/s(x))).
  \]
  - Proof idea:
    - \( \Theta(x) \): rank of \( x \) after the \( i \)-th splay step;
    - \( \phi \): amortized cost of the \( i \)-th splay step;
    - \( \phi(x) = \Theta(x) - \Theta(x) \) (for the zig step, if any)
    - \( \phi(x) = \Theta(x) - \Theta(x) \) (for any zig-zig and zig-zag steps)
  - Total amortized cost for all \( k \) steps
    \[
    \sum_{i=1}^{k} \phi_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} [\Theta(r(x)) - \Theta(x)] + [\Theta(r(x)) - \Theta(x)] + 1
    \]
    \[
    = \Theta(r(x)) - \Theta(x) + 1.
    \]

**Proof of Access Lemma: Splaying Step**

- Zig-zig:
  - Claim \( a \leq 4 \): \( r(x) = \Theta(x) \)
    \[
    t + \Phi - \Phi + 4 (\theta(x) - \theta(x))
    \]
    \[
    (\theta(x) - \theta(x)) \leq 4 (\theta(x) - \theta(x))
    \]
    \[
    \leq 4 (\theta(x) - \theta(x)).
    \]
  - Rearranging
    \[
    \log(s(x)/s(x)) - \log(s(x)/s(x)) < -1
    \]
    \[
    \text{TRUE because } s(x)/s(x): \text{ both ratios are smaller than 1, at least one is at most } -1/2.
    \]

**Proof of Access Lemma: Splaying Step**

- Zig:
  - Claim \( a \leq 6 \): \( r(x) = \Theta(x) \)
    \[
    1 + \Phi - \Phi + 6 (\theta(x) - \theta(x))
    \]
    \[
    (\theta(x) - \theta(x)) \leq 6 (\theta(x) - \theta(x))
    \]
    \[
    \leq 6 (\theta(x) - \theta(x)).
    \]
  - Rearranging
    \[
    \log(s(x)/s(x)) - \log(s(x)/s(x)) \leq -1
    \]
    \[
    \text{TRUE because } s(x)/s(x): \text{ both ratios are smaller than 1, at least one is at most } -1/2.
    \]
### Splaying

- **To sum up:**
  - No rotation: \( a = 1 \)
  - Zig: \( a \leq 6 \left( r(z) - r(x) \right) + 1 \)
  - Zig-zig: \( a \leq 6 \left( r(z) - r(x) \right) \)
  - Zig-zag: \( a \leq 4 \left( r(z) - r(x) \right) \)

  - Total amortized time at most \( 6 \left( r(z) - r(x) \right) + 1 = O(\log n) \)

- Since accesses bring the relevant element to the root, other operations (insert, delete, join, split) become trivial.

### Dynamic Trees

- We know how to deal with isolated paths.
- How to deal with paths within a tree?

### Dynamic Trees

- Main idea: partition the vertices in a tree into disjoint solid paths connected by dashed edges.

### Dynamic Trees

- Main idea: partition the vertices in a tree into disjoint solid paths connected by dashed edges.

### Dynamic Trees

- A vertex \( v \) is exposed if:
  - There is a solid path from \( v \) to the root;
  - No solid edge enters \( v \);

- It is unique.
Dynamic Trees

- Solid paths:
  - Represented as binary trees (as seen before).
  - Parent pointer of root is the outgoing dashed edge.
  - Hierarchy of solid binary trees linked by dashed edges: "virtual tree".
- "Isolated path" operations handle the exposed path.
  - The solid path entering the root.
  - Dashed pointers go up, so the solid path does not "know" it has dashed children.
- If a different path is needed:
  - expose(v): make entire path from v to the root solid.

Virtual Tree: An Example

actuel tree

virtual tree

Dynamic Trees

- Example: expose(v)
  - Take all edges in the path to the root, ...

Dynamic Trees

- Example: expose(v)
  - ... make them solid, ...

Dynamic Trees

- Example: expose(v)
  - ... make sure there is no other solid edge incident into the path.
  - Uses splice operation.
Exposing a Vertex

- exposeO: makes the path from x to the root solid.
- Implemented in three steps:
  1. Splay within each solid tree in the path from x to root.
  2. Splay each dashed edge from x to the root.
     - splay makes a dashed become the left solid child
     - if there is an original left solid child, it becomes dashed.
  3. Splay on x, which will become the root.

Dynamic Trees: Splice

- Additional restructuring primitive: splice.

  - Will only occur when w is the root of a tree.
  - Updates:
    - $\Delta \text{cost}(v) = \Delta \text{cost}(u) - \Delta \text{cost}(x)$
    - $\Delta \text{cost}(u) = \Delta \text{cost}(a) + \Delta \text{cost}(x)$
    - $\Delta \min(x) = \max(0, \Delta \min(v) - \Delta \text{cost}(u), \Delta \min(x) - \Delta \text{cost}(x))$

Exposing a Vertex: An Example

Implementing Dynamic Tree Operations

- findcost(v):
  - expose v, return cost(v).

- findroot(v):
  - expose v;
  - find w, the rightmost vertex in the solid subtree containing v;
  - splay at w and return w.

- findmin(v):
  - expose v;
  - use $\Delta \text{cost}$ and $\Delta \min$ to walk down from v to w, the last minimum-cost node in the solid subtree;
  - splay at w and return w.

Exposing a Vertex: Running Time

- Running time of exposeO:
  - proportion to initial depth of x;
  - x is rotated all the way to the root;
  - we just need to count the number of rotations;
  - will actually find amortized number of rotations: $O(\log n)$.
  - proof uses the Access Lemma:
    - $\sigma(x)$, $r(x)$ and potential are defined as before;
    - in particular, $\sigma(x)$ is the size of the whole subtree rooted at x.
    - included both solid and dashed edges.

Exposing a Vertex: Running Time (Proof)

- $k$: number of dashed edges from x to the root t.
- Amortized costs of each pass:
  1. Splay within each solid tree:
     - $s_2$ vertex splays in the i-th solid tree.
     - amortized cost of i-th splay: $6(r(x) + x) + i$.
     - $r(x) + x$, as the number of steps in the pass.
     - Amortized cost of pass: $6(r(x) + x) = 6 \log n + k$.
  2. Splay dashed edges:
     - no rotations, no potential changes, amortized cost is zero.
  3. Splay O(n):
     - amortized cost is at most $6 \log n + k$.
     - no changes in cost, no extra rotation happens;
     - each rotation costs one credit, but is charged twice;
     - they pay for the extra rotation in the first pass.
- Amortized number of rotations $= O(\log n)$.
Implementing Dynamic Tree Operations

- addcost(t, x):
  - expose x;
  - add edge (x, p(x));
- link(t, u, w):  
  - expose x and w (they are in different trees);
  - set p(x) = w (that is, make v a middle-child of w);
- cut(t, v):
  - expose v;
  - add Δcost(x) to Δcost(right(x));
  - make p(right(v)) = null and right(v) = null.

Dynamic Trees

Extensions and Variants

- Simple extensions:
  - Associate values with edges:
    - just interpret cost(v) as cost(u, p(v)).
  - other path queries (such as length):
    - change values stored in each node and update operations.
  - tree (unrooted) trees:
    - implement cut operation, which changes the root.
- Not-so-simple extension:
  - subtree-related operations:
    - requires that vertices have bounded degree;
    - Approach for arbitrary trees: "unravel" them:
      - [Chirodkar, Grigoriadis and Tarjan, 1991]

Dynamic Trees

Alternative Implementation

- Total time per operation depends on the data structure used to represent paths:
  - Splay trees: O(log n) amortized [ST85].
  - Balanced search tree: O(log n) amortized [ST85].
  - Locally biased search tree: O(log n) amortized [ST85].
  - Globally biased search tree: O(log n) worst-case [ST85].
- Biased search trees:
  - Support leaves with different "weights".
  - Some solid leaves are "heavier" because they also represent subtrees dangling from it from dashed edges.
  - Much more complicated than splay trees.

Dynamic Trees

Other Data Structures

- Some applications require tree-related information:
  - minimum vertex in a tree;
  - add value to all elements in the tree;
  - link and cut as usual.
- ET-Trees can do that:
  - Henzinger and King (1995);
  - Tarjan (1997).

Dynamic Trees

ET-Trees

- Each tree represented by its Euler tour.
  - Edge {u, w}:
    - appears as arcs (u, w) and (w, u);
  - Vertex u:
    - appears once as a self-loop (u, u);
    - used as an "anchor" for new links.
    - stores vertex-related information.
  - Representation is not circular: tour broken at arbitrary place.

Dynamic Trees

ET-Trees

- Consider link(t, u, v):
  - Create elements representing arcs (t, u) and (u, v):
  - Split and concatenate tours appropriately:
    - Original tours:
      - Final tour:
        - The cut operation is similar.
### ET-Trees

- Tours as doubly-linked lists:
  - Natural representation.
  - link/cut: $O(1)$ time.
  - addcost/findmin: $O(n)$ time.

- Tours as balanced binary search trees:
  - link/cut: $O(\log n)$ time (binary tree join and split).
  - addcost/findmin: $O(\log n)$ time:
    - values stored in difference form.

### Constructions

- **ST-Trees [ST83, ST85]:**
  - first data structure to handle paths within trees efficiently.
  - It is clearly path-oriented:
    - relevant paths explicitly exposed and dealt with.
  - Other approaches are based on constructions:
    - Original tree is progressively contracted until a structure representing only the relevant path (or tree) is left.

### Constructions

- Assume we are interested in the path from $a$ to $b$:

  ![Path Diagram]

  - Using only local information, how can we get closer to the solution?

### Constructions

- Consider any vertex $v$ with degree 2 in the tree:

  ![Degree 2 Vertex Diagram]

  - Possibilities if $v$ is neither $a$ nor $b$:
    - $a$ and $b$ on same "side": $v$ is not in $a$–$b$.
    - If $a$ and $b$ on different sides: $v$ belongs to path $a$–$b$.

### Constructions

- Consider any vertex $v$ with degree 1 in the tree:

  ![Degree 1 Vertex Diagram]

  - If $v$ is neither $a$ nor $b$, it is clearly not in $a$–$b$.
Constructions

- Consider any vertex $v$ with degree $1$ in the tree:

- If $v$ is neither $a$ nor $b$, it is clearly not in $a-b$.
- We can simply eliminate $(a, w)$, reducing the problem size.
  - This is a rake operation.

Path Queries

- Computing the minimum cost from $a$ to $b$:

Constructions

- A contraction-based algorithm:
  - Work in rounds;
  - In each round, perform some rakes and/or compresses:
    - this will create a new, smaller tree;
    - moves within a round are usually “independent”.
  - Eventually, we will be down to a single element (vertex/edge)
    that represents a path (or the tree).

Path Queries

- Computing the minimum cost from $a$ to $b$: 
Path Queries

- Computing the minimum cost from $a$ to $b$:

Path Queries

- Computing the minimum cost from $a$ to $b$:

Path Queries

- Computing the minimum cost from $a$ to $b$:

Path Queries

- Computing the minimum cost from $a$ to $b$:

Contractions

- Suppose a definition of independence guarantees that a fraction $1/k$ of all possible takes and compresses will be executed in a round.
  - All degree-1 vertices are rake candidates.
  - All degree-2 vertices are compress candidates.
  - Fact: at least half the vertices in any tree have degree 1 or 2.
  - Result: a fraction $1/2k$ of all vertices will be removed.
  - Total number of rounds is $\lceil \log_{2k} n \rceil = O(\log n)$.  

Dynamic Trees
### Contraction
- rake and compress proposed by Miller and Reif [1985].
- Original context: parallel algorithms.
- Perform several operations on trees in $O(\log n)$ time.

### The Update Problem
- Coming up with a definition of independence that results in a contraction with $O(\log n)$ levels.
- But that is not the problem we need to solve.
- Essentially, we want to repair an existing contraction after a tree operation (link/cut).
- So we are interested in the update problem:
  - Given a contraction $C$ of a forest $F$, find another contraction $C'$ of a forest $F$ that differs from $F$ in one single edge (inserted or deleted).
  - Fast: $O(\log n)$ time.

### Our Problem
- Several data structures deal with this problem.
  - [Frederickson, 85 and 97]: Topology Trees;
  - [Alstrup et al., 97 and 03]: Top Trees;
  - [Acar et al. 03]: RC-Trees.

### Top Trees
- Proposed by Alstrup et al. [1997, 2003]
- Handle unrooted (free) trees with arbitrary degrees.
- Key ideas:
  - Associate information with the edges directly.
  - Pair edges up:
    - compress: combines two edges linked by a degree-two vertex;
    - rake: combines leaf with an edge with which it shares an endpoint.
  - All pairs (clusters) must be disjoint.
  - expose: determines which two vertices are relevant to the query (they will not be raked or compressed).

### Top Trees
- Consider some free tree.

(level zero: original tree)

### Top Trees
- All degree-1 and degree-2 vertices are candidates for a move (rake or compress).

(level zero: original tree)
Top Trees

- When two edges are matched, they create new clusters, which are edge-disjoint.

(level zero: original tree)

Top Trees

- Clusters are new edges in the level above:
  - New rakes and compresses can be performed as before.

(level one)

Top Trees

- The top tree itself represents the hierarchy of clusters:
  - original edge: leaf of the top tree (level zero).
  - two edges/clusters are grouped by rake or compress
    - Resulting cluster is their parent in the level above.
  - edge/cluster unmatched: parent will have only one child.
  - What about values?

Top Trees

- AKS et al. see top tree as an API.
- The top tree engine handles structural operations:
  - User has limited access to it.
  - Engine calls user-defined functions to handle values properly:
    - \texttt{join(A,B,C)}: called when A and B are paired (by rake or compress) to create cluster C
    - \texttt{split(A,B,C)}: called when a rake or compress is undone (and C is split into A and B).
    - \texttt{create(C,e)}: called when base cluster C is created to represent edge e.
    - \texttt{destroy(C)}: called when base cluster C is deleted.

Top Trees

- Example (path operations: \texttt{findmin/addcost})
  - Associate two values with each cluster:
    - \texttt{mincost(C)}: minimum cost in the path represented by C.
    - \texttt{extra(C)}: cost that must be added to all subpaths of C.
  - \texttt{create(C,e)}: (called when base cluster C is created)
    - \texttt{mincost(C)} = cost of edge e.
    - \texttt{extra(C)} = 0
  - \texttt{destroy(C)}: (called when base cluster C is deleted).
    - Do nothing.

Dynamic Trees

Top Trees

- Example (path operations: \texttt{findmin/addvalue})
  - \texttt{join(A,B,C)}: (called when A and B are combined into C)
    - compress: \texttt{mincost(C)} = min(\texttt{mincost(A)}, \texttt{mincost(B)})
    - rake: \texttt{mincost(C)} = \texttt{mincost(B)} (assume A is the leaf)
    - Both cases: \texttt{extra(C)} = 0
  - \texttt{split(A,B,C)}: (called when C is split into A and B)
    - compress: for each child \texttt{X} of \{A,B\}:
      - \texttt{mincost(X)} = \texttt{mincost(X)} + \texttt{extra(C)}
      - \texttt{extra(X)} = \texttt{extra(X)} + \texttt{extra(C)}
    - rake: same as above, but only for the edge/cluster that was not raked.
**Top Trees**

- Example (path operations: $\text{findmin/}\text{addvalue}$)
  - To find the minimum cost in path $a \rightarrow b$:
    - $K = \text{expose}(a, b)$;
    - return $\text{mincost}(K)$.
  - To add a cost $x$ to all edges in path $a \rightarrow b$:
    - $K = \text{expose}(a, b)$;
    - $\text{mincost}(K) = \text{mincost}(K) + x$;
    - $\text{extra}(K) = \text{extra}(K) + x$.

**Top Trees**

- Can handle operations such as:
  - tree costs (just a different way of handling rakes);
  - path lengths;
  - tree diameters.
- Can handle non-local information using the select operation:
  - allows user to perform binary search on top tree.
- an example: tree center.
- Top trees are implemented on top of topology trees, which they generalize.

**Topology Trees**

- Proposed by Frederickson [1985, 1997].
- Work on rooted trees of bounded degree.
  - Assume each vertex has at most two children.
  - Values (and clusters) are associated with vertices.
  - Perform a maximal set of independent moves in each round.
  - Handle updates in $O(\log n)$ worst-case time.

**RC-Trees**

- Proposed by Acar et al. [2003].
- Can be seen as a variant of topology trees.
  - Information stored on vertices.
  - Trees of bounded degree.
- Main differences:
  - Not necessarily rooted.
  - Alternate rake and compress rounds.
  - Not maximal in compress rounds (randomization).
  - Updates in $O(\log n)$ expected time.

**Constructions**

- Topology, Top, and Trace trees:
  - contraction-based.
- ST-Trees: path-based.
  - But there is a (rough) mapping:
    - dashed = rake
    - solid = compress
  - Both part of a single path
- ST-Trees can be used to implement topology trees [AHdLT03].

**Chronology**

- ST-Trees:
  - Sleator and Tarjan (1983); with balanced binary search trees;
  - Sleator and Tarjan (1985); splay trees.
- Topology Trees:
- ET-trees:
  - Hemminger and King (1995);
  - Tarjan (1997).
- Top Trees:
  - Ahuja, de Lichtenberg, and Thorup (1997);
  - Ahuja, de Lichtenberg, and Thorup (2003).
- RC-Trees: