

The AVL Balance Condition AVL balance property:

Left and right subtrees of *every node* have *heights* **differing by at most 1**

- Ensures small depth
 Will prove this by showing that an AVL tree of height h must have a lot of (i.e. O(2^h)) nodes
- Easy to maintain
 Using single and double rotations









Proof that $M(h) \ge \phi^h$

- Basis: $M(0) = 1 > \phi^0 1$, $M(1) = 2 > \phi^1 1$
- Induction step.
 $$\begin{split} M(h) &= M(h-1) + M(h-2) + 1 \\ &> (\varphi^{h-1} - 1) + (\varphi^{h-2} - 1) + 1 \\ &= \varphi^{h-2} (\varphi + 1) - 1 \\ &= \varphi^h - 1 \ (\varphi^2 = \varphi + 1) \end{split}$$

Height of an AVL Tree

- $M(h) > \phi^h \quad (\phi \approx 1.62)$
- Suppose we have N nodes in an AVL tree of height h.
 - \rightarrow N > M(h)
 - > N > φ^h 1
 - ${\scriptstyle \rightarrow \ log_{\varphi}(N+1) \geq h}$ (relatively well balanced tree!!)







- Insert operation may cause balance factor to become 2 or –2 for some node
 - > only nodes on the path from insertion point to root node have possibly changed in height
 - So after the Insert, go back up to the root node by node, updating heights
 - > If a new balance factor (the difference h_{left} , h_{right}) is 2 or –2, adjust tree by rotation around the node

















































Student Activity































Pros and Cons of AVL Trees

Arguments for AVL trees:

 Search is O(log N) since AVL trees are always well balanced.
 The height balancing adds no more than a constant factor to the 2. speed of insertion, deletion, and find.

- Arguments against using AVL trees:
- Difficult to program & debug; more space for height info.
 Asymptotically faster but rebalancing costs time.
- Most large searches are done in database systems on disk and use other structures (e.g. B-trees).
 May be OK to have O(N) for a single operation if total run time for
- many consecutive operations is fast (e.g. Splay trees).