

Splay Tree Summary

- All operations are in amortized O(log n) time
- Splaying can be done top-down; this may be better because:
 - > only one pass
 - > no recursion or parent pointers necessary
 - > we didn't cover top-down in class
- Splay trees are very effective search trees > Relatively simple
- > No extra fields required
- > Excellent locality properties: frequently accessed keys are cheap to find

Disk vs. Memory

- · Disks many times slower than memory:
 - > Processor measured in GH = 10⁹ cycles per second > Main memory measured in microsec. = 10⁶ per second
 - Disk seek measured in miliseconds = 10³ per second
- i.e. ~ 1 million instructions per disk lookup
- Measuring runtime by pointer lookups meaningless if data can't fit in main memory

Trees on disk

- · Each pointer lookup means seeking the disk
- · Want as shallow a tree as possible
- Balanced binary tree with N nodes has height ?
- · Balanced M-ary tree with N nodes has height ?



Problems with M-ary Search Trees

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.































Run Time Analysis of B-Tree Operations

• For a B-Tree of order M

- Each internal node has up to M-1 keys to search
- $\, > \,$ Each internal node has between [M/2] and M children
- > Depth of B-Tree storing N items is $O(\log_{[M/2]}N)$
- Example: M = 86
 - $\rightarrow \log_{43}N = \log_2 N / \log_2 43 = .184 \log_2 N$
 - > log₄₃ 1,000,000,000 = 5.51

Summary of Search Trees

- Problem with Search Trees: Must keep tree balanced to allow fast access to stored items
- AVL trees: Insert/Delete operations keep tree balanced
- Splay trees: Repeated Find operations produce balanced trees on average
- Multi-way search trees (e.g. B-Trees): More than two children
- per node allows shallow trees; all leaves are at the same depth
- > keeping tree balanced at all times