Fibonacci Heaps

Outline for Today

- Recap from Last Time
 - Quick refresher on binomial heaps and lazy binomial heaps.
- The Need for decrease-key
 - An important operation in many graph algorithms.
- Fibonacci Heaps
 - A data structure efficiently supporting *decreasekey*.
- **Representational Issues**
 - Some of the challenges in Fibonacci heaps.

Recap from Last Time

(Lazy) Binomial Heaps

- Last time, we covered the *binomial heap* and a variant called the *lazy binomial heap*.
- These are priority queue structures designed to support efficient *meld*ing.
- Elements are stored in a collection of *binomial trees*.



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap



Lazy Binomial Heap

123456789



Lazy Binomial Heap

123456789



Lazy Binomial Heap

123456789



Lazy Binomial Heap

123456789



Lazy Binomial Heap

123456789



Lazy Binomial Heap

123456789



Lazy Binomial Heap

123456789



Lazy Binomial Heap

123456789



Lazy Binomial Heap

123456789


Lazy Binomial Heap

123456789



Lazy Binomial Heap

123456789



Lazy Binomial Heap

123456789



Lazy Binomial Heap

123456789



Lazy Binomial Heap

123456789



Lazy Binomial Heap

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9



Lazy Binomial Heap

23456789



Lazy Binomial Heap		
Order 2	Order 1	Order 0
		23456789



Order 1	Order 0
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
	Order 1























Lazy Binomial Heap		1		
Order 2	Order 1		Order 0	
	3 7 4 8	2	56	9



Lazy Binomial Heap				
Order 2	Order 1		Order 0	
	3 7 4 8	2	56	9



Lazy Binomial Heap)			
Order 2	Order 1		Order 0	
	3 7 4 8	2	56	9







Lazy Binomial Heap				
Order 2	Order 1		Order 0	
	3 7 5 4 8 6	2		9



Lazy Binomial Heap			
Order 2	Order 1	Order 0	
	3 7 5 4 8 6	2	9



Lazy Binomial Heap			
Order 2	Order 1	Order 0	
	3 7 5 4 8 6	2	9



Lazy Binomial Heap	1	
Order 2	Order 1	Order 0
	3 7 5	2 9



Lazy Binomial Heap		
Order 2	Order 1	Order 0
	3752 4869	



Lazy Binomial Heap		
Order 2	Order 1	Order 0
	3 7 5 2 4 8 6 9	



Lazy Binomial Heap		
Order 2	Order 1	Order 0
	3 5 2 4 7 6 9 8	







Lazy Binomial Hea	 p			
Order 2	Ord	er 1	Order 0	
5 76 8	3 4	2 9		



Lazy Binomial Heap		
Order 2	Order 1	Order 0
5 7 6 8	3 4 9	



Lazy Binomial Heap		
Order 2	Order 1	Order 0
5 7 6 8	2 3 9 4	



Lazy Binomial Heap			
Order 2	Order 1	Order 0	
5 7 6 3 9 4			



Lazy Binomial Heap			
Order 2	Order 1	Order 0	
5 7 6 3 9 8 4			



Lazy Binomial Heap	Order 1	Order 0	
Order 2	Order 1	Urder U	
5 7 6 3 9 4			



Lazy Binomial Heap





Lazy Binomial Heap



Let's *enqueue* 10, 11, and 12 into both heaps.



Lazy Binomial Heap



Let's *enqueue* 10, 11, and 12 into both heaps.



Lazy Binomial Heap



Let's *enqueue* 10, 11, and 12 into both heaps.


Lazy Binomial Heap





Lazy Binomial Heap





Lazy Binomial Heap













Lazy Binomial Heap





Lazy Binomial Heap





Lazy Binomial Heap





Lazy Binomial Heap





Lazy Binomial Heap





Lazy Binomial Heap





Lazy Binomial Heap















































Draw what happens after we do a *extract-min* from both heaps.

8
























Operation Costs

- Eager Binomial Heap:
 - *enqueue*: O(log *n*)
 - *meld*: O(log *n*)
 - *find-min*: O(log *n*)
 - **extract-min**: O(log n)

- Lazy Binomial Heap:
 - *enqueue*: O(1)
 - *meld*: O(1)
 - *find-min*: O(1)
 - **extract-min**: $O(\log n)^*$
- *amortized

Intuition: Each **extract-min** has to do a bunch of cleanup for the earlier **enqueue** operations, but then leaves us with few trees.

New Stuff!

The Need for *decrease-key*

The *decrease-key* Operation

Some priority queues support the operation
decrease-key(v, k), which works as follows:

Given a pointer to an element v, lower its key (priority) to k. It is assumed that k is less than the current priority of v.

 This operation is crucial in efficient implementations of Dijkstra's algorithm and Prim's MST algorithm.

- Dijkstra's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-keys*.



- Dijkstra's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(m) total *decrease-key*s.



- Dijkstra's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(m) total *decrease-key*s.



- Dijkstra's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(m) total *decrease-key*s.



- Dijkstra's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(m) total *decrease-key*s.



- Dijkstra's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.



- Dijkstra's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(m) total *decrease-key*s.



- Dijkstra's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.



- Dijkstra's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(m) total *decrease-keys*.



- Dijkstra's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.



- Dijkstra's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.
- Dijkstra's algorithm runtime is

 $O(n T_{enq} + n T_{ext} + m T_{dec})$

- Prim's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.

- Prim's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.



- Prim's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.



- Prim's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.



- Prim's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.



- Prim's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.



- Prim's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.



- Prim's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.



- Prim's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.



- Prim's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.



- Prim's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.



- Prim's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.



- Prim's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.



- Prim's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.



- Prim's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.



- Prim's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.



- Prim's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(*m*) total *decrease-key*s.



- Prim's algorithm can be implemented with a priority queue using
 - O(n) total **enqueue**s,
 - O(*n*) total *extract-min*s, and
 - O(m) total *decrease-key*s.
- Prim's algorithm runtime is

 $O(n T_{enq} + n T_{ext} + m T_{dec})$

Standard Approaches

- In a binary heap, *enqueue*, *extract-min*, and *decrease-key* can be made to work in time O(log n) time each.
- Cost of Dijkstra's / Prim's algorithm: $O(n T_{enq} + n T_{ext} + m T_{dec})$ $= O(n \log n + n \log n + m \log n)$ $= O(m \log n)$

Standard Approaches

- In a lazy binomial heap, *enqueue* takes amortized time O(1), and *extract-min* and *decrease-key* take amortized time O(log n).
- Cost of Dijkstra's / Prim's algorithm:

$$O(n T_{enq} + n T_{ext} + m T_{dec})$$

 $= O(n + n \log n + m \log n)$

 $= \mathbf{O}(m \log n)$

Where We're Going

- The *Fibonacci heap* has these amortized runtimes:
 - *enqueue*: O(1)
 - *extract-min*: O(log *n*).
 - *decrease-key*: O(1).
- Cost of Prim's or Dijkstra's algorithm:

 $O(n T_{enq} + n T_{ext} + m T_{dec})$

 $= \mathcal{O}(n + n \log n + m)$

$= \mathbf{O}(m + n \log n)$

• This is theoretically optimal for a comparison-based priority queue in Dijkstra's or Prim's algorithms.
The Challenge of *decrease-key*







































































Problem: What do we do in an **extract-min**?






































Order 2	Order 1	Order 0	
5	3 9 11		
7 6			
8			



	Oraer 0
3 9 11	
4 10 12	
	3911 41012



Order 2	Order 1	Order 0	
5	3911 Y Y Y		
76	4 10 12		
8			




















































































(1) To do a *decrease-key*, cut the node from its parent.
(2) Do *extract-min* as usual, using child count as order.

Question: How efficient is this?



(1) To do a *decrease-key*, cut the node from its parent.
(2) Do *extract-min* as usual, using child count as order.

Claim: Our trees can end up with very unusual shapes.

There are $\Theta(n^{1/2})$ trees here. Why?



There are $\Theta(n^{1/2})$ trees here.

What happens if we repeatedly *enqueue* and *extract-min* a small value?



There are $\Theta(n^{1/2})$ trees here.

What happens if we repeatedly *enqueue* and *extract-min* a small value?



There are $\Theta(n^{1/2})$ trees here.

What happens if we repeatedly *enqueue* and *extract-min* a small value?



(Do a bunch of work to compact the trees, which doesn't accomplish anything.)

There are $\Theta(n^{1/2})$ trees here.

What happens if we repeatedly *enqueue* and *extract-min* a small value?



There are $\Theta(n^{1/2})$ trees here.

What happens if we repeatedly *enqueue* and *extract-min* a small value?



There are $\Theta(n^{1/2})$ trees here.

What happens if we repeatedly *enqueue* and *extract-min* a small value?



(Do a bunch of work to compact the trees, which doesn't accomplish anything.)

There are $\Theta(n^{1/2})$ trees here.

What happens if we repeatedly *enqueue* and *extract-min* a small value?

Each operation does $\Theta(n^{1/2})$ work, and doesn't make any future operations any better.



With n nodes, it's possible to have $\Omega(n^{1/2})$ trees of distinct orders.

Question: Why didn't this happen before?



Question: Why didn't this happen before?

Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.


Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.



Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.

Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.

Rule: Nodes can lose at most one child. If a node loses two children, cut it from its parent.

Question: Does this guarantee exponential tree size?

- Here's a binomial tree of order 4. That is, the root has four children.
- Question: Using our marking scheme, how many nodes can we remove without changing the order of the tree?
- Equivalently: how many nodes can we remove without removing any direct children of the root?







We can't cut any nodes from this tree without making the root node have order 0.

0



We can't cut any of the root's children without decreasing its order.

We can't cut any of the root's children without decreasing its order.

2

0

0

0

However, we can cut this node, leaving the root node with two children.







As before, we can't cut any of the root's children without decreasing its order.









3

2

 $\mathbf{0}$

U

0

We can't cut this node without triggering a cascading cut, so we're done.




















Maximally-Damaged Trees



Maximally-Damaged Trees



Maximally-Damaged Trees



Claim: The minimum number of nodes in a tree of order k is F_{k+2}

These trees are the base cases for our inductive line of reasoning.

Theorem: The minimum number of nodes in a tree of order k is F_{k+2} .

2

A binomial tree of order k+2.

What's the maximum amount of damage we can do to this tree without cutting any of the direct children of the root?

Theorem: The minimum number of nodes in a tree of order k is F_{k+2} .









Remove as many nodes here as possible without cutting any direct children of the root.

Theorem: The minimum number of nodes in a tree of order k is F_{k+2} .

A (former) binomial tree of order k+1.

Remove as many nodes here as possible without cutting any direct children of the root.

Theorem: The minimum number of nodes in a tree of order k is F_{k+2} .











Fact:
$$F_k = \Theta(\varphi^k)$$
, where
 $\varphi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$
is the golden ratio.
Corollary: The number of
nodes in a tree of order *k*
grows exponentially with
k (approximately 1.61^{*k*}
versus our previous 2^{*k*}).

A **Fibonacci heap** is a lazy binomial heap with **decrease-key** implemented using the "lose at most one child" marking scheme.

How fast are the operations on Fibonacci heaps?























































$\Phi = t$

where

t is the number of trees.

where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.



where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.



where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.



where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.





where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.



where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.



where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.



where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.




where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.



where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.



where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.



where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.



where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.



where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.



where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.



where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.





where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.

where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.



where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.



where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.



where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.







where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.



where

t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.





t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.







t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.





t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.





t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.





t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.





t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.





t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.





t is the number of trees and m is the number of marked nodes.









The Overall Analysis

- Here's the final scorecard for the Fibonacci heap.
- These are excellent theoretical runtimes. There's minimal room for improvement!
- Later work made all these operations *worst-case efficient* at a significant increase in both runtime and intellectual complexity.

enqueue: O(1)
find-min: O(1)
meld: O(1)
extract-min: O(log n)*
decrease-key: O(1)*

*amortized

Representation Issues

- The trees in a Fibonacci heap must be able to do the following:
 - During a merge: Add one tree as a child of the root of another tree.
 - During a cut: Cut a node from its parent in time O(1).
- *Claim:* This is trickier than it looks.














Representing Trees





Representing Trees





Representing Trees





Finding this pointer might take time $\Theta(\log n)!$

This is going to be weird.

Sorry.













To cut a node from its parent, if it isn't the representative child, just splice it out of its linked list.











If it is the representative, change the parent's representative child to be one of the node's siblings.

Awful Linked Lists

- Trees are stored as follows:
 - Each node stores a pointer to *some* child.
 - Each node stores a pointer to its parent.
 - Each node is in a circularly-linked list of its siblings.
- The following possible are now possible in time O(1):
 - Cut a node from its parent.
 - Add another child node to a node.

Fibonacci Heap Nodes

- Each node in a Fibonacci heap stores
 - A pointer to its parent.
 - A pointer to the next sibling.
 - A pointer to the previous sibling.
 - A pointer to an arbitrary child.
 - A bit for whether it's marked.
 - Its order.
 - Its key.
 - Its element.

In Practice

- In practice, the constant factors on Fibonacci heaps make it slower than other heaps, except on huge graphs or workflows with tons of *decrease-keys*.
- Why?
 - Huge memory requirements per node.
 - High constant factors on all operations.
 - Poor locality of reference and caching.

In Theory

- That said, Fibonacci heaps are worth knowing about for several reasons:
 - Clever use of a two-tiered potential function shows up in lots of data structures.
 - Implementation of *decrease-key* forms the basis for many other advanced priority queues.
 - Gives the theoretically optimal comparisonbased implementation of Prim's and Dijkstra's algorithms.

More to Explore

- Since the development of Fibonacci heaps, there have been a number of other priority queues with similar runtimes.
 - In 1986, a powerhouse team (Fredman, Sedgewick, Sleator, and Tarjan) invented the *pairing heap*. It's much simpler than a Fibonacci heap, is fast in practice, but its runtime bounds are unknown!
 - In 2012, Brodal et al. invented the *strict Fibonacci heap*. It has the same time bounds as a Fibonacci heap, but in a *worst-case* rather than *amortized* sense.
 - In 2013, Chan invented the *quake heap*. It matches the asymptotic bounds of a Fibonacci heap but uses a totally different strategy.
- Also interesting to explore: if the weights on the edges in a graph are chosen from a continuous distribution, the expected number of *decrease-key*s in Dijkstra's algorithm is O(n log (m / n)). That might counsel another heap structure!
- Also interesting to explore: binary heaps generalize to *b*-ary heaps, where each node has *b* children. Picking $b = \log (2 + m/n)$ makes Dijkstra and Prim run in time $O(m \log n / \log m/n)$, which is O(m) if $m = \Theta(n^{1+\varepsilon})$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

Next Time

- Randomized Data Structures
 - Doing well on average, broadly speaking.
- Frequency Estimation
 - Counting in sublinear space.
- Count-Min Sketches
 - A simple, elegant, fast, and widely-used data structure.