Fibonacci Heaps

Goal: Modify Binomial Heaps so that
O(1) Amortized decreaseKey

Back to Binomial Heaps

Lazy Meld \equiv \text{Only link during delete min}

Claim AC is still \( O(\log n) \)

using \( E(A) = \# \text{of trees} \)

Idea decreaseKey\( (k, A) \)
1) disconnect \( k \) from its tree.
2) add subtree to trees of \( A \).

Prob: Trees will become unbalanced
Solution  A nonroot node can have at most one missing child

**Def** \( \text{Mark}(k) \) if \( k \) has a missing child & \( k \) is not a root

**Def** \( \text{rank}(T) \) = # children of root

**Cut** \( (k) \)

1) return if \( k \) is a root
2) Let \( P = \text{parent}(k) \)
3) Remove subtree of \( k \) & move it to list of trees (unmark \( k \) & decrement rank of \( P \))
4) If \( P \) is marked then **Cut** \( (P) \)
AC of decrease key

Potential Method \( \Phi(A) = \# \text{trees} + 2(\# \text{marks}) \)

Token Method
1) Token on each root
2) 2 tokens on each marked node

Claim Amortized Cost of Cut \( \leq 4 \)

Proof consider cut \( (K) \)

Unit-cut = \# new trees formed \( \leq \# \text{nodes unmarked} + 1 \)
\[ \Delta \hat{E} = \# \text{newtrees} + 2(1 - \# \text{unmarked}) \]

\[ \leq \# \text{newtrees} + 2(1 - (\# \text{newtrees} - 1)) \]

\[ \leq -\# \text{newtrees} + 4 \]

\[ AC \leq \# \text{newtrees} - \# \text{newtrees} + 4 = 4 \]

Need bd for AC determine!

Suffice \( F_{n+2} \leq |F_{\text{bitree of rank } n}| \)

\[ F_0 = 0, \quad F_1 = 1, \quad F_{n+1} = F_n + F_{n-1} \]
Size Lower Bounds for Fibonacci Trees

There are many different proofs the the size is bound below by the Fibonacci numbers. Here is yet another one.

Claim: All Fibonacci trees can be generated by the following set of rules.

1) The singleton tree is a Fib-tree
2) The link of 2 Fib-trees is a Fib-tree.
   The two tree must have the same rank and the rank of the new tree is one more than the children.
3) The removal of any child from the root generates a Fib-tree.
   The new rank is one less.
4) The removal of a child from an unmarked non-root parent is a Fib-tree. The parent is now marked.

Define the Fibonacci numbers to be

\[ F_0 = 0 \quad F_1 = 1 \quad F_{n+1} = F_n + F_{n-1} \]

Claim: \( F_{n+2} \leq 1 \) Fib-tree of rank \( n \)

Proof:

The proof is by induction on the rank of a tree \( T \).

If the rank is 0 or 1 we are done by inspection. Let \( T \) be a minimal size tree of rank \( n+1 \) generated by the rules above.

Consider a sequence \( S \) of operation generating \( T \). Let \( T' = \text{Link}(T_1,T_2) \) be the last Link in the sequence, \( T_2 \) being linked to \( T_1 \). Assume that the rank of \( T' \) is of minimum size over all sequences generating \( T \). In this case we claim that there will be no rule-3's after \( T' \).

Proof of subclaim:

The proof is by contradiction. Suppose there was a rule-3 after constructing \( T' \).

There are two cases:
1) If we remove \( T_2 \) from the tree then we can find a new sequence which does not use this link at all.
2) Consider the case of removing a child of \( T_1 \) after \( T' \). Since \( T \) is of minimum size we will remove a child of \( T_2 \)
after $T'$. Thus we could have removed these two children before the link and then linked them. This contradicts our assumption that the rank of $T'$ was minimum.

Thus we now know that the rank of $T_1$ and $T_2$ are both $n$. WLOG all the rule-4s can be moved before $T'$ except for the removal of a child of $T_2$. Let $T'_2$ be the tree of rank $n-1$ with one child of the root removed.

$|T| = |T_1| + |T'_2| \geq F_-(n+2) + F_-(n+1) = F_-(n+3)$.

QED
Fibonacci numbers

\[ F_0 = 0 \quad F_1 = 1 \quad F_n = F_{n-1} + F_{n-2} \]

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 1 \\
1 & 1
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
f_n \\
f_{n+1}
\end{pmatrix}
=
\begin{pmatrix}
f_{n+1} \\
f_{n+2}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
\Rightarrow \quad \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 1 \\
1 & 1
\end{pmatrix}^n
\begin{pmatrix}
0 \\
1
\end{pmatrix}
=
\begin{pmatrix}
f_n \\
f_{n+1}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\[ f_n \approx \phi^n \]

\[ |\lambda| = \frac{1 \pm \sqrt{5}}{2} \quad \phi = \frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \]