Amortized Analysis
Doing the Dishes

• What do I do with a dirty dish or kitchen utensil?

• **Option 1:** Wash it by hand.

• **Option 2:** Put it in the dishwasher rack, then run the dishwasher if it’s full.
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  - **Option 2:** Put it in the dishwasher rack, then run the dishwasher if it’s full.
Doing the Dishes

• Washing every individual dish and utensil by hand is 
way slower than using the dishwasher, but I always have 
access to my plates and kitchen utensils.

• Running the dishwasher is faster in aggregate, but 
means I may have to wait a bit for dishes to be ready.
**Key Idea:** Design data structures that trade *per-operation efficiency* for *overall efficiency.*
Example: The Two-Stack Queue
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Our dirty dishes are piling up because we didn’t do any work to clean them when we added them in.
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- **Clean Dishes**
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4

- **Dirty Dishes**
  - 1
We just cleaned up our entire mess and are back to a pristine state.
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We need to do some “cleanup” on this before it’ll be useful. It’s fast to add it here because we’re deferring that work.
The Two-Stack Queue

Clean Dishes

Dirty Dishes

1 2

3 4

6 5
The Two-Stack Queue

Clean Dishes

3

4

Dirty Dishes

6

5

1 2
The Two-Stack Queue
The Two-Stack Queue

Clean Dishes

Dirty Dishes

1 2 3

4

5 6 7
The Two-Stack Queue

Clean Dishes

1
2
3

Dirty Dishes

4
5
6
7
The Two-Stack Queue
The Two-Stack Queue

Clean Dishes

1 2 3 4

Dirty Dishes

5 6 7
The Two-Stack Queue

Clean Dishes

1 2 3 4

Dirty Dishes

5 6 7
The Two-Stack Queue

1  2  3  4

Clean Dishes

7

Dirty Dishes

6

5
The Two-Stack Queue

Clean Dishes

1 2 3 4

Dirty Dishes

5
6 7
The Two-Stack Queue

Clean Dishes

Dirty Dishes

1  2  3  4

1  2  3  4  5

6  7
The Two-Stack Queue

Clean Dishes

6
7

Dirty Dishes

5

1 2 3 4
The Two-Stack Queue
The Two-Stack Queue

Clean Dishes

Dirty Dishes

1 2 3 4 5
The Two-Stack Queue

• Maintain an *In* stack and an *Out* stack.
• To enqueue an element, push it onto the *In* stack.
• To dequeue an element:
  • If the *Out* stack is nonempty, pop it.
  • If the *Out* stack is empty, pop elements from the *In* stack, pushing them into the *Out* stack, until the bottom of the *In* stack is exposed.
The Two-Stack Queue

- Each enqueue takes time $O(1)$.
  - Just push an item onto the $\text{In}$ stack.
- Dequeues can vary in their runtime.
  - Could be $O(1)$ if the $\text{Out}$ stack isn’t empty.
  - Could be $\Theta(n)$ if the $\text{Out}$ stack is empty.
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- Each enqueue takes time $O(1)$.
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The Two-Stack Queue

• **Intuition:** We only do expensive dequeues after a long run of cheap enqueues.

• Think “dishwasher:” we very slowly introduce a lot of dirty dishes to get cleaned up all at once.

• Provided we clean up all the dirty dishes at once, and provided that dirty dishes accumulate slowly, this is a fast strategy!
The Two-Stack Queue

- Any series of $m$ operations on a two-stack queue will take time $O(m)$.
- Every element is pushed at most twice and popped at most twice.
- **Key Question:** What’s the best way to summarize the above idea in a useful way?
- This is a bit more subtle than it looks.

```
| 3  |
| ... |
| n-1 |
| n   |
```

*Out*   *In*
Analyzing the Queue

- **Initial idea:** Summarize our result using an average-case analysis.
  - If we do $m$ total operations, the total work done is $O(m)$.
  - Average amount of work per operation: $O(1)$.
  - Based on this argument, we can claim that the average cost of an enqueue or dequeue is $O(1)$.

- **Claim:** While the above statement is true, it’s not as precise as we might like.
**Issue:** When we say the average cost of an operation is $O(1)$, what are we averaging over?
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Total operations: 9
Average work per element: \( \approx 1.66 \)
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[Diagram showing different colored boxes representing work over time]
Total work done: $\Theta(m)$

Total operations: $\Theta(m)$

Average work per element: $O(1)$. 
If the array has size $m$ and we do $m - 1$ queries, the average work per operation is $O(1)$.
Building this dam is an enormous up-front cost, but pays for itself in the long-term... assuming it lasts that long. 😊
**Dishwasher model:** Lots of cheap operations that need to be made up for by an expensive one later.

The average work done at each point in time is low.

**Dam model:** Early, expensive operation that pays off in the long term.

The average work done at each point in time is high until lots of operations are performed.
**Nuance 1:** The average cost of the operations done on a two-stack queue is *always* low, regardless of when we stop performing operations.
Averaging Over What?

• Compare our two-stack queue to a chained hash table.

• Assuming there are at least as many buckets as elements, the expected cost of an insertion or lookup is O(1).

• However, it isn’t guaranteed that the cost of a lookup or insertion is O(1).
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- Compare our two-stack queue to a chained hash table.
- Assuming there are at least as many buckets as elements, the expected cost of an insertion or lookup is $O(1)$.
- However, it isn’t guaranteed that the cost of a lookup or insertion is $O(1)$.
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Total operations: $\Theta(m)$
Average work per element: $\Theta(m)$. 
Grocery stores don’t need to stock up huge quantities of every item because, *on average*, people aren’t buying the same thing.

But if they all want toilet paper...
**Dishwasher model:** Lots of cheap operations that need to be made up for by an expensive one later.

The average work done at each point in time is low.

**Grocery store model:** It’s unlikely that there will be any large operations because randomization saves the day.

Except that, every now and then, we run into trouble...
**Nuance 2:** The “average” mentioned in a two-stack queue is not based on any random variables. There is no chance that any sequence of operations on a two-stack queue takes “too long.”
To Summarize
**Dishwasher (Amortization)**
Each expensive operation is preceded by lots of cheap ones.

**Grocery Store (Randomization)**
Performs well on expectation, can’t guarantee efficiency.

**Dam (Preprocessing)**
Early expensive operations, cheap later ones.
What Amortization Means
**Key Idea:** Backcharge expensive operations to cheaper ones.
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**Key Idea:** Backcharge expensive operations to cheaper ones.

If we *pretend* that each operation takes three units of time, we never underestimate the amount of work that we do.
Amortized Analysis

• Suppose we perform a series of operations $op_1, op_2, \ldots, op_m$.

• The amount of time taken to execute operation $op_i$ is denoted by $t(op_i)$.

• **Goal:** For each operation $op_i$, pick a value $a(op_i)$, called the *amortized cost* of $op_i$, such that

\[
\forall k \leq m. \sum_{i=1}^{k} t(op_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} a(op_i).
\]
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...the *actual* cost of performing those operations...
Amortized Analysis

- Suppose we perform a series of operations $op_1$, $op_2$, ..., $op_m$.
- The amount of time taken to execute operation $op_i$ is denoted by $t(op_i)$.
- **Goal**: For each operation $op_i$, pick a value $a(op_i)$, called the *amortized cost* of $op_i$, such that

$$\forall k \leq m. \quad \sum_{i=1}^{k} t(op_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} a(op_i).$$

...the actual cost of performing those operations...

...is at most the amortized cost of performing those operations.
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• Suppose we perform a series of operations $op_1$, $op_2$, ..., $op_m$.

• The amount of time taken to execute operation $op_i$ is denoted by $t(op_i)$.

• **Goal:** For each operation $op_i$, pick a value $a(op_i)$, called the *amortized cost* of $op_i$, such that
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Amortized Analysis

- The *amortized* cost of an enqueue or dequeue in a two-stack queue is $O(1)$.

**Intuition:** If you pretend that the *actual* cost of each enqueue or dequeue is $O(1)$, you will never underestimate the total time spent performing queue operations.

\[ \forall k \leq m. \sum_{i=1}^{k} t(op_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} a(op_i). \]
Major Questions

- In what situations can we nicely amortize the cost of expensive operations?
- How do we choose the amortized costs we want to use?
- How do we design data structures with amortization in mind?
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Most appends take time $O(1)$ and consume some free space.

Every now and then, an append takes time $O(n)$, but produce a lot of free space.

With a little math, you can show that the amortized cost of any append is $O(1)$.
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Most insertions take time $O(\log n)$ and unbalance the tree. Some insertions do more work, but balance large parts of the tree.

With the right strategy for rebuilding trees, all insertions can be shown to run in *amortized* time $O(\log n)$ each. (This is called a *scapegoat tree*.)
**Key Intuition:** Amortization works best if (1) imbalances accumulate slowly, and (2) imbalances get cleaned up quickly.
Performing Amortized Analyses
Performing Amortized Analyses

• You have a data structure where
  • imbalances accumulate slowly, and
  • imbalances get cleaned up quickly.
• You’re fairly sure the cleanup costs will amortize away nicely.
• How do you assign amortized costs?
The Banker's Method

• In the **banker's method**, operations can place **credits** on the data structure or spend credits that have already been placed.

• Placing a credit on the data structure takes time $O(1)$.

• Spending a credit previously placed on the data structure takes time $-O(1)$. *(Yes, that’s negative time!)*

• The amortized cost of an operation is then

  \[
  a(op_i) = t(op_i) + O(1) \cdot (\text{added}_i - \text{removed}_i)
  \]

• There aren’t any real credits anywhere. They’re just an accounting trick.
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Actual work: $O(1)$
Credits added: 1
Amortized cost: $O(1)$

This credit will pay for the work to pop this element later on and push it onto the other stack.
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![Diagram of two stacks with numbers 3, 4 on the left and 2, 1 on the right, with a dollar sign symbolizing input and output.]
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Actual work: $\Theta(k)$
Credits spent: $k$

Amortized cost: $O(1)$
Why This Works
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(Assuming we never spend credits we don’t have.)
Using the Banker’s Method

• To perform an amortized analysis using the banker’s method, do the following:
  • Figure out the actual runtimes of each operation.
  • Indicate where you’ll place down credits, and compute the amortized cost of operations that place credits this way.
  • Indicate where you’ll spend credits, and *justify why the credits you intend to spend are guaranteed to be there*. Then, compute the amortized cost of each operation that spends credits this way.
An Observation

● The amortized cost of an operation is
  \[ a(op_i) = t(op_i) + O(1) \cdot (\text{added}_i - \text{removed}_i) \]

● Equivalently, this is
  \[ a(op_i) = t(op_i) + O(1) \cdot \Delta\text{credits}_i. \]

● Some observations:
  
  ● It doesn't matter where these credits are placed or removed from.
  
  ● The total number of credits added and removed doesn't matter; all that matters is the difference between these two.
The Potential Method

• In the **potential method**, we define a **potential function** $\Phi$ that maps a data structure to a non-negative real value.

• Define $a(op_i)$ as

$$a(op_i) = t(op_i) + O(1) \cdot \Delta \Phi_i$$

• Here, $\Delta \Phi_i$ is the change in the value of $\Phi$ during the execution of operation $op_i$. 
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\[
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\]

\[
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Think “fundamental theorem of calculus,” but for discrete derivatives!

\[
\int_{a}^{b} f'(x) \, dx = f(b) - f(a)
\]

\[
\sum_{x=a}^{b} \Delta f(x) = f(b+1) - f(a)
\]

Look up \textit{finite calculus} if you’re curious to learn more!
Why This Works

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k} a(op_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} (t(op_i) + O(1) \cdot \Delta \Phi_i)
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{k} t(op_i) + O(1) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{k} \Delta \Phi_i
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{k} t(op_i) + O(1) \cdot (net \ change \ in \ potential)
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Why This Works

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{k} a(op_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left( t(op_i) + O(1) \cdot \Delta \Phi_i \right) \]

\[ = \sum_{i=1}^{k} t(op_i) + O(1) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{k} \Delta \Phi_i \]

\[ = \sum_{i=1}^{k} t(op_i) + O(1) \cdot \text{(net change in potential)} \]

\[ \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} t(op_i) \]

(Assuming our potential doesn’t end up below where it started)
Using the Potential Method

To perform an amortized analysis using the potential method, do the following:

1. Figure out the actual runtimes of each operation.
2. Define your potential function $\Phi$, and explain why it’s initially zero or otherwise account for a nonzero start potential.
3. For each operation, determine its $\Delta \Phi$.
4. Compute the amortized costs of each operation.
The Story So Far

- We assign *amortized costs* to operations, which are different than their real costs.
- The requirement is that the sum of the amortized costs never underestimates the sum of the real costs.
- The *banker’s method* works by placing credits on the data structure and adjusting costs based on those credits.
- The *potential method* works by assigning a potential function to the data structure and adjusting costs based on the change in potential.
Deleting from a BST
BST Deletions

• We’ve seen how to do insertions into a 2-3-4 tree.
  • Put the key into the appropriate leaf.
  • Keep splitting big nodes and propagating keys upward as necessary.

• Using our isometry, we can use this to derive insertion rules for red/black trees.

• **Question:** How do you delete from a 2-3-4 tree or red/black tree?
**Question:** How do we delete 20 from this tree? How about 4? How about 25? How about 17?
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- **Question:** How do we delete 20 from this tree? How about 4? How about 25? How about 17?
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**Question:** How do we delete 20 from this tree? How about 4? How about 25? How about 17?
**BST Deletions**

- **Question:** How do we delete 20 from this tree? How about 4? How about 25? How about 17?
Dead Simple Deletions

• *Idea:* Delete things in the laziest way possible.
Dead Simple Deletions

- Each key is either **dead** (removed) or **alive** (still there).
- To remove a key, just mark it dead.
- Do lookups as usual, but pretend missing keys aren’t there.
- When inserting, if a dead version of the key is found, resurrect it.
Dead Simple Deletions

- **Problem:** What happens if too many keys die?
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- **Idea:** Rebuild the tree when half the keys are dead.
Dead Simple Deletions

- **Idea:** Rebuild the tree when half the keys are dead.

We can rebuild this tree in time $O(n)$. We can get the keys in sorted order from the last BST in time $O(n)$ by doing an inorder traversal, then directly build the red/black tree.

**Great exercise:** fill in the details!
Dead Simple Deletions

• **Idea:** Rebuild the tree when half the keys are dead.
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- **Idea:** Rebuild the tree when half the keys are dead.
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- **Idea:** Rebuild the tree when half the keys are dead.
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- **Idea:** Rebuild the tree when half the keys are dead.
Analyzing Lazy Rebuilding

• What is the cost of an insertion or lookup in a tree with \( n \) (living) keys?
  • Total number of nodes: at most \( 2n \).
  • Cost of the operation: \( O(\log 2n) = O(\log n) \).

• What is the cost of a deletion?
  • Most of the time, it’s \( O(\log n) \).
  • Every now and then, it’s \( O(n) \).
  • Can we amortize these costs away?
Amortized Analysis

- **Idea:** Place a credit on each dead key.
- When we do a rebuild, there are $\Theta(n)$ credits on the tree, which we can use to pay for the $\Theta(n)$ rebuild cost.
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• **Idea:** Place a credit on each dead key.
• When we do a rebuild, there are $\Theta(n)$ credits on the tree, which we can use to pay for the $\Theta(n)$ rebuild cost.
**Amortized Analysis**

- **Idea:** Place a credit on each dead key.
- When we do a rebuild, there are $\Theta(n)$ credits on the tree, which we can use to pay for the $\Theta(n)$ rebuild cost.
Lazy Rebuilding

- The amortized cost of a lookup or insertion is $O(\log n)$. 
  *(Do you see why?)*

- If a deletion doesn’t rebuild, its amortized cost is $O(\log n) + O(1) = O(\log n)$.

- If a deletion triggers a rebuild:
  - When we start, we have $n / 2$ credits.
  - When we end, we have 0 credits.
  - Cost of the tree search: $O(\log n)$.
  - Cost of the tree rebuild: $\Theta(n)$.
  - Amortized cost: $O(\log n) + \Theta(n) - O(1) \cdot \Theta(n) = O(\log n)$.

*Intuition:* Imbalances build up over time, then get fixed all at once, so we’d expect costs to spread out nicely.
Lazy Deletions

• This approach isn’t perfect.
  • Queries for the min or max are slower.
  • Augmentation is a bit harder.
  • Successor / predecessor / range searches slower.
• There are a number of papers about being lazy during BST deletions, many of which have led to new, fast tree data structures.
• Check out WAVL and RAVL trees – these might make for great final project topics!
Next Time

• **Binomial Heaps**
  • A simple and versatile heap data structure based on binary arithmetic.

• **Lazy Binomial Heaps**
  • Rejiggering binomial heaps for fun and profit.