

Selectable Heaps and Optimal Lazy Search Trees

Bryce Sandlund¹ and Lingyi Zhang¹

¹David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, University of Waterloo
November 25, 2020

Abstract

We show the $O(\log n)$ time extract minimum function of efficient priority queues can be generalized to the extraction of the k smallest elements in $O(k \log(n/k))$ time, where we define $\log(x)$ as $\max(\log_2(x), 1)$. We first show heap-ordered tree selection (Kaplan et al., SOSA '19) can be applied on the heap-ordered trees of the classic Fibonacci heap to support the extraction in $O(k \log(n/k))$ amortized time. We then show selection is possible in a priority queue with optimal worst-case guarantees by applying heap-ordered tree selection on Brodal queues (SODA '96), supporting the operation in $O(k \log(n/k))$ worst-case time. Via a reduction from the multiple selection problem, $\Omega(k \log(n/k))$ time is necessary if insertion is supported in $o(\log n)$ time.

We then apply the result to lazy search trees (Sandlund & Wild, FOCS '20), creating a new interval data structure based on selectable heaps. This gives optimal $O(B + n)$ time lazy search tree performance, lowering insertion complexity into a gap Δ_i to $O(\log(n/|\Delta_i|))$ time. An $O(1)$ time merge operation is also made possible when used as a priority queue, among other situations. If Brodal queues are used, runtimes of the lazy search tree can be made worst-case in the general case of two-sided gaps. The presented data structure makes fundamental use of soft heaps (Chazelle, J. ACM '00), biased search trees, and efficient priority queues, approaching the theoretically-best data structure for ordered data.

1 Introduction

The first priority queue data structure, binary heaps, were invented in 1964 for the heapsort algorithm [Wil64]. Binary heaps support $O(\log n)$ time extract minimum and insert operations. Due to their simplicity and storage of elements in an array, binary heaps or their generalization to d -ary heaps [Joh74, Tar83] continue to be one of the most practical priority queues. However, some applications for priority queues require additional operations. The binomial heap was invented in 1978 [Vui78], providing a simple priority queue that supports insertion in $O(1)$ amortized time and the merge of two heaps also in $O(1)$ amortized time [KL93]. A breakthrough in efficient priority queue literature, Fibonacci heaps, came in 1984 via generalizing binomial heaps to support an efficient decrease-key operation [FT87]. Fibonacci heaps can perform insert, meld, and decrease-key all in $O(1)$ amortized time, providing improved runtimes in shortest path and minimum spanning tree algorithms, among other applications [FT87]. A number of priority queues with time bounds matching or close to Fibonacci heaps have since been developed [FSST86, Cha09, BLT12, Elm09, HST11, Bro96, HKTZ17, DGST88, Hø95, Bro95, Elm10, KT99, KT08, SW20]. Many claim to be a simpler or more practical alternative to Fibonacci heaps [Cha09, HKTZ17, HST11, Elm10, KT99, KT08, SW20]; however, Fibonacci heaps continue to be one of the most-taught, most-performant, and simplest-to-code priority queues with optimal theoretical efficiency [HKTZ17, LST14]. A priority queue matching Fibonacci heap bounds but in the worst-case was given by Brodal in 1996 [Bro96]. More on the history and breadth of research on priority queues is given in the recent survey by Brodal [Bro13].

In this paper we show the extract minimum function of priority queues, particularly, Fibonacci heaps [FT87] and Brodal queues [Bro78], can be generalized to the extraction of the k smallest elements. Altogether, we consider the following set of heap operations, where we consider elements themselves to be keys (the generalization to key-value pairs is straightforward). We consider the following static functions without access to a heap instance:

- **MakeHeap()** := Create a new, empty heap.
- **Merge**(h_1, h_2) := Return a new heap containing all elements of h_1 and h_2 , destroying h_1 and h_2 .

And we consider the following member functions on a heap instance (thus with access to the root):

- **Insert**(e) := Add element e to the heap.
- **DecreaseKey**(e, v) := Decrease the value of e to v .
- **Delete**(e) := Delete e from the heap.
- **FindMin**() := Return the minimum element of the heap.
- **ExtractMin**() := Return and remove the minimum element of the heap.
- **SelectK**(k) := Return the k smallest elements of the heap, in no particular order.
- **ExtractK**(k) := Return and remove the k smallest elements of the heap, in no particular order.

The following operation on a heap instance will also be useful:

- **Delete**(e_1, \dots, e_k) := Remove elements e_1, \dots, e_k from the heap.

In the original Fibonacci heap paper [FT87], it was proven that Fibonacci heaps support `MakeHeap()`, `Merge()`, `Insert()`, `DecreaseKey()`, and `FindMin()` in $O(1)$ amortized time and `ExtractMin()` and `Delete()` in $O(\log n)$ amortized time. We show `FindMin()` and `ExtractMin()` operations can be generalized to `SelectK(k)` and `ExtractK(k)`, respectively. We apply the heap-ordered tree selection algorithm of Kaplan, Kozma, Zamir, and Zwick [KKZZ18] to the heap-ordered trees of Fibonacci heaps, supporting `SelectK(k)` and `ExtractK(k)` in $O(k \log(n/k))$ amortized time. Via a reduction from the multiple selection problem, we show a comparison-based priority queue supporting insertion in $o(\log n)$ time must take $\Omega(k \log(n/k))$ time for the extraction of the k smallest elements.

We then show Brodal queues [Bro96] also support efficient selection. Brodal queues match all time bounds of Fibonacci heaps for the considered set of standard priority queue operations but in the worst-case. We show heap-ordered selection [KKZZ18] can be made to work on a Brodal queue, giving `SelectK(k)` and `ExtractK(k)` in $O(k \log(n/k))$ worst-case time. This provides a priority queue with optimal worst-case time operations for all standard operations while also supporting optimal worst-case time extraction. Finally, we show both Fibonacci heaps and Brodal queues support `Delete(e_1, \dots, e_k)` in $O(k \log(n/k))$ time.

We develop selectable heaps for the application of an interval data structure for use in a lazy search tree [SW20]. A lazy search tree is a comparison-based data structure that supports the operations of a binary search tree; this operation set is referred to as a *sorted dictionary* in [SW20]. (A formal description of allowed operations is given in Section 6.) Instead of sorting elements on insertion, as does a binary search tree, lazy search trees store bags of unsorted elements in a partition into *gaps* based on key order. Specifically, a set of gaps $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_m$ are maintained such that for any $x \in \Delta_i$ and $y \in \Delta_{i+1}$, $x \leq y$. Inserted elements are placed into a gap respecting the key-order partition, and each query falls into a gap and *splits* the gap into two new gaps at a rank associated with the query operation. Lazy search trees are able to provide superior runtimes to binary search trees on operation sequences with infrequent or non-uniform query distribution. For example, n insertions and q queries can be served in $O(n \log q + q \log n)$ time, q queries for k consecutive keys with n interspersed uniformly-distributed insertions can be served in $O(n \log q + qk \log n + n \log \log n)$ time, or the data structure can be used directly as a priority queue with $O(\log \log n)$ time insert and decrease-key operations. More generally, if we take $B = \sum_{i=1}^m |\Delta_i| \log_2(n/|\Delta_i|)$, lazy search trees serve an operation sequence of n insertions and q distinct queries in $O(B + \min(n \log \log n, n \log q))$ time, where $\Omega(B + n)$ is a lower bound. Precise performance statements and further applications are stated in [SW20].

The interval data structure given in the original lazy search tree paper can be made into a selectable heap with time complexities matching those stated herein for Fibonacci heaps and Brodal queues, except that `Insert()` and `DecreaseKey()` take $O(\log \log n)$ time and `SelectK(k)` can be supported in $O(k)$ amortized time. (Although operations `FindMin()` and `SelectK(k)` are not explicitly addressed in [SW20], in Section 1.2, “Selectable Priority Queue”, it is stated how they can be performed.) By building an interval data structure off Fibonacci heaps or Brodal queues, we show the following:

1. Lazy search trees can achieve optimal $O(B + n)$ time performance over a sequence of n insertions and q distinct queries, lowering insertion complexity into gap Δ_i from $O(\min(\log(n/|\Delta_i|) + \log \log |\Delta_i|, \log q))$ to $O(\log(n/|\Delta_i|))$. This lowers the time complexity for n uniformly-distributed insertions and q interspersed queries for k consecutive keys to $O(n \log q + qk \log n)$ and improves insertion and decrease-key complexity as a priority queue to $O(1)$ time. (This answers open problem 2 from [SW20].)
2. Lazy search trees can be made to support $O(1)$ time merge when used as a priority queue,

among other situations. (This answers open problem 4 from [SW20].)

3. Queries in a lazy search tree can be made worst-case in the general case of two-sided gaps. (This addresses open problem 5 from [SW20]; a fully-general worst-case time solution does not appear possible while keeping change-key in the exact model given in [SW20]. We do offer a worst-case time solution with fully-general gap merge and change-key supported as deletion and re-insertion in $O(\log n)$ time.)

The proposed data structure makes fundamental use of soft heaps [Cha00, KTZ13, KKZZ18], biased search trees, and efficient priority queues. In some sense, this research approaches a unification of different ordered data structures into a single theory of a best data structure for ordered data. Optimal priority queues (a single gap Δ_1), online dynamic multiple selection [BGSS16] (gaps are separated by queried ranks), and binary search trees (every element is in its own gap) are special cases of our solution. This paper closes the book theoretically in the gap-based model proposed in [SW20]; any further work in this research direction requires generalization of the gap model, stated in [SW20] as open problem 1.

It is not surprising that various seemingly-unrelated ordered data structures see simultaneous use in our construction. As optimal solutions in their own domains, an optimal solution in the general domain will likely require similar ideas. On the other hand, with regards to selection in priority queues, it may seem surprising that existing efficient priority queues can support the selection of the k smallest elements in optimal time without modification, despite being designed only for the extraction of the minimum element. This is evidence that, for example, having degree bounded by the logarithm of subtree size in a heap-ordered tree is not just convenient for use as a standard priority queue, but is the “right” representation of the underlying partial order. This condition alone is not enough to guarantee optimal selection, however, and various existing priority queues seem roughly evenly-divided in their ability to support the behavior. Specifically, it appears relaxed heaps [DGST88], two-tier pruned binomial queues [EJK07], hollow heaps [HKTZ17], and thin and fat heaps [KT99] can also support selection in $O(k \log(n/k))$ time, while quake heaps [Cha09], strict Fibonacci heaps [BLT12], pairing heaps [FSST86], rank-pairing heaps [HST11], and violation heaps [Elm10] do not.

We organize the remainder of this paper as follows. In the next section, Section 2, we show a priority queue supporting insertion in $o(\log n)$ time must take $\Omega(k \log(n/k))$ time to extract the k smallest elements. In Section 3, we describe the general framework of heap-ordered tree selection from [KKZZ18]. In Section 4, we show how to support `SelectK(k)`, `ExtractK(k)`, and `Delete(e1, ..., ek)` in a Fibonacci heap in $O(k \log(n/k))$ amortized time. In Section 5, we show how to support `SelectK(k)`, `ExtractK(k)`, and `Delete(e1, ..., ek)` in a Brodal queue in $O(k \log(n/k))$ worst-case time. In Section 6, we apply selectable heaps to lazy search trees, achieving optimal performance, supporting merge as a priority queue, and giving worst-case time operations for the general case of two-sided gaps. We give concluding remarks in Section 7.

2 Lower bound

In this section, we give a simple lower bound for extraction of the k smallest elements in a priority queue.

Theorem 1. *Fix k . A priority queue supporting insertion and extraction of the k smallest elements must have $\Omega(\log(n/k))$ insertion or $\Omega(k \log(n/k))$ time extraction of the k smallest elements.*

Proof. We can reduce a multiple selection instance [DM81] to the selectable priority queue. We insert all n elements and repeatedly extract the k smallest. We can find the smallest in each set

of k elements with linear time selection [BFP⁺73]. The lower bound for this multiple selection instance is $\Omega(n + n \log_2(n/k))$ time ($\Omega(n \log_2(n/k))$ comparisons) [DM81]. Assuming fixed per-operation costs, this implies either insertion must take $\Omega(\log(n/k))$ time or extraction of the k smallest elements must take $\Omega(k \log(n/k))$ time. \square

Corollary 2. *A priority queue supporting $\text{Insert}()$ and $\text{ExtractK}(k)$ must spend either $\Omega(\log n)$ time on $\text{Insert}()$ or $\Omega(k \log(n/k))$ time on $\text{ExtractK}(k)$.*

Proof. As we consider priority queues with extraction operations with k specified as a parameter, Theorem 1 implies such a priority queue must either have $\Omega(\log n)$ time insertion or $\Omega(k \log(n/k))$ time extraction of the k smallest elements. \square

Corollary 2 implies the priority queues we consider in this paper must take $\Omega(k \log(n/k))$ time on $\text{ExtractK}(k)$ operations.

3 Heap-ordered tree selection

We use the heap-ordered tree selection algorithm of Kaplan, Kozma, Zamir, and Zwick [KKZZ18]. We can use their algorithm $\text{Soft-Select-Heapify}(r)$ as a black box, though we note that both the algorithm as well as the given soft heap implementation are simple. This is in contrast to a different algorithm by Frederickson [Fre93] which can be used to achieve the same result but is quite complicated.

We need the following definition from [KKZZ18].

Definition 3 ([KKZZ18]). *Let T be a (possibly infinite) rooted tree and let $k \geq 1$. Let $D(T, k)$ be the maximum sum of degrees over subtrees of T of size k rooted at the root of T . (The degrees summed are in T , not in the subtree.)*

Kaplan et al. [KKZZ18] give the following examples. A d -ary tree has $D(T, k) = dk$, as each node has degree d . As another example consider a tree T where each node at level i has degree $i + 2$; then, $D(T, k) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} i + 2 = k(k + 3)/2$, where the subtrees achieving this maximum are paths starting from the root. The heap-ordered tree selection theorem is the following.

Theorem 4 ([KKZZ18]). *Let T be a heap-ordered tree. We can select the k smallest items from T in $O(D(T, 3k))$ time.*

4 Fibonacci heap selection

In this section we describe our algorithm and analysis for Fibonacci heap [FT87] selection. Fibonacci heaps store a forest of heap-ordered trees and a pointer to the minimum root. A marking scheme is employed to ensure efficient decrease-key. We assume the reader is familiar with Fibonacci heaps, but to read more, we suggest consulting [FT87] or Wikipedia¹.

It is perhaps surprising that a tree T of a Fibonacci heap satisfies $D(T, k) = O(k \log(n/k))$. The bound is easier to show on a Binomial heap [Vui78]. Fibonacci heaps have a more-flexible structure, in particular giving only *lower bounds* on the rank (degree) of child nodes. This will require bounding the total degree sum by showing that a large degree sum implies more than n nodes in the Fibonacci heap. The fundamental property used is that children of a node have exponentially-increasing subtree size. In Fibonacci heaps, this is due to the following lemma.

¹https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fibonacci_heap.

Lemma 5 ([FT87]). *Let x be any node in a Fibonacci heap. Arrange the children of x in the order they were linked to x , from earliest to latest. Then the i th child of x has a rank of at least $i - 2$.*

Lemma 5 can be used to prove the following corollary.

Corollary 6 ([FT87]). *A node of rank k in a Fibonacci heap has at least $F_{k+2} \geq \phi^k$ descendants, including itself, where F_k is the k th Fibonacci number and $\phi = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$ is the golden ratio.*

We give the main theorem of the section below.

Theorem 7. *Fibonacci heaps support $\text{SelectK}(k)$, $\text{ExtractK}(k)$, and $\text{Delete}(e_1, \dots, e_k)$ in $O(k \log(n/k))$ amortized time.*

Proof. We first create a heap-ordered tree T_{big} out of the collection of roots stored in the Fibonacci heap by creating a dummy node d with value $-\infty$ and linking all roots below it. We then perform $\text{Soft-Select-Heapify}(d)$ [KKZZ18] to select the $k + 1$ smallest elements from T_{big} . We show $D(T_{big}, k) = O(t + k \log(n/k))$, where t is the number of roots the Fibonacci heap contains at the time of selection.

Consider the subtree T_{select} of T_{big} of selected nodes. Subtree T_{select} contributes $O(k)$ to the degree of the selected nodes in tree T_{big} . Let us thus ignore this contribution and consider only unselected children of selected nodes. As there are a total $n + 1$ nodes in T_{big} , we will maximize the sum of unselected children by attaching subtrees of smallest size to every selected node other than d , so that we may attach as many of them as possible. By Lemma 5 and Corollary 6, the first two unselected subtrees we attach must be of rank at least 0, containing 1 element, then the third must be of rank 1, containing 2 elements, and the j th subtree must be of rank at least $j - 2$, containing at least ϕ^{j-2} elements. The number of attached subtrees, ignoring the contribution of T_{select} , is maximized when we attach the same number i to each selected node. Solving for i in

$$k + k \sum_{j=2}^i \phi^{j-2} \geq n - k,$$

we can determine

$$i \leq \frac{\log\left(1 + \frac{(\phi-1)(n-2k)}{k}\right)}{\log \phi} + 1.$$

It follows that $i \leq \log_\phi(n/k) + 1$. Adding back the contribution of T_{select} affects the above analysis by no more than k , so that in total each selected node has degree $O(\log(n/k))$, besides dummy node d which has degree t . Structural limitations imposed by the particular tree T_{big} can only make average degree decrease by replacing smaller subtrees with larger subtrees. It thus follows that $D(T_{big}, k) = O(t + k \log(n/k))$ and by Theorem 4, selection in T_{big} takes $O(t + k \log(n/k))$ time.

To complete operation $\text{SelectK}(k)$, we reduce t to at most $\log n$ by repeatedly combining roots of equal rank. By the potential function of the Fibonacci heap [FT87], this releases t units of potential and achieves amortized $O(k \log(n/k))$ time selection. To complete operation $\text{ExtractK}(k)$, we first remove the k smallest elements. This leaves $O(t + k \log(n/k))$ independent trees. We then again repeatedly combine roots of equal rank, resulting in at most $\log n$ independent trees. The amortized time complexity of $\text{ExtractK}(k)$ is thus also $O(k \log(n/k))$.

The above degree bounds did not require the subtree T_{select} be minimal, or even connected. Our argument shows the total sum of degrees of any k nodes in a Fibonacci heap is $O(k \log(n/k))$. This allows an $O(k \log(n/k))$ time $\text{Delete}(e_1, \dots, e_k)$ operation. For each i , we remove the subtree rooted at e_i and perform cascading cuts until an ancestor of e_i is not marked or a root is reached, as in the decrease-key operation. The final unmarked ancestor, if not a root, is then marked and

all children of e_i are added to the collection of roots. The total number of children is $O(k \log(n/k))$ and each cascading cut operation takes $O(1)$ amortized time per e_i . Thus the entire deletion can be performed in $O(k \log(n/k))$ amortized time. \square

5 Brodal queue selection

Brodal queues [Bro96] are more complicated than Fibonacci heaps, but allow all operations in worst-case time. Nodes are stored in a tree T_1 and possibly another tree T_2 which is incrementally merged into T_1 . Each node x has a rank $r(x)$ and at most 7 children of any rank less than $r(x)$ (Invariants S2 and S4). Additionally, x cannot have a single child of any rank (S4) and must have at least two children of rank $r(x) - 1$ (S3). Leaves have rank 0 (S1). Violations in heap-order are allowed. If a node x is smaller than its parent $p(x)$, the violation is stored in a violating set $V(y)$ or $W(y)$ for some node $y \leq x$ (O2 and O3). The set $W(y)$ contains at most 6 violations of any rank (O4) and the set $V(y)$ contains at most $m\alpha$ violations of rank less than m , where α is a constant (O5). At the roots t_1 of T_1 and t_2 of T_2 , invariants are stronger. Each root t_i has at least two children of every rank (R1). A *guide* data structure (see also [KT99] and [EJK07] for a more thorough description of said data structure) is used to implement a redundant binary counter to ensure R1 and S4 at the roots. Two instances of the guide data structure are used at each root to maintain both a lower and upper bound on the number of children of each rank so that addition and removal of a child of any rank can be supported in $O(1)$ worst-case time. A guide data structure is also used to maintain the upper bound given in Invariant O4 on $W(t_1)$. Two violations of the same rank r can be reduced to at most one of rank $r + 1$ in worst-case $O(1)$ time.

Brodal queue [Bro96] selection will differ from Fibonacci heap selection in a couple ways. The most important is handling violating nodes. We treat violating nodes with on-the-fly conversion into a proper heap-ordered tree. The second is that the rigid rank structure of Brodal queues can actually allow us to simplify the proof of degree bounds compared to the approach taken in the previous section. Namely, rather than lower bounding the sizes of unselected subtrees, we can directly upper bound the number of nodes of high degree. We first give a lemma from [Bro96]².

Lemma 8 (Brodal [Bro96]). *A node x with rank $r(x)$ in a Brodal queue has subtree of size at least $2^{r(x)+1} - 1$.*

Lemma 8 implies the maximum rank r in a Brodal queue is at most $\log_2(n)$. Recall invariant

$$\text{S2} : r(x) < r(p(x)).$$

We can use S2 and Lemma 8 to get a bound on the number of nodes in a Brodal queue of a particular rank.

Lemma 9. *A Brodal queue has at most one node of rank $\lceil \log_2(n) \rceil$, two nodes of rank $\lceil \log_2(n) \rceil - 1$, and in general at most 2^i nodes of rank $\lceil \log_2(n) \rceil - i$, where $i \leq \lceil \log_2(n) \rceil$.*

Proof. By S2, nodes of the same rank cannot be descendants of each other. This implies their subtrees are disjoint. By Lemma 8, a node of rank $\lceil \log_2(n) \rceil - i$ has at least $n/2^{i-1} - 1 \geq n/2^i$ descendants. Thus there can only be 2^i such nodes. \square

Theorem 10. *Brodal queues support $\text{SelectK}(k)$, $\text{ExtractK}(k)$, and $\text{Delete}(e_1, \dots, e_k)$ in $O(k \log(n/k))$ worst-case time.*

²While this is not an explicit lemma in [Bro96], it is explicitly stated and proven on page 2.

Proof. As in the Brodal queue delete minimum operation, we first empty tree T_2 by moving all sons of t_2 to T_1 and making t_2 a rank 0 son of T_1 . We then call `Soft-Select-Heapify(t_1)` to select the k smallest nodes in T_1 .

Whenever we reach a node x , we consider nodes of $V(x)$ and $W(x)$ to be children of x in the selection algorithm. It is thus possible to reach a node x via its proper parent or a node y in which $x \in V(y) \cup W(y)$. Upon encountering x , we check to make sure it was not already selected. Since x is in the violating set $V(y)$ or $W(y)$ of at most one node y , the total extra work for encountering x on two paths is $O(1)$, totaling $O(k)$ for all k selected nodes. Algorithm `Soft-Select-Heapify()` can process the selection by considering the heap to be constructed in this way, on the fly. (In fact, it converts degree d nodes to degree two nodes with on-the-fly binarization anyway.)

We now consider the cost of the selection. We must show $D(T, k) = O(k \log(n/k))$, where T is the heap-ordered tree we construct on the fly. Observe that the degree of a node x in T is the sum of the number of violating nodes in its sets $V(x)$ and $W(x)$ and the number of its proper children. Observe that the number of proper children of a node x is bounded by $7r(x)$. Thus to bound the number of proper children of selected nodes, it suffices to find an upper bound on the total sum of ranks of selected nodes.

Let the ranks of the k selected nodes in non-increasing order be r_1, \dots, r_k . Then by Lemma 9, $r_1 \leq \lceil \log_2(n) \rceil$, $r_2, r_3 \leq \lceil \log_2(n) \rceil - 1$, $r_4, \dots, r_7 \leq \lceil \log_2(n) \rceil - 2$, and $r_k \leq \lceil \log_2(n) \rceil - \lceil \log_2(k) \rceil \leq \log_2(n/k) + 2$. The total sum of ranks is thus at most

$$2k + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{k}{2^i} (\log_2(n/k) + i) = k \log_2(n/k) + 4k.$$

It follows the total sum of proper children of selected nodes is $O(k \log(n/k))$.

We can apply a similar strategy to bound the total number of nodes in violating sets V and W of selected nodes. Divide the nodes into two categories: those with rank greater than or equal to $\log_2(n) - \log_2(k)$ and those with rank less than $\log_2(n) - \log_2(k)$. By Lemma 9 again and by employing the above argument, there are at most $O(k)$ nodes in the first category.

We can bound the number of nodes in the second category with invariants O4 and O5. Invariant O4 states that the W sets of selected nodes contain at most 6 nodes per rank. Invariant O5 states that V sets of selected nodes contain at most $m\alpha$ nodes of rank less than m . Together they imply a bound of $(6 + \alpha) \log_2(n/k)$ nodes in total in the second category. As $\alpha = O(1)$, this implies the total number of nodes in violating sets of selected nodes is $O(k \log(n/k))$. Since the number of proper children of selected nodes is also $O(k \log(n/k))$, we have $D(T, k) = O(k \log(n/k))$. By Theorem 4, this implies the heap-ordered tree selection takes $O(k \log(n/k))$ worst-case time.

This shows `SelectK(k)` takes $O(k \log(n/k))$ worst-case time on a Brodal queue. To prove $O(k \log(n/k))$ worst-case runtime for `ExtractK(k)`, we must rebuild the Brodal queue with the k smallest nodes removed. We can do so as follows. We remove nodes other than t_1 one-by-one. Consider the process for a node x . First, we remove x . This may cause $p(x)$ to have only one child of rank $r(x)$, violating S4. If $r(p(x)) > r(x) + 1$, we can remove the other rank $r(x)$ node from $p(x)$ and make it a child of t_1 . Otherwise, we can find a rank $r(x)$ child of the root and replace x with it. This may create a violation; if so, we can add it to $W(t_1)$. We then add the proper children of x below t_1 . Further, we must deal with $V(x)$ and $W(x)$. We can simply add them to $W(t_1)$.

We can bound the total cost of adding children of removed nodes below t_1 as the above analysis gives for the bound on the number of proper children, at $O(k \log(n/k))$. Similarly, we can bound the number of violations created at $O(k)$ and the number of violations added to $W(t_1)$ at $O(k \log(n/k))$, again following the above analysis. At this point we can then remove t_1 , following the extract minimum procedure stated in `DeleteMin(Q)` of [Bro96]. The total time taken to remove the k smallest elements is $O(k \log(n/k))$.

As in the proof of Theorem 7, we again do not need the property that the k nodes removed in $\text{ExtractK}(k)$ are minimal. We can thus support $\text{Delete}(e_1, \dots, e_k)$ as follows. We again first empty tree T_2 by moving all sons of t_2 to T_1 and making t_2 a rank 0 son of T_1 . If any $e_i = t_1$, we remove each node one-by-one as in $\text{ExtractK}(k)$, but save t_1 for the final removal as in $\text{DeleteMin}(Q)$ of [Bro96]. Otherwise, we remove each node e_i one-by-one exactly as in the above procedure for $\text{ExtractK}(k)$, skipping the final $\text{DeleteMin}(Q)$ procedure of [Bro96]. Either way the above analysis indicates the total cost will be $O(k \log(n/k))$ worst-case time. □

6 Optimal lazy search trees

Lazy search trees [SW20] are comparison-based data structures that support the following operations on a dynamic multiset S with $|S| = n$. This set of operations is referred to as a *sorted dictionary*:

- $\text{Construction}(S) :=$ Construct a sorted dictionary on the set S .
- $\text{Insert}(e) :=$ Add element e to S ; (this increments n).
- $\text{RankBasedQuery}(r) :=$ Perform a rank-based query pertaining to rank r on S .
- $\text{Delete}(e) :=$ Delete e from S , with a pointer to e ; (this decrements n).
- $\text{ChangeKey}(e, v) :=$ Change the key of the element e (with pointer to it) to v .
- $\text{Split}(r) :=$ Split S at rank r , returning two sorted dictionaries T_1 and T_2 of r and $n - r$ elements, respectively, such that for all $x \in T_1, y \in T_2, x \leq y$.
- $\text{Merge}(T_1, T_2) :=$ Merge sorted dictionaries T_1 and T_2 and return the result, given that for all $x \in T_1, y \in T_2, x \leq y$.

Informally, a rank-based query is a query computable in $O(\log n)$ time on a (possibly augmented) binary search tree and in $O(n)$ time on an unsorted array. Explicitly permitted queries include rank, select, contains, successor, predecessor, minimum, and maximum. With each query, a rank r is associated. For rank and membership queries, r is the rank of the queried element, and for select, successor, predecessor, minimum, and maximum queries, r is the rank of the element returned. Operation $\text{Split}(r)$ is a query/update hybrid with rank r given as the argument.

A formal criteria for classification as a rank-based query and the dictation of the rank r is given in the below definition, where an aggregate function is defined intuitively in [SW20]. For standard runtime analyses given herein and in [SW20], it must be possible to perform step 1 in $O(1)$ time.

Definition 11 (Rank-based query [SW20]). *Call a query on a multiset of comparable elements S such that $|S| = n$ a rank-based query pertaining to rank r if the following two conditions are satisfied:*

1. *Consider if S is split into two sets X and Y such that for all $x \in X, y \in Y, x \leq y$. It must be possible, based on an aggregate function f on X and Y , to reduce the query to a query that can be answered considering only the elements of X or only the elements of Y . The query rank r should be such that if the query is reduced to X , $r \leq |X|$, and if the query is reduced to Y , $|X| < r$.*
2. *It must be possible to answer the query on S in $O(n)$ time.*

Lazy search trees seek to improve the $O(\log n)$ time per-operation complexity given by binary search trees as a sorted dictionary by employing a fine-grained complexity analysis, not unlike that done in dynamic optimality literature [ST85, Wil89, CMSS00, Col00, Iac01, DHIP07, DHI⁺09]. Instead of sorting elements upon insertion, sorting is delayed until query operations. Elements are stored in a partition into gaps $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_m$ such that for $x \in \Delta_i$ and $y \in \Delta_{i+1}$, $x \leq y$. Inserted elements are placed into a gap respecting the key-order partition. Upon query, the gap Δ_i containing rank r is split into two gaps Δ'_i and Δ'_{i+1} such that $|\Delta'_i| + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} |\Delta_j| = r$ and for $x \in \Delta'_i$, $y \in \Delta'_{i+1}$, $x \leq y$.

The results of [SW20] are **Construction**(S) in $O(n)$ time where $|S| = n$, **Insert**(v) into a gap Δ_i in $O(\min(\log(n/|\Delta_i|) + \log \log |\Delta_i|, \log q))$ worst-case time (q is the number of queries), **RankBasedQuery**(r) that splits a gap Δ_i into a smaller gap of size k and a larger gap of size $|\Delta_i| - k$ in $O(k \log(|\Delta_i|/k) + \log n)$ amortized time, **Delete**(v) in $O(\log n)$ worst-case time, **Split**(r) in time as in **RankBasedQuery**(r), and **Merge**(v, w) in $O(\log n)$ worst-case time. The performance of **ChangeKey**(e, v) is not as easily stated. In general it can be supported in $O(\log n)$ worst-case time as in deletion and reinsertion. More efficient runtimes are possible dependent on the rank of the element e and the nature of the gap Δ_i to which e belongs (and remains after the key-change). Each gap is either *zero-sided*, *left-sided*, *right-sided*, or *two-sided*. If no queries have occurred, the single gap Δ_1 is zero-sided; if queries have occurred only on the left boundary of Δ_i it is left-sided, only on the right boundary it is right-sided, and otherwise (the typical case) it is two-sided. A zero-sided gap Δ_i supports any key-change operation within Δ_i in $O(1)$ time. A left-sided gap Δ_i supports decrease-key within Δ_i in $O(\min(\log q, \log \log |\Delta_i|))$ time. A right-sided gap Δ_i supports increase-key within Δ_i in the same time complexity. A two-sided gap Δ_i supports decrease-key on elements less than or equal to the median of Δ_i and increase-key on elements larger than or equal to the median of Δ_i , again in the same time complexity.

As previously stated, if we take $B = \sum_{i=1}^m |\Delta_i| \log_2(n/|\Delta_i|)$, lazy search trees serve an operation sequence of n insertions and q distinct queries in $O(B + \min(n \log \log n, n \log q))$ time, where $\Omega(B + n)$ is a lower bound [SW20]. By using selectable heaps in place of the interval data structure in [SW20], we can achieve three new results for lazy search trees.

Theorem 12. *1. Lazy search trees can support insertion into gap Δ_i in $O(\log(n/|\Delta_i|))$ time and change-key in $O(1)$ time instead of $O(\min(\log q, \log \log |\Delta_i|))$ time in the conditions stated above, while matching previous time bounds for all other operations. Taking $B = \sum_{i=1}^m |\Delta_i| \log_2(n/|\Delta_i|)$, lazy search trees serve a sequence of n insertions and q distinct queries in $O(B + n)$ time, which is optimal.*

2. Split of a two-sided gap Δ_i can be done in worst-case instead of amortized time. Split of a left-sided or right-sided gap Δ_i can be done in worst-case instead of amortized time if the larger resulting gap is left-sided or right-sided, respectively.

3. Merge of two left-sided gaps or two right-sided gaps can be performed in $O(1)$ amortized or worst-case time. Alternatively, change-key can be made $O(\log n)$ time, the merge of any two gaps can be supported in $O(1)$ time, and all operations of the lazy search tree can be made worst-case.

Proof. We create a new interval data structure³ based on selectable heaps. If the gap is zero-sided, the interval data structure is an unsorted array or linked list. If the gap is left-sided, the interval

³The term “interval data structure” was used in [SW20] due to the representation of elements within a gap into a second-level key-order partition into intervals, analogous to the gaps on the first level. The “interval data structure” discussed herein is based on selectable heaps, so at this point the name is a misnomer, but we maintain the nomenclature for consistency.

data structure is a selectable min-heap. If the gap is right-sided, the interval data structure is a selectable max-heap. Otherwise, the gap is two-sided, and we partition the elements roughly into thirds. The smallest third of the elements we make into a min-heap, the largest into a max-heap, and the middle third we keep unsorted. We maintain that each third contains at least a $1/3 - \epsilon$ for $0 < \epsilon < 1/6$ fraction of the total elements in the gap. We can maintain static separator elements between the thirds to ensure a valid partition.

As in [SW20], insertion first locates the gap Δ_i in which the inserted element belongs in $O(\log(n/|\Delta_i|))$ worst-case time. Insertion within the interval data structure then considers which third to place the element, if applicable, then does so in $O(1)$ worst-case time if the selectable heap is Fibonacci [FT87] or Brodal [Bro96] (or if it is an unsorted array). Change-key is supported as decrease-key in a left-sided heap or increase-key in a right-sided heap, in $O(1)$ time. For a two-sided gap, any element in the middle third can have its key increased or decreased via removal and re-insertion into the proper third in $O(1)$ time, otherwise the min-heap supports decrease-key and the max-heap increase-key, ultimately satisfying the necessary constraints for efficient change-key, in $O(1)$ time. If a Brodal queue is used, the complexity is worst-case.

Query works as follows. As in [SW20], first the gap Δ_i in which $r \in \Delta_i$ is found in $O(\log n)$ time. If Δ_i is zero-sided we amortized the work against the total number of elements in zero-sided gaps, as in [SW20], performing the operation in $O(1)$ amortized time. If Δ_i is two-sided, then via Definition 11, it should be possible to determine which third the query rank r falls into, if applicable, in $O(1)$ time. If in the middle third, we answer the query in $O(|\Delta_i|)$ time, rebuilding Δ_i into Δ'_i and Δ'_{i+1} as previously described. Otherwise, we must perform selection in a min- or max-heap; without loss of generality, assume it is a min-heap. We repeat the following. We select the smallest 2^j elements into a set X and the smallest 2^{j+1} elements into a set Y , starting at $j = 0$. By Definition 11, we can determine which of X or Y contains r . If it is Y , we continue with $j \leftarrow j + 1$; otherwise, we stop and answer the query. We break Δ_i into Δ'_i and Δ'_{i+1} so that $|\Delta'_i| + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} |\Delta_j| = r$, by extracting $k = r - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} |\Delta_j|$ elements from the heap. We make Δ'_i into a new two-sided gap in $O(k)$ time. The existing structure of gap Δ_i becomes Δ'_{i+1} .

The time complexity of query can be proven as follows. The time taken for the selections, by Theorems 7 and 10, is proportional to no more than $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} k/2^i \log(n2^i/k) = O(k \log(n/k))$. Extraction similarly takes $O(k \log(n/k))$ time. If a Brodal queue is used, the time bound is worst-case. However, k may be larger than $|\Delta_i|/2$ if Δ_i was a left-sided or right-sided gap. In this case we can amortized against the total number of elements in one-sided gaps, as is done in [SW20], to perform the operation in $O(1)$ amortized time.

Operation **Construction(S)** can be completed via insert. Operation **Delete(e)** can be performed as priority queue deletion, in $O(\log n)$ time. Operation **Split(r)** is performed as query and then an operation on the biased search tree gap data structure, as in [SW20]. Finally, **Merge(T_1, T_2)** similarly occurs at the gap level.

One detail remains, which is the maintenance of the partition into thirds in a two-sided gap into fractions of size at least $1/3 - \epsilon$ of the total gap size. For every k elements inserted, removed, or key-changed in an operation, we perform $O(k)$ work towards building a new copy of the interval data structure with a more-accurate partition, as described in [Ove83]. After the new version is constructed it is caught up to the operations performed during construction at twice the pace they occur. When it is caught up the current data structure is thrown away and construction on a new data structure begins. This allows worst-case time maintenance of the partition while keeping all operation complexity the same.

The above shows parts 1 and 2 of Theorem 12. We now consider part 3. Brodal and Fibonacci heaps support $O(1)$ time merge, in worst-case and amortized time, respectively. As left-sided and right-sided gaps are just selectable heaps, we can simply merge the heaps. For the alternative

approach, we forget about left-sided, right-sided, or two-sided gaps and store all elements of a gap in both a min- and max-heap, with each element containing a pointer to the other in the opposite heap. All operations work as above, except now for query, when we extract elements from the min- or max-heap, we also delete the elements in the other heap. As stated in Theorems 7 and 10, deletion of the k elements can be completed in $O(k \log(n/k))$ amortized or worst-case time, respectively. Now, since any two gaps has both a min- and a max-heap, we can support the merge of two arbitrary gaps in $O(1)$ time by simply merging the two min- and max-heaps. Change-key is supported only by deletion and re-insertion, in $O(\log n)$ time. All operations can be made worst-case via use of a Brodal queue. \square

Theorem 12 answers open problems 2, 4, and 5 from [SW20], though we give worst-case performance only in the general case of two-sided gaps. It appears this may be necessary if change-key is to be supported as a decrease-key operation for all elements in a left-sided gap (analogously, increase-key in a right-sided gap), which is what provides optimal performance as a priority queue. Specifically, the performance of change-key and the ability to perform quick splitting of a gap are coupled. If a lazy search tree is used as a min-heap, allowing decrease-key of all elements, then we cannot find the maximum element in $O(\log n)$ worst-case time. We need to rebuild the data structure so that ranks close to the maximum and minimum can be found efficiently, which necessarily requires the change-key operation to be decrease-key on elements with rank closer to the minimum and increase-key on elements with rank closer to the maximum.

Finally, we observe that the alternative insertion complexity of $O(\log q)$ is also achieved in the version of lazy search trees stated herein. The number of elements in the gap data structure is bounded by q [SW20], and insertion into the interval data structure based on selectable heaps takes $O(1)$ time. However, $O(\log q)$ vs. $O(\log(n/|\Delta_i|))$ time insertion does not impact overall time complexity on any sequence of operations, so we leave it out of the statement of Theorem 12.

7 Conclusion

In this paper we have shown that the $O(\log n)$ time extract-minimum function of efficient priority queues can be generalized to the extraction of the k smallest elements in $O(k \log(n/k))$ time. We apply selectable heaps to lazy search trees [SW20], giving an optimal data structure in the gap model, adding a merge function when used as a priority queue, and providing worst-case runtimes in the general case of two-sided gaps. Any further theoretical improvement in lazy search trees would require abstraction to an even more fine-grained model.

We believe the approach to lazy search trees given in this paper is more straightforward than that of [SW20]. With an understanding of Fibonacci heaps [FT87] or Brodal queues [Bro96], the technical arguments required herein are slightly less involved. However, the approach of [SW20] based on first principles has its own merit. In [SW20], the data structure satisfies an $O(\min(n, q))$ pointer bound, where n is the number of elements and q the number of queries. Further, the simple priority queue developed which supports extraction natively is surely more practical. In [SW20], it is shown a rudimentary implementation of the described data structure can outperform binary search trees in infrequent or non-uniformly-distributed query scenarios when the number of insertions approaches 1 000 000. In contrast, the lazy search tree algorithms discussed herein are likely to mostly be of theoretical interest.

For future work, it would be interesting to see if selectable heaps have further applications outside of the straightforward transitive applications through lazy search trees, such as an optimal online multiple selection algorithm [DM81]. Although of relatively low theoretical import, it would

also be interesting to see if selection can be supported on a priority queue with optimal worst-case guarantees in the pointer machine model, such as strict Fibonacci heaps [BLT12]. Such a data structure would allow a lazy search tree with worst-case guarantees on the pointer machine, whereas the version discussed here requires internal use of arrays. Finally, it may be possible to support `SelectK(k)` in $O(k)$ time, as do lazy search tree priority queues, but while retaining optimal time bounds for the remaining operations.

References

- [BFP⁺73] Manuel Blum, Robert W. Floyd, Vaughan Pratt, Ronald L. Rivest, and Robert E. Tarjan. Time bounds for selection. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 7(4):448–461, 1973.
- [BGSS16] Jérémy Barbay, Ankur Gupta, Srinivasa Rao Satti, and Jon Sorenson. Near-optimal online multiselection in internal and external memory. *Journal of Discrete Algorithms*, 36:3–17, 2016. WALCOM 2015.
- [BLT12] Gerth Stølting Brodal, George Lagogiannis, and Robert E. Tarjan. Strict Fibonacci heaps. In *Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*. ACM, 2012.
- [Bro78] Mark R. Brown. Implementation and analysis of binomial queue algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 7(3):298–319, 1978.
- [Bro95] Gerth Stølting Brodal. Fast meldable priority queues. In *Workshop on Algorithms and Data Structures (WADS)*, pages 282–290. Springer, 1995.
- [Bro96] Gerth Stølting Brodal. Worst-case efficient priority queues. In *Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*. SIAM, 1996.
- [Bro13] Gerth Stølting Brodal. A survey on priority queues. In *Space-Efficient Data Structures, Streams, and Algorithms*, pages 150–163. Springer, 2013.
- [Cha00] Bernard Chazelle. The soft heap: an approximate priority queue with optimal error rate. *Journal of the ACM*, 47(6):1012–1027, 2000.
- [Cha09] Timothy M. Chan. Quake heaps: A simple alternative to Fibonacci heaps. In *Space-Efficient Data Structures, Streams, and Algorithms*, pages 27–32. Springer, 2009.
- [CMSS00] Richard Cole, Bud Mishra, Jeanette Schmidt, and Alan Siegel. On the dynamic finger conjecture for splay trees. part I: Splay sorting $\log n$ -block sequences. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 30(1):1–43, 2000.
- [Col00] Richard Cole. On the dynamic finger conjecture for splay trees. part II: The proof. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 30(1):44–85, 2000.
- [DGST88] James R. Driscoll, Harold N. Gabow, Ruth Shairman, and Robert E. Tarjan. Relaxed heaps: An alternative to Fibonacci heaps with applications to parallel computation. *Communications of the ACM*, 31(1):343–354, 1988.
- [DHI⁺09] Erik D. Demaine, Dion Harmon, John Iacono, Daniel Kane, and Mihai Patrascu. The geometry of binary search trees. In *Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 496–505. SIAM, 2009.

- [DHIP07] Erik D. Demaine, Dion Harmon, John Iacono, and Mihai Patrascu. Dynamic optimality—almost. *Siam Journal of Computing*, 37(1):240–251, 2007.
- [DM81] David Dobkin and J. Ian Munro. Optimal time minimal space selection algorithms. *Journal of the Association for Computing Machinery*, 28(3):454–461, 1981.
- [EJK07] Amr Elmasry, Claus Jensen, and Jyrki Katajainen. On the power of structural violations in priority queues. In *Proceedings of the thirteenth Australasian symposium on Theory of computing*. ACM, 2007.
- [Elm09] Amr Elmasry. Pairing heaps with $O(\log \log n)$ decrease cost. In *Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*. SIAM, 2009.
- [Elm10] Amr Elmasry. The violation heap: A relaxed Fibonacci-like heap. *Discrete Mathematics Algorithms and Applications*, 2(4):493–503, 2010.
- [Fre93] Greg N. Frederickson. An optimal algorithm for selection in a min-heap. *Information and Computation*, 104(2):197–214, 1993.
- [FSST86] Michael L. Fredman, Robert Sedgwick, Daniel D. Sleator, and Robert E. Tarjan. The pairing heap: A new form of self-adjusting heap. *Algorithmica*, 1(1):111–129, 1986.
- [FT87] Michael Fredman and Robert E. Tarjan. Fibonacci heaps and their uses in improved network optimization algorithms. *Journal of the Association for Computing Machinery*, 34(3):596–615, 1987.
- [HKTZ17] Thomas Dueholm Hansen, Haim Kaplan, Robert E. Tarjan, and Uri Zwick. Hollow heaps. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 13(3):1–27, 2017.
- [Hø95] Peter Høyer. A general technique for implementation of efficient priority queues. In *Proceedings of the Third Israel Symposium on the Theory of Computing and Systems*. IEEE, 1995.
- [HST11] Bernhard Haeupler, Siddhartha Sen, and Robert E. Tarjan. Rank-pairing heaps. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 40(6):1463–1485, 2011.
- [Iac01] John Iacono. Alternatives to splay trees with $o(\log n)$ worst-case access time. In *Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 516–522. SIAM, 2001.
- [Joh74] Donald B. Johnson. Priority queues with update and finding minimum spanning trees. *Information Processing Letters*, 4(3):53–57, 1974.
- [KKZZ18] Haim Kaplan, László Kozma, Or Zamir, and Uri Zwick. Selection from Heaps, Row-Sorted Matrices, and $X + Y$ Using Soft Heaps. In Jeremy T. Fineman and Michael Mitzenmacher, editors, *2nd Symposium on Simplicity in Algorithms (SOSA 2019)*, volume 69 of *OpenAccess Series in Informatics (OASICs)*, pages 5:1–5:21, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2018. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik.
- [KL93] C. M. Khoong and H. W. Leong. Double-ended binomial queues. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation*. Springer, 1993.
- [KT99] Haim Kaplan and Robert E. Tarjan. New heap data structures. Technical report, Princeton University, 1999.

- [KT08] Haim Kaplan and Robert Endre Tarjan. Thin heaps, thick heaps. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 4(1), 2008.
- [KTZ13] Haim Kaplan, Robert Endre Tarjan, and Uri Zwick. Soft heaps simplified. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 42(4):1660–1673, 2013.
- [LST14] Daniel H. Larkin, Siddhartha Sen, and Robert E. Tarjan. A back-to-basics empirical study of priority queues. In *Proceedings of the Meeting on Algorithm Engineering & Experiments*, pages 61–72. ACM, 2014.
- [Ove83] Mark H Overmars. *The design of dynamic data structures*, volume 156. Springer Science & Business Media, 1983.
- [ST85] Daniel D. Sleator and Robert E. Tarjan. Self-adjusting binary search trees. *Journal of the ACM*, 32(3):652–686, 1985.
- [SW20] Bryce Sandlund and Sebastian Wild. Lazy search trees. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 2020.
- [Tar83] Robert Endre Tarjan. *Data Structures and Network Algorithms*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1983.
- [Vui78] Jean Vuillemin. A data structure for manipulating priority queues. *Communications of the ACM*, 21(4):309–315, 1978.
- [Wil64] J. W. J. Williams. Algorithm 232 - heapsort. *Communications of the ACM*, 7(6):347–348, 1964.
- [Wil89] Robert E. Wilber. Lower bounds for accessing binary search trees with rotations. *Siam Journal of Computing*, 18(1):56–69, 1989.