Collection of trees that fulfill the heap property.

Structure is much more relaxed than binomial heaps.



Additional implementation details:

- Every node x stores its degree in a field x. degree. Note that this can be updated in constant time when adding a child to x.
- Every node stores a boolean value x.marked that specifies whether x is marked or not.

The potential function:

- t(S) denotes the number of trees in the heap.
- m(S) denotes the number of marked nodes.
- We use the potential function $\Phi(S) = t(S) + 2m(S)$.



The potential is $\Phi(S) = 5 + 2 \cdot 3 = 11$.

We assume that one unit of potential can pay for a constant amount of work, where the constant is chosen "big enough" (to take care of the constants that occur).

To make this more explicit we use *c* to denote the amount of work that a unit of potential can pay for.

S. minimum()

- Access through the min-pointer.
- Actual cost $\mathcal{O}(1)$.
- No change in potential.
- Amortized cost $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

- S.merge(S')
 - Merge the root lists.
 - Adjust the min-pointer





- S.merge(S')
 - Merge the root lists.
 - Adjust the min-pointer



Running time:

Actual cost $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

- S.merge(S')
 - Merge the root lists.
 - Adjust the min-pointer



Running time:

- Actual cost $\mathcal{O}(1)$.
- No change in potential.

- S.merge(S')
 - Merge the root lists.
 - Adjust the min-pointer



Running time:

- Actual cost $\mathcal{O}(1)$.
- No change in potential.
- Hence, amortized cost is $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

- S. insert(x)
 - Create a new tree containing x.
 - Insert x into the root-list.
 - Update min-pointer, if necessary.



- S. insert(x)
 - Create a new tree containing x.
 - Insert x into the root-list.
 - Update min-pointer, if necessary.



- S. insert(x)
 - Create a new tree containing x.
 - Insert x into the root-list.
 - Update min-pointer, if necessary.



Running time:

- Actual cost $\mathcal{O}(1)$.
- Change in potential is +1.
- Amortized cost is c + O(1) = O(1).

S. delete-min(x)



S. delete-min(x)

► Delete minimum; add child-trees to heap; time: D(min) · O(1).



- S. delete-min(x)
 - ► Delete minimum; add child-trees to heap; time: D(min) · O(1).
 - Update min-pointer; time: $(t + D(\min)) \cdot O(1)$.



- S. delete-min(x)
 - ► Delete minimum; add child-trees to heap; time: D(min) · O(1).
 - Update min-pointer; time: $(t + D(\min)) \cdot O(1)$.



- S. delete-min(x)
 - ► Delete minimum; add child-trees to heap; time: D(min) · O(1).
 - Update min-pointer; time: $(t + D(\min)) \cdot O(1)$.



Consolidate root-list so that no roots have the same degree. Time $t \cdot O(1)$ (see next slide).












































Consolidate:



Actual cost for delete-min()

At most $D_n + t$ elements in root-list before consolidate.

Actual cost for delete-min()

- At most $D_n + t$ elements in root-list before consolidate.
- ► Actual cost for a delete-min is at most O(1) · (D_n + t). Hence, there exists c₁ s.t. actual cost is at most c₁ · (D_n + t).

Actual cost for delete-min()

- At most $D_n + t$ elements in root-list before consolidate.
- Actual cost for a delete-min is at most $\mathcal{O}(1) \cdot (D_n + t)$. Hence, there exists c_1 s.t. actual cost is at most $c_1 \cdot (D_n + t)$.

Amortized cost for delete-min()

▶ $t' \leq D_n + 1$ as degrees are different after consolidating.

Actual cost for delete-min()

- At most $D_n + t$ elements in root-list before consolidate.
- Actual cost for a delete-min is at most $\mathcal{O}(1) \cdot (D_n + t)$. Hence, there exists c_1 s.t. actual cost is at most $c_1 \cdot (D_n + t)$.

Amortized cost for delete-min()

- ► $t' \leq D_n + 1$ as degrees are different after consolidating.
- Therefore $\Delta \Phi \leq D_n + 1 t$;

Actual cost for delete-min()

- At most $D_n + t$ elements in root-list before consolidate.
- Actual cost for a delete-min is at most $\mathcal{O}(1) \cdot (D_n + t)$. Hence, there exists c_1 s.t. actual cost is at most $c_1 \cdot (D_n + t)$.

Amortized cost for delete-min()

- ► $t' \leq D_n + 1$ as degrees are different after consolidating.
- Therefore $\Delta \Phi \leq D_n + 1 t$;
- We can pay $\mathbf{c} \cdot (\mathbf{t} D_n 1)$ from the potential decrease.

Actual cost for delete-min()

- At most $D_n + t$ elements in root-list before consolidate.
- Actual cost for a delete-min is at most $\mathcal{O}(1) \cdot (D_n + t)$. Hence, there exists c_1 s.t. actual cost is at most $c_1 \cdot (D_n + t)$.

Amortized cost for delete-min()

- ► $t' \leq D_n + 1$ as degrees are different after consolidating.
- Therefore $\Delta \Phi \leq D_n + 1 t$;
- We can pay $\mathbf{c} \cdot (\mathbf{t} D_n 1)$ from the potential decrease.
- The amortized cost is

Actual cost for delete-min()

- At most $D_n + t$ elements in root-list before consolidate.
- Actual cost for a delete-min is at most $\mathcal{O}(1) \cdot (D_n + t)$. Hence, there exists c_1 s.t. actual cost is at most $c_1 \cdot (D_n + t)$.

Amortized cost for delete-min()

- ▶ $t' \leq D_n + 1$ as degrees are different after consolidating.
- Therefore $\Delta \Phi \leq D_n + 1 t$;
- We can pay $\mathbf{c} \cdot (\mathbf{t} D_n 1)$ from the potential decrease.
- The amortized cost is

 $c_1 \cdot (D_n + t) - c \cdot (t - D_n - 1)$

Actual cost for delete-min()

- At most $D_n + t$ elements in root-list before consolidate.
- Actual cost for a delete-min is at most $\mathcal{O}(1) \cdot (D_n + t)$. Hence, there exists c_1 s.t. actual cost is at most $c_1 \cdot (D_n + t)$.

Amortized cost for delete-min()

- ► $t' \leq D_n + 1$ as degrees are different after consolidating.
- Therefore $\Delta \Phi \leq D_n + 1 t$;
- We can pay $\mathbf{c} \cdot (\mathbf{t} D_n 1)$ from the potential decrease.
- The amortized cost is

 $c_1 \cdot (D_n + t) - c \cdot (t - D_n - 1)$ $\leq (c_1 + c)D_n + (c_1 - c)t + c$

Actual cost for delete-min()

- At most $D_n + t$ elements in root-list before consolidate.
- Actual cost for a delete-min is at most $\mathcal{O}(1) \cdot (D_n + t)$. Hence, there exists c_1 s.t. actual cost is at most $c_1 \cdot (D_n + t)$.

Amortized cost for delete-min()

- ► $t' \leq D_n + 1$ as degrees are different after consolidating.
- Therefore $\Delta \Phi \leq D_n + 1 t$;
- We can pay $\mathbf{c} \cdot (\mathbf{t} D_n 1)$ from the potential decrease.
- The amortized cost is

 $c_1 \cdot (D_n + t) - c \cdot (t - D_n - 1)$ \$\le (c_1 + c)D_n + (c_1 - c)t + c \le 2c(D_n + 1)\$

Actual cost for delete-min()

- At most $D_n + t$ elements in root-list before consolidate.
- Actual cost for a delete-min is at most $\mathcal{O}(1) \cdot (D_n + t)$. Hence, there exists c_1 s.t. actual cost is at most $c_1 \cdot (D_n + t)$.

Amortized cost for delete-min()

- ► $t' \leq D_n + 1$ as degrees are different after consolidating.
- Therefore $\Delta \Phi \leq D_n + 1 t$;
- We can pay $\mathbf{c} \cdot (\mathbf{t} D_n 1)$ from the potential decrease.
- The amortized cost is

 $c_1 \cdot (D_n + t) - c \cdot (t - D_n - 1)$ \$\le (c_1 + c)D_n + (c_1 - c)t + c \le 2c(D_n + 1) \le \mathcal{O}(D_n)\$

Actual cost for delete-min()

- At most $D_n + t$ elements in root-list before consolidate.
- Actual cost for a delete-min is at most $\mathcal{O}(1) \cdot (D_n + t)$. Hence, there exists c_1 s.t. actual cost is at most $c_1 \cdot (D_n + t)$.

Amortized cost for delete-min()

- ► $t' \leq D_n + 1$ as degrees are different after consolidating.
- Therefore $\Delta \Phi \leq D_n + 1 t$;
- We can pay $\mathbf{c} \cdot (\mathbf{t} D_n 1)$ from the potential decrease.
- The amortized cost is

 $c_1 \cdot (D_n + t) - c \cdot (t - D_n - 1)$ $\leq (c_1 + c)D_n + (c_1 - c)t + c \leq 2c(D_n + 1) \leq \mathcal{O}(D_n)$ for $c \geq c_1$. If the input trees of the consolidation procedure are binomial trees (for example only singleton vertices) then the output will be a set of distinct binomial trees, and, hence, the Fibonacci heap will be (more or less) a Binomial heap right after the consolidation. If the input trees of the consolidation procedure are binomial trees (for example only singleton vertices) then the output will be a set of distinct binomial trees, and, hence, the Fibonacci heap will be (more or less) a Binomial heap right after the consolidation.

If we do not have delete or decrease-key operations then $D_n \leq \log n$.



Case 1: decrease-key does not violate heap-property



Case 1: decrease-key does not violate heap-property



Case 1: decrease-key does not violate heap-property



Case 1: decrease-key does not violate heap-property



- Decrease key-value of element x reference by h.
- If the heap-property is violated, cut the parent edge of x, and make x into a root.
- Adjust min-pointers, if necessary.
- Mark the (previous) parent of x (unless it's a root).



- Decrease key-value of element x reference by h.
- If the heap-property is violated, cut the parent edge of x, and make x into a root.
- Adjust min-pointers, if necessary.
- Mark the (previous) parent of x (unless it's a root).



- Decrease key-value of element x reference by h.
- If the heap-property is violated, cut the parent edge of x, and make x into a root.
- Adjust min-pointers, if necessary.
- Mark the (previous) parent of x (unless it's a root).



- Decrease key-value of element x reference by h.
- If the heap-property is violated, cut the parent edge of x, and make x into a root.
- Adjust min-pointers, if necessary.
- Mark the (previous) parent of x (unless it's a root).



- Decrease key-value of element x reference by h.
- If the heap-property is violated, cut the parent edge of x, and make x into a root.
- Adjust min-pointers, if necessary.
- Mark the (previous) parent of x (unless it's a root).



- Decrease key-value of element x reference by h.
- Cut the parent edge of x, and make x into a root.
- Adjust min-pointers, if necessary.
- Continue cutting the parent until you arrive at an unmarked node.



- Decrease key-value of element x reference by h.
- Cut the parent edge of x, and make x into a root.
- Adjust min-pointers, if necessary.
- Continue cutting the parent until you arrive at an unmarked node.



- Decrease key-value of element x reference by h.
- Cut the parent edge of x, and make x into a root.
- Adjust min-pointers, if necessary.
- Continue cutting the parent until you arrive at an unmarked node.



- Decrease key-value of element x reference by h.
- Cut the parent edge of x, and make x into a root.
- Adjust min-pointers, if necessary.
- Continue cutting the parent until you arrive at an unmarked node.



- Decrease key-value of element x reference by h.
- Cut the parent edge of x, and make x into a root.
- Adjust min-pointers, if necessary.
- Continue cutting the parent until you arrive at an unmarked node.



- Decrease key-value of element x reference by h.
- Cut the parent edge of x, and make x into a root.
- Adjust min-pointers, if necessary.
- Continue cutting the parent until you arrive at an unmarked node.



- Decrease key-value of element x reference by h.
- Cut the parent edge of x, and make x into a root.
- Adjust min-pointers, if necessary.
- Continue cutting the parent until you arrive at an unmarked node.



- Decrease key-value of element x reference by h.
- Cut the parent edge of x, and make x into a root.
- Adjust min-pointers, if necessary.
- Continue cutting the parent until you arrive at an unmarked node.



- Decrease key-value of element x reference by h.
- Cut the parent edge of x, and make x into a root.
- Adjust min-pointers, if necessary.
- Continue cutting the parent until you arrive at an unmarked node.

- Decrease key-value of element x reference by h.
- Cut the parent edge of x, and make x into a root.
- Adjust min-pointers, if necessary.
- Execute the following:

```
p \leftarrow parent[x];

while (p is marked)

pp \leftarrow parent[p];

cut of p; make it into a root; unmark it;

p \leftarrow pp;

if p is unmarked and not a root mark it;
```

Actual cost:

Actual cost:

Constant cost for decreasing the value.

Actual cost:

- Constant cost for decreasing the value.
- Constant cost for each of ℓ cuts.
Actual cost:

- Constant cost for decreasing the value.
- Constant cost for each of ℓ cuts.
- Hence, cost is at most $c_2 \cdot (\ell + 1)$, for some constant c_2 .

Actual cost:

- Constant cost for decreasing the value.
- Constant cost for each of ℓ cuts.
- Hence, cost is at most $c_2 \cdot (\ell + 1)$, for some constant c_2 .

Amortized cost:

• $t' = t + \ell$, as every cut creates one new root.

Actual cost:

- Constant cost for decreasing the value.
- Constant cost for each of ℓ cuts.
- Hence, cost is at most $c_2 \cdot (\ell + 1)$, for some constant c_2 .

Amortized cost:

- $t' = t + \ell$, as every cut creates one new root.
- ▶ $m' \le m (\ell 1) + 1 = m \ell + 2$, since all but the first cut unmarks a node; the last cut may mark a node.

Actual cost:

- Constant cost for decreasing the value.
- Constant cost for each of ℓ cuts.
- Hence, cost is at most $c_2 \cdot (\ell + 1)$, for some constant c_2 .

Amortized cost:

- $t' = t + \ell$, as every cut creates one new root.
- ▶ $m' \le m (\ell 1) + 1 = m \ell + 2$, since all but the first cut unmarks a node; the last cut may mark a node.
- $\blacktriangleright \Delta \Phi \le \ell + 2(-\ell + 2) = 4 \ell$

Actual cost:

- Constant cost for decreasing the value.
- Constant cost for each of ℓ cuts.
- Hence, cost is at most $c_2 \cdot (\ell + 1)$, for some constant c_2 .

Amortized cost:

- $t' = t + \ell$, as every cut creates one new root.
- ▶ $m' \le m (\ell 1) + 1 = m \ell + 2$, since all but the first cut unmarks a node; the last cut may mark a node.
- $\blacktriangleright \Delta \Phi \le \ell + 2(-\ell + 2) = 4 \ell$
- Amortized cost is at most

Actual cost:

- Constant cost for decreasing the value.
- Constant cost for each of ℓ cuts.
- Hence, cost is at most $c_2 \cdot (\ell + 1)$, for some constant c_2 .

Amortized cost:

- $t' = t + \ell$, as every cut creates one new root.
- ▶ $m' \le m (\ell 1) + 1 = m \ell + 2$, since all but the first cut unmarks a node; the last cut may mark a node.
- $\blacktriangleright \Delta \Phi \le \ell + 2(-\ell + 2) = 4 \ell$
- Amortized cost is at most

 $c_2(\ell+1) + c(4-\ell)$

Actual cost:

- Constant cost for decreasing the value.
- Constant cost for each of ℓ cuts.
- Hence, cost is at most $c_2 \cdot (\ell + 1)$, for some constant c_2 .

Amortized cost:

- $t' = t + \ell$, as every cut creates one new root.
- ▶ $m' \le m (\ell 1) + 1 = m \ell + 2$, since all but the first cut unmarks a node; the last cut may mark a node.
- $\blacktriangleright \Delta \Phi \le \ell + 2(-\ell + 2) = 4 \ell$
- Amortized cost is at most

 $c_2(\ell+1) + c(4-\ell) \le (c_2-c)\ell + 4c + c_2$

Actual cost:

- Constant cost for decreasing the value.
- Constant cost for each of ℓ cuts.
- Hence, cost is at most $c_2 \cdot (\ell + 1)$, for some constant c_2 .

Amortized cost:

- $t' = t + \ell$, as every cut creates one new root.
- ▶ $m' \le m (\ell 1) + 1 = m \ell + 2$, since all but the first cut unmarks a node; the last cut may mark a node.
- $\blacktriangleright \Delta \Phi \le \ell + 2(-\ell + 2) = 4 \ell$
- Amortized cost is at most

 $c_2(\ell+1) + c(4-\ell) \le (c_2-c)\ell + 4c + c_2 = \mathcal{O}(1),$

if $c \geq c_2$.

Delete node

H.delete(*x*):

- decrease value of x to $-\infty$.
- delete-min.

Amortized cost: $\mathcal{O}(D_n)$

- $\mathcal{O}(1)$ for decrease-key.
- $\mathcal{O}(D_n)$ for delete-min.

Lemma 1

Let x be a node with degree k and let $y_1, ..., y_k$ denote the children of x in the order that they were linked to x. Then

degree
$$(\gamma_i) \ge \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = 1\\ i - 2 & \text{if } i > 1 \end{cases}$$

Proof

When y_i was linked to x, at least y₁,..., y_{i-1} were already linked to x.

Proof

- When y_i was linked to x, at least y₁,..., y_{i-1} were already linked to x.
- ► Hence, at this time degree(x) ≥ i − 1, and therefore also degree(y_i) ≥ i − 1 as the algorithm links nodes of equal degree only.

Proof

- When y_i was linked to x, at least y₁,..., y_{i-1} were already linked to x.
- ► Hence, at this time degree(x) ≥ i − 1, and therefore also degree(y_i) ≥ i − 1 as the algorithm links nodes of equal degree only.
- Since, then y_i has lost at most one child.

Proof

- When y_i was linked to x, at least y₁,..., y_{i-1} were already linked to x.
- ► Hence, at this time degree(x) ≥ i − 1, and therefore also degree(y_i) ≥ i − 1 as the algorithm links nodes of equal degree only.
- Since, then y_i has lost at most one child.
- Therefore, degree(y_i) $\ge i 2$.

Let s_k be the minimum possible size of a sub-tree rooted at a node of degree k that can occur in a Fibonacci heap.

- Let s_k be the minimum possible size of a sub-tree rooted at a node of degree k that can occur in a Fibonacci heap.
- s_k monotonically increases with k

- Let s_k be the minimum possible size of a sub-tree rooted at a node of degree k that can occur in a Fibonacci heap.
- s_k monotonically increases with k
- ▶ $s_0 = 1$ and $s_1 = 2$.

- Let s_k be the minimum possible size of a sub-tree rooted at a node of degree k that can occur in a Fibonacci heap.
- s_k monotonically increases with k
- ▶ $s_0 = 1$ and $s_1 = 2$.

Let x be a degree k node of size s_k and let y_1, \ldots, y_k be its children.

$$s_k = 2 + \sum_{i=2}^k \operatorname{size}(\gamma_i)$$

- Let s_k be the minimum possible size of a sub-tree rooted at a node of degree k that can occur in a Fibonacci heap.
- \triangleright *s*_k monotonically increases with *k*
- ▶ $s_0 = 1$ and $s_1 = 2$.

Let x be a degree k node of size s_k and let y_1, \ldots, y_k be its children.

$$s_k = 2 + \sum_{i=2}^k \operatorname{size}(y_i)$$
$$\geq 2 + \sum_{i=2}^k s_{i-2}$$

- Let s_k be the minimum possible size of a sub-tree rooted at a node of degree k that can occur in a Fibonacci heap.
- \triangleright *s*_k monotonically increases with *k*
- ▶ $s_0 = 1$ and $s_1 = 2$.

Let x be a degree k node of size s_k and let y_1, \ldots, y_k be its children.

$$s_{k} = 2 + \sum_{i=2}^{k} \operatorname{size}(y_{i})$$
$$\geq 2 + \sum_{i=2}^{k} s_{i-2}$$
$$= 2 + \sum_{i=0}^{k-2} s_{i}$$

 $\phi = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \sqrt{5})$ denotes the *golden ratio*. Note that $\phi^2 = 1 + \phi$.

Definition 2

Consider the following non-standard Fibonacci type sequence:

$$F_{k} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = 0\\ 2 & \text{if } k = 1\\ F_{k-1} + F_{k-2} & \text{if } k \ge 2 \end{cases}$$

Facts:

1. $F_k \ge \phi^k$. 2. For $k \ge 2$: $F_k = 2 + \sum_{i=0}^{k-2} F_i$.

The above facts can be easily proved by induction. From this it follows that $s_k \ge F_k \ge \phi^k$, which gives that the maximum degree in a Fibonacci heap is logarithmic.

k=2: $3 = F_2 = 2 + 1 = 2 + F_0$ **k-1** \rightarrow **k**: $F_k = F_{k-1} + F_{k-2} = 2 + \sum_{i=0}^{k-3} F_i + F_{k-2} = 2 + \sum_{i=0}^{k-2} F_i$