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Learning Objectives
Finish disjoint set implementation
Discuss efficiency of disjoint sets

## Disjoint Sets



## Key Ideas:

- Each element exists in exactly one set.
- Every item in each set has the same representation
- Each set has a different representation

Implementation \#2

Find(k):

Union( $\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{1}}, \mathrm{k}_{\mathbf{2}}$ ):

UpTrees


Disjoint Sets


| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

UpTrees: Worst Case


| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |


| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |

## Disjoint Sets Representation

We can represent a disjoint set as an array where the key is the index

The values inside the array stores our sets as a pseudo-tree (UpTree)
The value - $\mathbf{1}$ is our representative element (the root)
All other set members store the index to a parent of the UpTree


## Disjoint Sets Find

```
int DisjointSets::find(int i) {
    if ( s[i] < 0 ) { return i; }
    else { return find( s[i] ); }
}
```

Running time?


What is ideal UpTree?

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{- 1}$ |  |  |  | $\mathbf{4}$ |  |

## Disjoint Sets Union

| 1 | int DisjointSets: :union(int r1, int r2) \{ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 |  |
| 3 |  |
| 4 |  |
| 5 | $\}$ |



| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{- 1}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{- 1}$ |  |  |  | $\mathbf{4}$ |  |

Disjoint Sets - Union



| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | -1 | 10 | 7 | -1 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 5 |

## Disjoint Sets - Smart Union



Union by height | Idea: Keep the height of |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Disjoint Sets - Smart Union



Union by size

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 |  | 10 | 7 |  | 7 | 7 | 4 | 5 |

Idea: Minimize the number of nodes that increase in height

## Disjoint Sets - Smart Union



Union by height \begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l}
\& 0 \& 1 \& 2 \& 3 \& 4 \& 5 \& 6 \& 7 \& 8 \& 9 \& 10 \& 11 <br>

\cline { 2 - 11 } \& | Idea: Keep the height of |
| :--- |
| the tree as small as |
| possible. | <br>

\hline
\end{tabular}

Union by size

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 |  | 10 | 7 |  | 7 | 7 | 4 | 5 |

Idea: Minimize the number of nodes that increase in height

Claim that both guarantee the height of the tree is: $\qquad$ .

## Disjoint Sets Find

```
int DisjointSets::find(int i) {
    if ( s[i] < 0 ) { return i; }
    else { return find( s[i] ); }
}
```

Does our metadata change anything?

## 0148



| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ |  |  | $-\mathbf{3} /-\mathbf{4}$ |  |  |  | $\mathbf{4}$ |  |

Disjoint Sets Union Example
$\begin{array}{cccccc}\uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ 0 & (1) & 2 & (3) & 4 & (5)\end{array}$

| 0 | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{- 1}$ | $\mathbf{- 1}$ | $\mathbf{- 1}$ | $\mathbf{- 1}$ | $\mathbf{- 1}$ | $\mathbf{- 1}$ |


| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Disjoint Sets Union

```
void DisjointSets::unionBySize(int root1, int root2) {
    int newSize = arr_[root1] + arr_[root2];
    if ( arr_[root1] < arr_[root2] ) {
            arr_[root2] = root1;
            arr_[root1] = newSize;
    } else {
            arr_[root1] = root2;
            arr_[root2] = newSize;
        }
}
```

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ |  | $\mathbf{- 2}$ | -4 |  | $\mathbf{3}$ |  | $\mathbf{4}$ |  |

## Disjoint Sets Union by Size

Claim: Sets unioned by size have a height of at most $O$ ( $\log _{2} n$ )
Claim: An UpTree of height $\mathbf{h}$ has nodes $\geq$

## Base Case:

## Disjoint Sets Union by Size

Claim: An UpTree of height $\mathbf{h}$ has nodes $\geq 2^{h}$
IH:

## Disjoint Sets Union by Size

Claim: An UpTree of height $\mathbf{h}$ has nodes $\geq 2^{h}$
IH: Claim is true for $<i$ unions, prove for $i$ th union.
Case 1: height(A) < height(B)

## Disjoint Sets Union by Size

Claim: An UpTree of height $\mathbf{h}$ has nodes $\geq 2^{h}$
IH: Claim is true for $<i$ unions, prove for $i$ th union.
Case 2: height(A) == height(B)

## Disjoint Sets Union by Size

Claim: An UpTree of height $\mathbf{h}$ has nodes $\geq 2^{h}$
IH: Claim is true for $<i$ unions, prove for $i$ th union.
Case 3: height(A) > height(B)

## Disjoint Sets Union by Size

Proven: An UpTree of height $\mathbf{h}$ has nodes $\geq 2^{h}$
IH: Claim is true for $<i$ unions, prove for $i$ th union.
Each case we saw we have $n \geq 2^{h}$.

Disjoint Sets - Union by Rank


| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Union by Height (Rank)

Instead of using height, lets use rank.
The change: New UpTrees have rank $=0$
Let $A, B$ be two sets being unioned. If:
$\operatorname{rank}(\mathrm{A})==\boldsymbol{\operatorname { r a n k }}(\mathrm{B}):$ The merged UpTree has rank +1
$\operatorname{rank}(\mathbf{A})>\operatorname{rank}(\mathbf{B}):$ The merged UpTree has $\operatorname{rank}(\mathrm{A})$
$\operatorname{rank}(B)>\operatorname{rank}(A):$ The merged UpTree has rank(B)
This is identical to height (with a different starting base)!

