



**OPPA European Social Fund  
Prague & EU: We invest in your future.**

---

# Search trees, 2-3-4 tree, B+tree

Marko Berezovský  
Radek Mařík  
PAL 2012

## To read

- Robert Sedgwick: *Algorithms in C++, Parts 1–4: Fundamentals, Data Structure, Sorting, Searching, Third Edition*, Addison Wesley Professional, 1998
- <http://www.cs.helsinki.fi/u/mluukkai/tirak2010/B-tree.pdf>
- (CLRS) Cormen, Leiserson, Rivest, Stein: *Introduction to Algorithms*, 3rd ed., MIT Press, 2009

See PAL webpage for references

A **2-3-4 search tree** is either empty or contains three types of nodes:


2-nodes, with one key, a left link to a tree with smaller keys, and a right link to a tree with larger keys;

3-nodes, with two keys, a left link to a tree with smaller keys, a middle link to a tree with key values between the node's keys and a right link to a tree with larger keys;

4-nodes, with three keys and four links to trees with key values defined by the ranges subtended by the node's keys.

AND: All links to empty trees, ie. all leaves, are at the same distance from the root, thus the tree is perfectly balanced.

A **2-3-4 search tree** is structurally a **B-tree of order 4**.



Note 2-nodes, 3-nodes, 4-node, same depth of all leaves.

**Find:** As in B-tree

**Insert:** As in B-tree: Find the place for the inserted key  $x$  in a leaf and store it there. If necessary split the leaf.

Additional rule:

In our way down the tree, whenever we reach a **4-node**, we split it into two **2-nodes**, and move the middle element up

This strategy prevents the following from happening:

After inserting a key it might happen in B tree that it is necessary to split all the nodes going from inserted key back to the root. This is consider to be time consuming.

Splitting 4-nodes on the way down results in sparse occurrence of 4-nodes in the tree, thus it never happens that we have to split nodes recursively bottom-up.


**Delete:** As in B-tree

**Insert:**  
Splitting strategy

To change

a b c d

Any nodes,  
incl. empty



Note that splitting changes the height of a tree only when the root is splitted.



**Insert:**  
Splitting strategy

To change



a b c d

Any nodes,  
incl. empty



Non root



Non root




Non root



Note that splitting changes the height of a tree only when the root is splitted.


## Relation of 2-3-4 tree to Red-Black tree






## Relation of 2-3-4 tree to Red-Black tree

Original 2-3-4 tree:



Equivalent red-black tree:



Insert keys into initially empty 2-3-4 tree: A S E R C H I N G X

Insert A




Insert S




Insert E




Insert R






Insert C



Insert H





Note seemingly unnecessary split of EIR 4-node during insert of G.

## Complexities

Searches in N-node 2-3-4 trees visit at most  $\lg N + 1$  nodes

Insertions into N-node 2-3-4 trees require fewer than  $\lg N + 1$  node splits in the worst case, and seem to require less than one node split on the average

Precise analytic results on the average-case performance of 2-3-4 trees have so far eluded the experts\*\*, but it is clear from empirical studies that very few splits are used to balance the trees. The worst case is only  $\lg N$ , and that is not approached in practical situations.

\*\* Now, finally there is an appropriate challenge for you!

Results of an example experiment with  $N$  uniformly distributed random keys from range  $\{1, \dots, 10^9\}$  being inserted into initially empty 2-3-4 tree:

<b>N</b>	<b>Tree depth</b>	<b>2-nodes</b>	<b>3-nodes</b>	<b>4-nodes</b>
10	2	6	2	0
100	4	39	29	1
1000	7	414	257	24
10 000	10	4 451	2 425	233
100 000	13	43 583	24 871	2 225
1 000 000	15	434 671	248 757	22 605
10 000 000	18	4 356 849	2 485 094	224 321

### B+ tree


B+ tree is analogous to the B-tree, namely in being perfectly balanced all the time  
nodes cannot be less than half full  
operational complexity.

The differences are

Records (or pointers to actual records) are stored only at the leaf nodes.

Internal nodes store only search key values, and are used only as placeholders to guide the search.

The leaf nodes of a B<sup>+</sup>-tree are linked together to form a linked list. This is done so that the records can be retrieved sequentially without accessing the B<sup>+</sup>-tree index. This also supports fast processing of range-search queries.



Routers or keys

75

Data records  
or pointers to them



Values in internal nodes are routers, originally each of them was a key when a record was inserted later they migrated in the tree and may stay there even after the record and its key was deleted. Insert and Delete operations by splitting and Joining the nodes move routers around.

Values in the leaves are actual keys associated with the records and must be deleted when a record is deleted (their router copies may live on).

Inserting key K (and its associated record ) into B+ tree

Find, as in B tree, correct leaf to insert K,

**Case 1**

Free slot in a leaf? YES

Place the key and its associated record in the leaf

**Case 2**

Free slot in a leaf? NO. Free slot in parent node? YES.

1. Split the leaf, consider all its keys including K sorted.
2. insert middle (median) key M in the parent node in an appropriate slot Y.
3. Left leaf from Y contains records with keys smaller than M.
4. Right leaf from Y contains records with keys equal to or greater than M.

Note: Splitting leaves / inner nodes works same way as in B-trees.



Inserting key  $K$  (and its associated record ) into B+ tree


Find, as in B tree, correct leaf to insert  $K$ ,

### Case 3


Free slot in a leaf? NO. Free slot in parent node? NO.

1. Split the leaf, consider all its keys including  $K$  sorted, denote  $M$  median of these keys
2. Records with keys  $< M$  go to the left leaf.
3. Records with keys  $\geq M$  go to the right leaf.
4. Split the parent node  $P$  to nodes  $P1$  and  $P2$ , consider all its keys including  $M$  sorted, denote  $M1$  median of these keys.
5. Keys  $< M1$  key go to  $P1$ .
6. Keys  $> M1$  key go to  $P2$ .
7. If parent  $PP$  of  $P$  is not full, insert  $M1$  to  $PP$  and stop.  
Else set  $M := M1$ ,  $P := PP$  and continue splitting parent nodes recursively up the tree, repeating from step 4.

### Initial tree



### Insert 28



Changes




Leaf links




Records or records pointers are not drawn here for sake of simplicity.

### Initial tree



### Insert 70




Changes




Leaf links



### Initial tree



### Insert 95



Changes 

Leaf links 

Deleting key  $K$  (and its associated record) into B+ tree

Find, as in B tree, key  $K$  in a leaf,

**Case 1**

Leaf more than half full? YES.

Delete the key and its record from the leaf. Arrange keys in the leaf in ascending order to fill void. If the deleted key  $K$  appears in the parent node  $P$  too, replace it by next bigger key  $K_1$  from  $L$  (it must always exist) and leave  $K_1$  in  $L$  as well.

**Case 2**

Leaf more than half full? NO. Left or right sibling more than half full? YES.

Move one (or more if you wish and rules permit) key from sibling  $S$  to the leaf  $L$ , reflect the changes in the parent  $P$  of leaf and parent  $P_2$  of sibling  $S$  (if  $P_2 \neq P$ ).

Note: Joining leaves/inner nodes works same way as in B-trees.

Deleting key K (and its associated record ) into B+ tree

Find, as in B tree, key K in a leaf,


### Case 3

Leaf more than half full? NO. Left or right sibling more than half full? NO.


1. Consider sibling S of L which has same parent P as L.
2. Consider set M of ordered keys of L and S without K but together with key K1 in P which separates L and S.
3. Joining. Store M in L, connect L to the other sibling of S (if exists), destroy S.
4. The reference left to K1 points to L. Adjust P. If P contains K delete it from P. Delete K1 from S as well. If P is still at least half full stop, else continue with 5.
5. If any sibling SP of P is more than half full, move necessary number of keys from SP to P and adjust links in P, SP and their parents accordingly and stop. Else join P with sibling SP which parent PP is parent of P too and continue recursively as in B-tree up to the root if necessary.

Note: Joining leaves/inner nodes works same way as in B-trees.

Initial tree




Delete 70




Changes 

Leaf links 

### Initial tree



### Delete 25



Changes




Leaf links






Initial tree

Delete 75




Too few keys, join these two nodes and bring key from parent (recursively)




Progress...

... done.




Initial tree

Delete 60



Join here



Changes 

Leaf links 

## Complexities

Find, Insert, Delete,  
all need  $\Theta(\log_b n)$  operations, where  $n$  is number of records in the tree,  
and  $b$  is the branching factor or, as it is often understood, the order of the tree.

Note: Be careful, some authors (e.g CLRS) define degree/order of B-tree as  $\lfloor b/2 \rfloor$ , there is no unified precise common terminology.

Range search thanks to the linked leaves is performed in time  
 $\Theta(\log_b(n) + k)$   
where  $k$  is the range (number of elements) of the query.



**OPPA European Social Fund  
Prague & EU: We invest in your future.**

---