Union-Find Algorithms

- dynamic connectivity
- quick find
- quick union
- improvements
- applications
Subtext of today’s lecture (and this course)

Steps to developing a usable algorithm.

- Model the problem.
- Find an algorithm to solve it.
- Fast enough? Fits in memory?
- If not, figure out why.
- Find a way to address the problem.
- Iterate until satisfied.

The scientific method.

Mathematical analysis.
dynamic connectivity
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Dynamic connectivity

Given a set of objects

- **Union**: connect two objects.
- **Find**: is there a path connecting the two objects?

```plaintext
union(3, 4)  
union(8, 0)  
union(2, 3)  
union(5, 6)  
  find(0, 2)  no  
  find(2, 4)  yes  
union(5, 1)  
union(7, 3)  
union(1, 6)  
union(4, 8)  
  find(0, 2)  yes  
  find(2, 4)  yes
```

More difficult problem: find the path
Network connectivity: larger example
Dynamic connectivity applications involve manipulating objects of all types.

- Variable name aliases.
- Pixels in a digital photo.
- Computers in a network.
- Web pages on the Internet.
- Transistors in a computer chip.
- Metallic sites in a composite system.

When programming, convenient to name objects 0 to N-1.

- Use integers as array index.
- Suppress details not relevant to union-find.

Modeling the objects

can use symbol table to translate from object names to integers (stay tuned)
Transitivity.
If $p$ is connected to $q$ and $q$ is connected to $r$, then $p$ is connected to $r$.

Connected components. Maximal set of objects that are mutually connected.
Implementing the operations

Find query. Check if two objects are in the same set.

Union command. Replace sets containing two objects with their union.
Goal. Design efficient data structure for union-find.

- Number of objects $N$ can be huge.
- Number of operations $M$ can be huge.
- Find queries and union commands may be intermixed.

public class UnionFind

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UnionFind(int $N$)</td>
<td>create union-find data structure with $N$ objects and no connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boolean find(int $p$, int $q$)</td>
<td>are $p$ and $q$ in the same set?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>void unite(int $p$, int $q$)</td>
<td>replace sets containing $p$ and $q$ with their union</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Quick-find [eager approach]**

**Data structure.**
- Integer array `id[]` of size `N`.
- Interpretation: `p` and `q` are connected if they have the same `id`.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>id[i]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 and 6 are connected
2, 3, 4, and 9 are connected
Quick-find [eager approach]

Data structure.
• Integer array $\text{id}[\cdot]$ of size $N$.
• Interpretation: $p$ and $q$ are connected if they have the same id.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$i$</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{id}[i]$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Find. Check if $p$ and $q$ have the same id.

- $\text{id}[3] = 9$; $\text{id}[6] = 6$
- 3 and 6 not connected
- 5 and 6 are connected
- 2, 3, 4, and 9 are connected
Quick-find  [eager approach]

Data structure.
• Integer array \( \text{id}[\] \) of size \( N \).
• Interpretation: \( p \) and \( q \) are connected if they have the same id.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccc}
i & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 \\
\text{id}[i] & 0 & 1 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 6 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 \\
\end{array}
\]

Find.  Check if \( p \) and \( q \) have the same id.

Union.  To merge sets containing \( p \) and \( q \), change all entries with \( \text{id}[p] \) to \( \text{id}[q] \).

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccc}
i & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 \\
\text{id}[i] & 0 & 1 & 6 & 6 & 6 & 6 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 6 \\
\end{array}
\]
Quick-find example

3–4  0 1 2 4 4 5 6 7 8 9
4–9  0 1 2 9 9 5 6 7 8 9
8–0  0 1 2 9 9 5 6 7 0 9
2–3  0 1 9 9 9 5 6 7 0 9
5–6  0 1 9 9 9 6 6 7 0 9
5–9  0 1 9 9 9 9 9 7 0 9
7–3  0 1 9 9 9 9 9 9 0 9
4–8  0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
6–1  1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

problem: many values can change
Quick-find: Java implementation

```java
public class QuickFind {
    private int[] id;

    public QuickFind(int N) {
        id = new int[N];
        for (int i = 0; i < N; i++)
            id[i] = i;
    }

    public boolean find(int p, int q) {
        return id[p] == id[q];
    }

    public void unite(int p, int q) {
        int pid = id[p];
        for (int i = 0; i < id.length; i++)
            if (id[i] == pid) id[i] = id[q];
    }
}
```

- Set id of each object to itself (N operations)
- Check if p and q have same id (1 operation)
- Change all entries with id[p] to id[q] (N operations)
Quick-find is too slow

Quick-find defect.
  • Union too expensive (N operations).
  • Trees are flat, but too expensive to keep them flat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>algorithm</th>
<th>union</th>
<th>find</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quick-find</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ex.** May take $N^2$ operations to process $N$ union commands on $N$ objects.
Quadratic algorithms do not scale

Rough standard (for now).
• $10^9$ operations per second.
• $10^9$ words of main memory.
• Touch all words in approximately 1 second.

Ex. Huge problem for quick-find.
• $10^9$ union commands on $10^9$ objects.
• Quick-find takes more than $10^{18}$ operations.
• 30+ years of computer time!

Paradoxically, quadratic algorithms get worse with newer equipment.
• New computer may be 10x as fast.
• But, has 10x as much memory so problem may be 10x bigger.
• With quadratic algorithm, takes 10x as long!
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**Quick-union** [lazy approach]

**Data structure.**
- Integer array `id[]` of size `N`.
- Interpretation: `id[i]` is parent of `i`.
- **Root** of `i` is `id[id[id[...id[i]...]]]`.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>id[i]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

```
0 1 9 6 7 8

3’s root is 9; 5’s root is 6
```
**Quick-union [lazy approach]**

**Data structure.**
- Integer array `id[]` of size `N`.
- Interpretation: `id[i]` is parent of `i`.
- **Root** of `i` is `id[id[id[...id[i]...]]]`.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>id[i]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

**Find.** Check if `p` and `q` have the same root.

3's root is 9; 5's root is 6
3 and 5 are not connected
Quick-union [lazy approach]

Data structure.
• Integer array \( id[] \) of size \( N \).
• Interpretation: \( id[i] \) is parent of \( i \).
• Root of \( i \) is \( id[id[id[...id[i]...]]] \).

Find. Check if \( p \) and \( q \) have the same root.

Union. To merge subsets containing \( p \) and \( q \), set the id of \( q \)'s root to the id of \( p \)'s root.

Only one value changes
Quick-union example

3–4  0 1 2 4 4 5 6 7 8 9
4–9  0 1 2 4 9 5 6 7 8 9
8–0  0 1 2 4 9 5 6 7 0 9
2–3  0 1 9 4 9 5 6 7 0 9
5–6  0 1 9 4 9 6 6 7 0 9
5–9  0 1 9 4 9 6 9 7 0 9
7–3  0 1 9 4 9 6 9 9 0 9
4–8  0 1 9 4 9 6 9 9 0 0
6–1  1 1 9 4 9 6 9 9 0 0

problem: trees can get tall
Quick-union: Java implementation

```java
public class QuickUnion {
    private int[] id;

    public QuickUnion(int N) {
        id = new int[N];
        for (int i = 0; i < N; i++) id[i] = i;
    }

    private int root(int i) {
        while (i != id[i]) i = id[i];
        return i;
    }

    public boolean find(int p, int q) {
        return root(p) == root(q);
    }

    public void unite(int p, int q) {
        int i = root(p), j = root(q);
        id[i] = j;
    }
}
```

- Set id of each object to itself (N operations)
- Chase parent parents until reach root (depth of i operations)
- Check if p and q have same root (depth of p and q operations)
- Change root of p to point to root of q (depth of p and q operations)
Quick-union is also too slow

Quick-find defect.
• Union too expensive (N operations).
• Trees are flat, but too expensive to keep them flat.

Quick-union defect.
• Trees can get tall.
• Find too expensive (could be N operations).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>algorithm</th>
<th>union</th>
<th>find</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quick-find</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quick-union</td>
<td>N *</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes cost of finding root

worst case
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**Improvement 1: weighting**

**Weighted quick-union.**
- Modify quick-union to avoid tall trees.
- Keep track of size of each subset.
- Balance by linking small tree below large one.

**Ex.** Union of 3 and 5.
- Quick union: link 9 to 6.
- Weighted quick union: link 6 to 9.
Weighted quick-union example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3–4</th>
<th>0 1 2 3 3 5 6 7 8 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4–9</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 3 5 6 7 8 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8–0</td>
<td>8 1 2 3 3 5 6 7 8 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–3</td>
<td>8 1 3 3 3 5 6 7 8 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–6</td>
<td>8 1 3 3 3 5 5 7 8 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–9</td>
<td>8 1 3 3 3 5 7 8 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7–3</td>
<td>8 1 3 3 3 3 5 3 8 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–8</td>
<td>8 1 3 3 3 3 5 3 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–1</td>
<td>8 3 3 3 3 5 3 3 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

no problem: trees stay flat
**Weighted quick-union: Java implementation**

**Data structure.** Same as quick-union, but maintain extra array \( sz[i] \) to count number of objects in the tree rooted at \( i \).

**Find.** Identical to quick-union.

```java
return root(p) == root(q);
```

**Union.** Modify quick-union to:
- Merge smaller tree into larger tree.
- Update the \( sz[] \) array.

```java
int i = root(p);
int j = root(q);
if (sz[i] < sz[j]) { id[i] = j; sz[j] += sz[i]; }
else                { id[j] = i; sz[i] += sz[j]; }
```
Weighted quick-union analysis

Analysis.
- Find: takes time proportional to depth of p and q.
- Union: takes constant time, given roots.
- Fact: depth is at most \( \lg N \). [needs proof]

Q. How does depth of \( x \) increase by 1?
A. Tree \( T_1 \) containing \( x \) is merged into another tree \( T_2 \).
   - The size of the tree containing \( x \) at least doubles since \( |T_2| \geq |T_1| \).
   - Size of tree containing \( x \) can double at most \( \lg N \) times.
Weighted quick-union analysis

Analysis.
• Find: takes time proportional to depth of p and q.
• Union: takes constant time, given roots.
• Fact: depth is at most \( \lg N \). [needs proof]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>algorithm</th>
<th>union</th>
<th>find</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quick-find</td>
<td>( N )</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quick-union</td>
<td>( N^* )</td>
<td>( N )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weighted QU</td>
<td>( \lg N^* )</td>
<td>( \lg N )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes cost of finding root

Q. Stop at guaranteed acceptable performance?
A. No, easy to improve further.
Improvement 2: path compression

Quick union with path compression. Just after computing the root of $p$, set the id of each examined node to $\text{root}(p)$. 
Path compression: Java implementation

**Standard implementation:** add second loop to `root()` to set the id of each examined node to the root.

**Simpler one-pass variant:** halve the path length by making every other node in path point to its grandparent.

```java
public int root(int i) {
    while (i != id[i]) {
        id[i] = id[id[i]];
        i = id[i];
    }
    return i;
}
```

In practice. No reason not to! Keeps tree almost completely flat.
**Weighted quick-union with path compression example**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Parent Tree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 3 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–9</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 3 5 6 7 8 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8–0</td>
<td>8 1 2 3 3 5 6 7 8 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–3</td>
<td>8 1 3 3 3 5 6 7 8 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–6</td>
<td>8 1 3 3 3 5 7 8 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–9</td>
<td>8 1 3 3 3 3 5 7 8 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7–3</td>
<td>8 1 3 3 3 3 5 3 8 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–8</td>
<td>8 1 3 3 3 3 5 3 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–1</td>
<td>8 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No problem: trees stay VERY flat
**WQUPC performance**

**Theorem.** [Tarjan 1975] Starting from an empty data structure, any sequence of $M$ union and find operations on $N$ objects takes $O(N + M \lg^* N)$ time.

- Proof is very difficult.
- But the algorithm is still simple!

### Linear algorithm?

- **Cost within constant factor of reading in the data.**
- **In theory, WQUPC is not quite linear.**
- **In practice, WQUPC is linear.**

**Amazing fact.** No linear-time linking strategy exists.

### Table: lg* Function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$\lg^* N$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65536</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2^{65536}$</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*lg* function: number of times needed to take the lg of a number until reaching 1
Bottom line. WQUPC makes it possible to solve problems that could not otherwise be addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>algorithm</th>
<th>worst-case time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quick-find</td>
<td>$M N$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quick-union</td>
<td>$M N$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weighted QU</td>
<td>$N + M \log N$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QU + path compression</td>
<td>$N + M \log N$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weighted QU + path compression</td>
<td>$N + M \lg^* N$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$M$ union-find operations on a set of $N$ objects

Ex. $[10^9$ unions and finds with $10^9$ objects]$\quad$
- WQUPC reduces time from 30 years to 6 seconds.
- Supercomputer won’t help much; good algorithm enables solution.
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Union-find applications

- Percolation.
- Games (Go, Hex).
- Network connectivity.
- Least common ancestor.
- Equivalence of finite state automata.
- Hoshen-Kopelman algorithm in physics.
- Hinley-Milner polymorphic type inference.
- Kruskal’s minimum spanning tree algorithm.
- Compiling equivalence statements in Fortran.
- Morphological attribute openings and closings.
- Matlab's `bwlabel()` function in image processing.
Percolation

A model for many physical systems:
• N-by-N grid of sites.
• Each site is open with probability $p$ (or blocked with probability $1-p$).
• System percolates if top and bottom are connected by open sites.
Percolation

A model for many physical systems:

• N-by-N grid of sites.
• Each site is open with probability p (or blocked with probability 1-p).
• System percolates if top and bottom are connected by open sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>model</th>
<th>system</th>
<th>vacant site</th>
<th>occupied site</th>
<th>percolates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>electricity</td>
<td>material</td>
<td>conductor</td>
<td>insulated</td>
<td>conducts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fluid flow</td>
<td>material</td>
<td>empty</td>
<td>blocked</td>
<td>porous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social interaction</td>
<td>population</td>
<td>person</td>
<td>empty</td>
<td>communicates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
depends on site vacancy probability \( p \).

\( N = 20 \)
Percolation phase transition

Theory guarantees a sharp threshold $p^*$ (when $N$ is large).
- $p > p^*$: almost certainly percolates.
- $p < p^*$: almost certainly does not percolate.

Q. What is the value of $p^*$?
Monte Carlo simulation

- Initialize N-by-N whole grid to be blocked.
- Make random sites open until top connected to bottom.
- Vacancy percentage estimates $p^*$. 

![Diagram of Monte Carlo simulation with sites colored according to open status and connectivity]

Sites = 135
How to check whether system percolates?

- Create object for each site.
- Sites are in same set if connected by open sites.
- Percolates if any site in top row is in same set as any site in bottom row.

Brute force alg would need to check $N^2$ pairs

UF solution to find percolation threshold
Q. How to declare a new site open?

\[ N = 8 \]
Q. How to declare a new site open?
A. Take union of new site and all adjacent open sites.

UF solution to find percolation threshold

N = 8
**UF solution: a critical optimization**

**Q.** How to avoid checking all pairs of top and bottom sites?

**A.** Create a virtual top and bottom objects; system percolates when virtual top and bottom objects are in same set.
**Percolation threshold**

**Q.** What is percolation threshold $p^*$?

**A.** About 0.592746 for large square lattices.

---

The percolation constant known only via simulation.

---

Graph showing the percolation probability as a function of the site vacancy probability $p$. The graph indicates a sharp transition at $p^* = 0.593$, marking the percolation threshold.
Steps to developing a usable algorithm.

- Model the problem.
- Find an algorithm to solve it.
- Fast enough? Fits in memory?
- If not, figure out why.
- Find a way to address the problem.
- Iterate until satisfied.

The scientific method.

Mathematical analysis.