

Priority Search Trees

Peter Lammich Tobias Nipkow

March 17, 2025

Abstract

We present a new, purely functional, simple and efficient data structure combining a search tree and a priority queue, which we call a *priority search tree*. The salient feature of priority search trees is that they offer a decrease-key operation, something that is missing from other simple, purely functional priority queue implementations. Priority search trees can be implemented on top of any search tree. This entry does the implementation for red-black trees.

This entry formalizes the first part of our ITP-2019 proof pearl *Purely Functional, Simple and Efficient Priority Search Trees and Applications to Prim and Dijkstra* [2].

Contents

1 Priority Map Specifications	2
1.1 Abstract Data Type	2
1.2 Inorder-Based Specification	3
2 General Priority Search Trees	3
3 Priority Search Trees on top of RBTs	5
3.1 Definitions	6
3.1.1 The Code	6
3.1.2 Invariants	8
3.2 Functional Correctness	8
3.3 Invariant Preservation	9
3.3.1 Update	10
3.3.2 Delete	11
3.4 Overall Correctness	12
4 Related Work	13

1 Priority Map Specifications

```
theory Prio-Map-Specs
imports HOL-Data-Structures.Map-Specs
begin
⟨proof⟩⟨proof⟩

locale PrioMap = Map where lookup = lookup
  for lookup :: 'm ⇒ 'a ⇒ 'b::linorder option +
  fixes is-empty :: 'm ⇒ bool
  fixes getmin :: 'm ⇒ 'a × 'b
  assumes map-is-empty: invar m ⇒ is-empty m ↔ lookup m = Map.empty
  and map-getmin: getmin m = (k,p) ⇒ invar m ⇒ lookup m ≠ Map.empty
    ⇒ lookup m k = Some p ∧ (∀p'∈ran (lookup m). p≤p')
begin

lemmas prio-map-specs = map-specs map-is-empty

lemma map-getminE:
  assumes getmin m = (k,p) invar m lookup m ≠ Map.empty
  obtains lookup m k = Some p ∀k' p'. lookup m k' = Some p' → p≤p'
⟨proof⟩

end
```

```
definition is-min2 ::  $(-\times' a:\text{linorder}) \Rightarrow (-\times' a) \text{ set} \Rightarrow \text{bool}$  where
is-min2 x xs  $\equiv$   $x \in xs \wedge (\forall y \in xs. \text{snd } x \leq \text{snd } y)$ 
```

1.2 Inorder-Based Specification

```
locale PrioMap-by-Ordered = Map-by-Ordered
  where lookup=lookup for lookup ::  $'t \Rightarrow 'a:\text{linorder} \Rightarrow 'b:\text{linorder}$  option +
fixes is-empty ::  $'t \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ 
fixes getmin ::  $'t \Rightarrow 'a \times 'b$ 
assumes inorder-isempty':  $\llbracket \text{inv } t; \text{sorted1 } (\text{inorder } t) \rrbracket$ 
 $\implies \text{is-empty } t \leftrightarrow \text{inorder } t = []$ 
and inorder-getmin':
 $\llbracket \text{inv } t; \text{sorted1 } (\text{inorder } t); \text{inorder } t \neq []; \text{getmin } t = (a,b) \rrbracket$ 
 $\implies \text{is-min2 } (a,b) (\text{set } (\text{inorder } t))$ 
begin

lemma
  inorder-isempty:  $\text{invar } t \implies \text{is-empty } t \leftrightarrow \text{inorder } t = []$ 
  and inorder-getmin:  $\llbracket \text{invar } t; \text{inorder } t \neq []; \text{getmin } t = (a,b) \rrbracket$ 
 $\implies \text{is-min2 } (a,b) (\text{set } (\text{inorder } t))$ 
{proof}

lemma inorder-lookup-empty-iff:
   $\text{invar } m \implies \text{lookup } m = \text{Map.empty} \leftrightarrow \text{inorder } m = []$ 
{proof}

lemma inorder-lookup-ran-eq:
   $\llbracket \text{inv } m; \text{sorted1 } (\text{inorder } m) \rrbracket \implies \text{ran } (\text{lookup } m) = \text{snd } ' \text{set } (\text{inorder } m)$ 
{proof}

sublocale PrioMap empty update  $\text{invar }$   $\text{lookup }$  is-empty getmin
{proof}

end

end
```

2 General Priority Search Trees

```
theory PST-General
imports
  HOL-Data-Structures.Tree2
  Prio-Map-Specs
begin
```

We show how to implement priority maps by augmented binary search trees. That is, the basic data structure is some arbitrary binary search tree, e.g. a red-black tree, implementing the map from ' a ' to ' b ' by storing pairs (k,p) in each node. At this point we need to assume that the keys are also linearly

ordered. To implement *getmin* efficiently we annotate/augment each node with another pair (k', p') , the intended result of *getmin* when applied to that subtree. The specification of *getmin* tells us that (k', p') must be in that subtree and that p' is the minimal priority in that subtree. Thus the annotation can be computed by passing the (k', p') with the minimal p' up the tree. We will now make this more precise for balanced binary trees in general.

We assume that our trees are either leaves of the form $\langle \rangle$ or nodes of the form $\langle l, (kp, b), r \rangle$ where l and r are subtrees, kp is the contents of the node (a key-priority pair) and b is some additional balance information (e.g. colour, height, size, ...). Augmented nodes are of the form $\langle l, (kp, b, kp'), r \rangle$.

type-synonym $('k, 'p, 'c) \text{pstree} = (('k \times 'p) \times ('c \times ('k \times 'p))) \text{tree}$

The following invariant states that a node annotation is actually a minimal key-priority pair for the node's subtree.

```
fun invpst :: ('k, 'p::linorder, 'c) pstree => bool where
  invpst Leaf = True
  | invpst (Node l (x, -, mfp) r) <-> invpst l & invpst r
    & is-min2 mfp (set (inorder l @ x # inorder r))
```

The implementation of *getmin* is trivial:

```
fun pst-getmin where
  pst-getmin (Node - (-, -, a) -) = a
```

lemma *pst-getmin-ismin*:
$$\text{invpst } t \implies t \neq \text{Leaf} \implies \text{is-min2} (\text{pst-getmin } t) (\text{set-tree } t)$$
{proof}

It remains to upgrade the existing map operations to work with augmented nodes. Therefore we now show how to transform any function definition on un-augmented trees into one on trees augmented with (k', p') pairs. A defining equation $f \text{ pats} = e$ for the original type of nodes is transformed into an equation $f \text{ pats}' = e'$ on the augmented type of nodes as follows:

- Every pattern $\langle l, (kp, b), r \rangle$ in *pats* and *e* is replaced by $\langle l, (kp, b, DUMMY), r \rangle$ to obtain *pats'* and *e*.
- To obtain *e*', every expression $\langle l, (kp, b), r \rangle$ in *e* is replaced by *mkNode l kp b r* where:

definition $\text{min2} \equiv \lambda(k, p) \ (k', p'). \text{ if } p \leq p' \text{ then } (k, p) \text{ else } (k', p')$

```
definition min-kp a l r ≡ case (l, r) of
  (Leaf, Leaf) => a
  | (Leaf, Node - (-, (-, kpr)) -) => min2 a kpr
```

```

| (Node - (-, (-, kpl)) -, Leaf) ⇒ min2 a kpl
| (Node - (-, (-, kpl)) -, Node - (-, (-, kpr)) -) ⇒ min2 a (min2 kpl kpr)

```

definition $mkNode c l a r \equiv Node l (a, (c, min2 kpl kpr)) r$

Note that this transformation does not affect the asymptotic complexity of f . Therefore the priority search tree operations have the same complexity as the underlying search tree operations, i.e. typically logarithmic (*update*, *delete*, *lookup*) and constant time (*empty*, *is-empty*).

It is straightforward to show that $mkNode$ preserves the invariant:

lemma $is\text{-}min2\text{-}Empty[simp]: \neg is\text{-}min2 x \{\}$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $is\text{-}min2\text{-}singleton[simp]: is\text{-}min2 a \{b\} \longleftrightarrow b = a$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $is\text{-}min2\text{-}insert:$
 $is\text{-}min2 x (insert y ys)$
 $\longleftrightarrow (y = x \wedge (\forall z \in ys. \ snd x \leq snd z)) \vee (snd x \leq snd y \wedge is\text{-}min2 x ys)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $is\text{-}min2\text{-}union:$
 $is\text{-}min2 x (ys \cup zs)$
 $\longleftrightarrow (is\text{-}min2 x ys \wedge (\forall z \in zs. \ snd x \leq snd z))$
 $\quad \vee ((\forall y \in ys. \ snd x \leq snd y) \wedge is\text{-}min2 x zs)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $is\text{-}min2\text{-}min2\text{-}insI: is\text{-}min2 y ys \implies is\text{-}min2 (min2 x y) (insert x ys)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $is\text{-}min2\text{-}mergeI:$
 $is\text{-}min2 x xs \implies is\text{-}min2 y ys \implies is\text{-}min2 (min2 x y) (xs \cup ys)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem $invpst\text{-}mkNode[simp]: invpst (mkNode c l a r) \longleftrightarrow invpst l \wedge invpst r$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

end

3 Priority Search Trees on top of RBTs

```

theory PST-RBT
imports
  HOL-Data-Structures.Cmp
  HOL-Data-Structures.Isin2
  HOL-Data-Structures.Lookup2
  PST-General

```

begin

We obtain a priority search map based on red-black trees via the general priority search tree augmentation.

This theory has been derived from the standard Isabelle implementation of red black trees in `HOL-Data_Structures`.

3.1 Definitions

3.1.1 The Code

datatype `tcolor = Red | Black`

type-synonym `('k,'p) rbth = (('k×'p) × (tcolor × ('k × 'p))) tree`

abbreviation `R where R m kp l a r ≡ Node l (a, Red,m kp) r`

abbreviation `B where B m kp l a r ≡ Node l (a, Black,m kp) r`

abbreviation `mkR ≡ mkNode Red`

abbreviation `mkB ≡ mkNode Black`

fun `baliL :: ('k,'p::linorder) rbth ⇒ 'k×'p ⇒ ('k,'p) rbth ⇒ ('k,'p) rbth`

where

`baliL (R - (R - t1 a1 t2) a2 t3) a3 t4 = mkR (mkB t1 a1 t2) a2 (mkB t3 a3 t4)`
`| baliL (R - t1 a1 (R - t2 a2 t3)) a3 t4 = mkR (mkB t1 a1 t2) a2 (mkB t3 a3 t4)`
`| baliL t1 a t2 = mkB t1 a t2`

fun `baliR :: ('k,'p::linorder) rbth ⇒ 'k×'p ⇒ ('k,'p) rbth ⇒ ('k,'p) rbth`

where

`baliR t1 a1 (R - (R - t2 a2 t3) a3 t4) = mkR (mkB t1 a1 t2) a2 (mkB t3 a3 t4)`
`| baliR t1 a1 (R - t2 a2 (R - t3 a3 t4)) = mkR (mkB t1 a1 t2) a2 (mkB t3 a3 t4)`
`| baliR t1 a t2 = mkB t1 a t2`

fun `paint :: tcolor ⇒ ('k,'p::linorder) rbth ⇒ ('k,'p::linorder) rbth` **where**

`paint c Leaf = Leaf |`

`paint c (Node l (a, (-,m kp)) r) = Node l (a, (c,m kp)) r`

fun `baldL :: ('k,'p::linorder) rbth ⇒ 'k × 'p ⇒ ('k,'p::linorder) rbth`

`⇒ ('k,'p::linorder) rbth`

where

`baldL (R - t1 x t2) y t3 = mkR (mkB t1 x t2) y t3 |`
`baldL bl x (B - t1 y t2) = baliR bl x (mkR t1 y t2) |`
`baldL bl x (R - (B - t1 y t2) z t3)`
`= mkR (mkB bl x t1) y (baliR t2 z (paint Red t3)) |`
`baldL t1 x t2 = mkR t1 x t2`

fun `baldR :: ('k,'p::linorder) rbth ⇒ 'k × 'p ⇒ ('k,'p::linorder) rbth`

`⇒ ('k,'p::linorder) rbth`

where

```

baldR t1 x (R - t2 y t3) = mkR t1 x (mkB t2 y t3) |
baldR (B - t1 x t2) y t3 = baliL (mkR t1 x t2) y t3 |
baldR (R - t1 x (B - t2 y t3)) z t4
= mkR (baliL (paint Red t1) x t2) y (mkB t3 z t4) |
baldR t1 x t2 = mkR t1 x t2

fun combine :: ('k,'p::linorder) rbth  $\Rightarrow$  ('k,'p::linorder) rbth
 $\Rightarrow$  ('k,'p::linorder) rbth
where
combine Leaf t = t |
combine t Leaf = t |
combine (R - t1 a t2) (R - t3 c t4) =
(case combine t2 t3 of
R - u2 b u3  $\Rightarrow$  (mkR (mkR t1 a u2) b (mkR u3 c t4)) |
t23  $\Rightarrow$  mkR t1 a (mkR t23 c t4)) |
combine (B - t1 a t2) (B - t3 c t4) =
(case combine t2 t3 of
R - t2' b t3'  $\Rightarrow$  mkR (mkB t1 a t2') b (mkB t3' c t4)) |
t23  $\Rightarrow$  baldL t1 a (mkB t23 c t4)) |
combine t1 (R - t2 a t3) = mkR (combine t1 t2) a t3 |
combine (R - t1 a t2) t3 = mkR t1 a (combine t2 t3)

fun color :: ('k,'p) rbth  $\Rightarrow$  tcolor where
color Leaf = Black |
color (Node - (-, (c,-)) -) = c

fun upd :: 'a::linorder  $\Rightarrow$  'b::linorder  $\Rightarrow$  ('a,'b) rbth  $\Rightarrow$  ('a,'b) rbth where
upd x y Leaf = mkR Leaf (x,y) Leaf |
upd x y (B - l (a,b) r) = (case cmp x a of
LT  $\Rightarrow$  baliL (upd x y l) (a,b) r |
GT  $\Rightarrow$  baliR l (a,b) (upd x y r) |
EQ  $\Rightarrow$  mkB l (x,y) r) |
upd x y (R - l (a,b) r) = (case cmp x a of
LT  $\Rightarrow$  mkR (upd x y l) (a,b) r |
GT  $\Rightarrow$  mkR l (a,b) (upd x y r) |
EQ  $\Rightarrow$  mkR l (x,y) r)

definition update :: 'a::linorder  $\Rightarrow$  'b::linorder  $\Rightarrow$  ('a,'b) rbth  $\Rightarrow$  ('a,'b) rbth
where
update x y t = paint Black (upd x y t)

fun del :: 'a::linorder  $\Rightarrow$  ('a,'b::linorder)rbth  $\Rightarrow$  ('a,'b)rbth where
del x Leaf = Leaf |
del x (Node l ((a,b), (c,-)) r) = (case cmp x a of
LT  $\Rightarrow$  if l  $\neq$  Leaf  $\wedge$  color l = Black
then baldL (del x l) (a,b) r else mkR (del x l) (a,b) r |
GT  $\Rightarrow$  if r  $\neq$  Leaf  $\wedge$  color r = Black

```

```

    then baldR l (a,b) (del x r) else mkR l (a,b) (del x r) |
EQ ⇒ combine l r)

definition delete :: 'a::linorder ⇒ ('a,'b::linorder) rbth ⇒ ('a,'b) rbth where
delete x t = paint Black (del x t)

```

3.1.2 Invariants

```

fun bheight :: ('k,'p) rbth ⇒ nat where
bheight Leaf = 0 |
bheight (Node l (x, (c,-)) r) = (if c = Black then bheight l + 1 else bheight l)

fun invc :: ('k,'p) rbth ⇒ bool where
invc Leaf = True |
invc (Node l (a, (c,-)) r) =
  (invc l ∧ invc r ∧ (c = Red → color l = Black ∧ color r = Black))

fun invc2 :: ('k,'p) rbth ⇒ bool — Weaker version where
invc2 Leaf = True |
invc2 (Node l (a, -) r) = (invc l ∧ invc r)

fun invh :: ('k,'p) rbth ⇒ bool where
invh Leaf = True |
invh (Node l (x, -) r) = (invh l ∧ invh r ∧ bheight l = bheight r)

definition rbt :: ('k,'p::linorder) rbth ⇒ bool where
rbt t = (invc t ∧ invh t ∧ invpst t ∧ color t = Black)

```

3.2 Functional Correctness

lemma inorder-paint[simp]: $\text{inorder}(\text{paint } c \ t) = \text{inorder } t$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma inorder-mkNode[simp]:
 $\text{inorder}(\text{mkNode } c \ l \ a \ r) = \text{inorder } l @ a \# \text{inorder } r$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma inorder-baliL[simp]:
 $\text{inorder}(\text{baliL } l \ a \ r) = \text{inorder } l @ a \# \text{inorder } r$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma inorder-baliR[simp]:
 $\text{inorder}(\text{baliR } l \ a \ r) = \text{inorder } l @ a \# \text{inorder } r$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma inorder-baldL[simp]:
 $\text{inorder}(\text{baldL } l \ a \ r) = \text{inorder } l @ a \# \text{inorder } r$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *inorder-baldR*[simp]:
 $\text{inorder}(\text{baldR } l \ a \ r) = \text{inorder } l @ a \# \text{inorder } r$
(proof)

lemma *inorder-combine*[simp]:
 $\text{inorder}(\text{combine } l \ r) = \text{inorder } l @ \text{inorder } r$
(proof)

lemma *inorder-upd*:
 $\text{sorted1}(\text{inorder } t) \implies \text{inorder}(\text{upd } x \ y \ t) = \text{upd-list } x \ y \ (\text{inorder } t)$
(proof)

lemma *inorder-update*:
 $\text{sorted1}(\text{inorder } t) \implies \text{inorder}(\text{update } x \ y \ t) = \text{upd-list } x \ y \ (\text{inorder } t)$
(proof)

lemma *inorder-del*:
 $\text{sorted1}(\text{inorder } t) \implies \text{inorder}(\text{del } x \ t) = \text{del-list } x \ (\text{inorder } t)$
(proof)

lemma *inorder-delete*:
 $\text{sorted1}(\text{inorder } t) \implies \text{inorder}(\text{delete } x \ t) = \text{del-list } x \ (\text{inorder } t)$
(proof)

3.3 Invariant Preservation

lemma *color-paint-Black*: $\text{color}(\text{paint Black } t) = \text{Black}$
(proof)

theorem *rbt-Leaf*: rbt Leaf
(proof)

lemma *invc2I*: $\text{invc } t \implies \text{invc2 } t$
(proof)

lemma *paint-invc2*: $\text{invc2 } t \implies \text{invc2}(\text{paint } c \ t)$
(proof)

lemma *invc-paint-Black*: $\text{invc2 } t \implies \text{invc}(\text{paint Black } t)$
(proof)

lemma *invh-paint*: $\text{invh } t \implies \text{invh}(\text{paint } c \ t)$
(proof)

lemma *invc-mkRB*[simp]:
 $\text{invc } (\text{mkR } l \ a \ r) \longleftrightarrow \text{invc } l \wedge \text{invc } r \wedge \text{color } l = \text{Black} \wedge \text{color } r = \text{Black}$
 $\text{invc } (\text{mkB } l \ a \ r) \longleftrightarrow \text{invc } l \wedge \text{invc } r$
(proof)

lemma *color-mkNode*[simp]: $\text{color}(\text{mkNode } c \text{ } l \text{ } a \text{ } r) = c$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

3.3.1 Update

lemma *invc-baliL*:

$\llbracket \text{invc2 } l; \text{invc } r \rrbracket \implies \text{invc}(\text{baliL } l \text{ } a \text{ } r)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *invc-baliR*:

$\llbracket \text{invc } l; \text{invc2 } r \rrbracket \implies \text{invc}(\text{baliR } l \text{ } a \text{ } r)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *bheight-mkRB*[simp]:

$\text{bheight}(\text{mkR } l \text{ } a \text{ } r) = \text{bheight } l$
 $\text{bheight}(\text{mkB } l \text{ } a \text{ } r) = \text{Suc}(\text{bheight } l)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *bheight-baliL*:

$\text{bheight } l = \text{bheight } r \implies \text{bheight}(\text{baliL } l \text{ } a \text{ } r) = \text{Suc}(\text{bheight } l)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *bheight-baliR*:

$\text{bheight } l = \text{bheight } r \implies \text{bheight}(\text{baliR } l \text{ } a \text{ } r) = \text{Suc}(\text{bheight } l)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *invh-mkNode*[simp]:

$\text{invh}(\text{mkNode } c \text{ } l \text{ } a \text{ } r) \iff \text{invh } l \wedge \text{invh } r \wedge \text{bheight } l = \text{bheight } r$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *invh-baliL*:

$\llbracket \text{invh } l; \text{invh } r; \text{bheight } l = \text{bheight } r \rrbracket \implies \text{invh}(\text{baliL } l \text{ } a \text{ } r)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *invh-baliR*:

$\llbracket \text{invh } l; \text{invh } r; \text{bheight } l = \text{bheight } r \rrbracket \implies \text{invh}(\text{baliR } l \text{ } a \text{ } r)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *invc-upd*: **assumes** *invc t*

shows $\text{color } t = \text{Black} \implies \text{invc}(\text{upd } x \text{ } y \text{ } t) \text{ } \text{invc2}(\text{upd } x \text{ } y \text{ } t)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *invh-upd*: **assumes** *invh t*

shows $\text{invh}(\text{upd } x \text{ } y \text{ } t) \text{ } \text{bheight}(\text{upd } x \text{ } y \text{ } t) = \text{bheight } t$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *invpst-paint*[simp]: $\text{invpst} (\text{paint } c t) = \text{invpst } t$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *invpst-baliR*: $\text{invpst } l \implies \text{invpst } r \implies \text{invpst} (\text{baliR } l a r)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *invpst-baliL*: $\text{invpst } l \implies \text{invpst } r \implies \text{invpst} (\text{baliL } l a r)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *invpst-upd*: $\text{invpst } t \implies \text{invpst} (\text{upd } x y t)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

theorem *rbt-update*: $\text{rbt } t \implies \text{rbt} (\text{update } x y t)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

3.3.2 Delete

lemma *bheight-paint-Red*:
 $\text{color } t = \text{Black} \implies \text{bheight} (\text{paint Red } t) = \text{bheight } t - 1$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *invh-baldL-invC*:
 $\llbracket \text{invh } l; \text{ invh } r; \text{ bheight } l + 1 = \text{bheight } r; \text{ invc } r \rrbracket$
 $\implies \text{invh} (\text{baldL } l a r) \wedge \text{bheight} (\text{baldL } l a r) = \text{bheight } l + 1$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *invh-baldL-Black*:
 $\llbracket \text{invh } l; \text{ invh } r; \text{ bheight } l + 1 = \text{bheight } r; \text{ color } r = \text{Black} \rrbracket$
 $\implies \text{invh} (\text{baldL } l a r) \wedge \text{bheight} (\text{baldL } l a r) = \text{bheight } r$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *invC-baldL*: $\llbracket \text{invC2 } l; \text{ invc } r; \text{ color } r = \text{Black} \rrbracket \implies \text{invC} (\text{baldL } l a r)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *invC2-baldL*: $\llbracket \text{invC2 } l; \text{ invc } r \rrbracket \implies \text{invC2} (\text{baldL } l a r)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *invh-baldR-invC*:
 $\llbracket \text{invh } l; \text{ invh } r; \text{ bheight } l = \text{bheight } r + 1; \text{ invc } l \rrbracket$
 $\implies \text{invh} (\text{baldR } l a r) \wedge \text{bheight} (\text{baldR } l a r) = \text{bheight } l$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *invC-baldR*: $\llbracket \text{invC } a; \text{ invC2 } b; \text{ color } a = \text{Black} \rrbracket \implies \text{invC} (\text{baldR } a x b)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *invC2-baldR*: $\llbracket \text{invC } l; \text{ invC2 } r \rrbracket \implies \text{invC2} (\text{baldR } l x r)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

```

lemma invh-combine:
   $\llbracket \text{invh } l; \text{invh } r; \text{bheight } l = \text{bheight } r \rrbracket$ 
   $\implies \text{invh}(\text{combine } l \ r) \wedge \text{bheight}(\text{combine } l \ r) = \text{bheight } l$ 
  <proof>

lemma invc-combine:
  assumes invc l invc r
  shows color l = Black  $\implies$  color r = Black  $\implies$  invc (combine l r)
    invc2 (combine l r)
  <proof>

lemma neq-LeafD: t ≠ Leaf  $\implies \exists l \ x \ c \ r. \ t = \text{Node } l \ (x, c) \ r
  <proof>

lemma del-invc-invh: invh t  $\implies$  invc t  $\implies$  invh (del x t)  $\wedge$ 
  (color t = Red  $\wedge$  bheight (del x t) = bheight t  $\wedge$  invc (del x t))  $\vee$ 
  (color t = Black  $\wedge$  bheight (del x t) = bheight t - 1  $\wedge$  invc2 (del x t))
  <proof>

lemma invpst-baldR: invpst l  $\implies$  invpst r  $\implies$  invpst (baldR l a r)
  <proof>

lemma invpst-baldL: invpst l  $\implies$  invpst r  $\implies$  invpst (baldL l a r)
  <proof>

lemma invpst-combine: invpst l  $\implies$  invpst r  $\implies$  invpst (combine l r)
  <proof>

lemma invpst-del: invpst t  $\implies$  invpst (del x t)
  <proof>

theorem rbt-delete: rbt t  $\implies$  rbt (delete k t)
  <proof>

lemma rbt-getmin-ismin:
  rbt t  $\implies$  t ≠ Leaf  $\implies$  is-min2 (pst-getmin t) (set-tree t)
  <proof>

definition rbt-is-empty t  $\equiv$  t = Leaf

lemma rbt-is-empty: rbt-is-empty t  $\longleftrightarrow$  inorder t = []
  <proof>

definition empty where empty = Leaf$ 
```

3.4 Overall Correctness

interpretation *PM*: *PrioMap-by-Ordered*
where *empty = empty* **and** *lookup = lookup* **and** *update = update* **and** *delete =*

```

delete
and inorder = inorder and inv = rbt and is-empty = rbt-is-empty
and getmin = pst-getmin
⟨proof⟩

end

```

4 Related Work

Our priority map ADT is close to Hinze’s [1] *priority search queue* interface, except that he also supports a few further operations that we could easily add but do not need for our applications. However, it is not clear if his implementation technique is the same as our priority search tree because his description employs a plethora of concepts, e.g. *priority search pennants*, *tournament trees*, *semi-heaps*, and multiple *views* of data types that obscure a direct comparison. We claim that at the very least our presentation is new because it is much simpler; we encourage the reader to compare the two.

As already observed by Hinze, McCreight’s [3] priority search trees support range queries more efficiently than our trees. However, we can support the same range queries as Hinze efficiently, but that is outside the scope of this entry.

References

- [1] R. Hinze. A simple implementation technique for priority search queues. In B. C. Pierce, editor, *Proceedings of the Sixth ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP ’01), Firenze (Florence), Italy, September 3-5, 2001.*, pages 110–121. ACM, 2001.
- [2] P. Lammich and T. Nipkow. Proof pearl: Purely functional, simple and efficient Priority Search Trees and applications to Prim and Dijkstra. In *Proc. of ITP*, 2019. to appear.
- [3] E. M. McCreight. Priority search trees. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 14(2):257–276, 1985.