

The Logarithmic Funnel: An Efficient Indexed Priority Queue

Christian Loeffeld*

August 22, 2023

Abstract

For many data-processing applications, a comprehensive set of efficient operations for the management of priority values is required. Indexed priority queues are particularly promising to satisfy this requirement by design. In this work, we report the design and analysis of an efficient indexed priority queue with a comprehensive set of operations. In particular, `insert`, `delete` and `decrease` all run in expected $O(\log^* n)$ time, while `increase` is conjectured by means of Monte Carlo simulations to run in expected $O(\log \log n)$ time. The space complexity as well as the time complexity for the construction of the empty heap data structure is $O(n)$. For certain massive computational problems, such as specific analyses of extremely large graphs and (chemical) simulations, this heap system may exhibit considerable utility.

1 Introduction

A heap data structure maintains a specific partial ordering of a collection of comparable types. The heap is one of the most ubiquitously utilized data structures in computer science. Priority queues are employed in a broad range of important applications, from simulations [1, 2], to scheduling [3, 4], and graph analysis [5]. A broad survey into the variety of forays into heap research revealed a large number of ideas and approaches that have shaped the development of priority queues and beyond [6].

In 1964, Williams [7] was the first to introduce a sorting algorithm based on the notion of an array-based heap. An example of an efficient priority queue in practice is based on *van Emde Boas Trees* [8] and widely used in network routers. Various priority queues have been devised that exhibit optimal running times for common heap operations. Those ideas transformed the ability to analyze complex graph problems. Among them, the *Pairing-Heap* [9], the *Fibonacci heap* [10], *Brodal Queues* [11], and the *Rank-Pairing Heap* [12]. Another group of efficient data structures for shortest-path algorithms turn out to be so-called multi-level bucket heaps [13, 14]. For applications employing monotone sequences and involving shortest-path algorithms, especially efficient monotone priority queues have been designed [15, 16].

In this work, we present the design and analysis of an indexed priority queue, named the Logarithmic Funnel. This priority queue maintains uniquely identifiable elements that contain priority values in heap-order and supports comprehensive functionality for efficient modification of the priorities. Additionally, it also enables efficient deletion of elements from the priority queue. We will demonstrate runtime and space characteristics of this heap system in the realization of a max-heap, which besides the common heap operations, namely `insert`, `find-max`, `delete-max`, also facilitates the specific heap operations, `increase`, `decrease` and `delete` on its elements $[id : p]$, where id represents an immutable identifier and p , the priority, a comparable and mutable type. For a summary of the runtime behavior, see Table 1 below.

Beyond the present overview, this report contains three additional sections. Basic properties and structural composition of the Logarithmic Funnel are detailed in Section 2. The functional facilities supported by this heap system are analyzed and its associated computational complexities are established in Section 3. In Section 4, we then conclude with some remarks, allude to some open questions, and mention a few potential extensions to this heap system.

*Email: c.loeffeld@proton.me

†Expected running time.

‡Projected upper-bound of expected running time - determined using Monte Carlo simulations. See Section 3.5.

Name	Operation	Time Complexity	Section
<code>make-heap(λ, n)</code>	Make empty $(\lambda+1)$ -level heap for n elements.	$O(n)$	3.1
<code>find-max()</code>	Access element with highest priority.	$O(1)$	3.2
<code>delete-max()</code>	Delete element with the highest priority.	$O(\log n)$	3.3
<code>insert(id, p)</code>	Insert element id with priority p .	$O(\log^* n)$ [†]	3.4.1
<code>delete(id)</code>	Delete the element id .	$O(\log^* n)$ [†]	3.4.2
<code>decrease(id, p')</code>	Decrease priority from p to p' of element id .	$O(\log^* n)$ [†]	3.4.3
<code>increase(id, p')</code>	Increase priority from p to p' of element id .	$O(\log \log n)$ ^{†‡}	3.5

Table 1: Overview of heap system operations and associated time complexities on elements with unique immutable identifiers id and mutable, potentially degenerate priorities p . The expression $\log^* n$ denotes the iterated logarithm (see Section 2.3 for more details).

2 Structure and Composition of the Logarithmic Funnel H_λ

The Logarithmic Funnel is an indexed priority queue. It is a recursive and composite data type built from two families of specific composite heap types, namely the base heap type H_0 and the inductive heap types H_ℓ with $0 < \ell \leq \lambda$. The recursive nature and data type composition of this heap system are graphically illustrated in Figure 1. A Logarithmic Funnel with λ inductive levels is denoted as H_λ , and is constructed from multiple instances of all λ distinct heap types H_ℓ where $\ell \in [1 \dots \lambda]$, and multiple instances of base heaps H_0 .

The heap system contains a single global hash table, the *location_table* \mathbb{T} , to store a specific set of $[id : [heap - addresses]]$ -bundle. The table \mathbb{T} essentially acts as a routing table facilitating a unique path down the system to the particular base heap H_0 that stores the required element that is associated with the unique identifier id .

2.1 Base Heap Type H_0

Structurally, base heaps H_0 are a small composite data structures that in addition to core heap functionalities, also support naive operations for decrease and increase of the priority value of an element, as well as deletion of an element. Base heaps H_0 consist of two distinct data types, (i) a backpointer to its parent inductive heap, a heap of type H_1 , and (ii) an array-based, implicit max-heap that maintains a very small set of constant-size elements of the form $id : p$, where id is a unique and immutable identifier and p is a mutable and comparable priority value.

The data elements of the heap system H_λ are exclusively managed by H_0 heaps, i.e. all element operations occur only on the base-level. The inductive level functions of the heap system only serve to direct the requested action on the element to the particular H_0 base heap hosting the specific element.

See Section 2.3 and Figure 2 for more details on base heap sizes. An exciting recent results seemingly supporting this particular design choice was presented by Mankowitz, Michi, Zhernov *et al.*[17]. They discovered highly efficient, optimized algorithms to sort short sequences of elements. Benchmarks using these sort implementations in the LLVM C++ library [18] revealed improvements of up to 70% for sequences of a length of five for uint32, uint64 and float on specific architectures [17].

2.2 Inductive Heap Types H_ℓ

The composition of the inductive heap types H_ℓ is being depicted in the bottom half of Fig. 1. Each heap of type H_ℓ consists of an array-based binary max-heap denoted as $\alpha \mathbb{M}$, a backpointer \mathbb{B} to the *metaheap* of its parent heap, a $H_{\ell+1}$ heap, and a variable *heap-max* to keep track of the local max-priority element.

The elements of the *metaheap* of an inductive heap H_ℓ are pointers \mathbb{P} to heaps of type $H_{\ell-1}$. The *metaheap* implicitly maintains in heap-order the max-priority elements of its k_ℓ bidirectionally linked heaps of type $H_{\ell-1}$. The bidirectionality of the heap linkage is required in order to compute in constant time the position in the *metaheap* where a heap-property violation may have occurred as the result of an element deletion or the modification of its priority value.




Figure 1: Graphical representation of the composition and structural setup of the Logarithmic Funnel. The heap system is characterized by its recursive depth $\lambda + 1$, and constructed from a large number of instances of two structurally distinct heap families, namely heaps of type H_ℓ where $\ell \in [1 \dots \lambda]$, and the base heap type H_0 . It contains a global hash table \mathbb{T} to store routing paths from level λ to the base level.

Top (H_0): The base heap H_0 consists of a back-pointer \mathbb{B} to its parent H_1 heap and an implicit binary max-heap that maintains a specific set of elements $id : p$, where id is a unique, immutable identifier and p is a mutable and comparable value.

Bottom (H_ℓ): Each inductive heap H_ℓ consists of an implicit binary max-heap, denoted as *metaheap* \mathbb{M} , a back-pointer \mathbb{B} to the parent $H_{\ell+1}$ heap, and a variable *heap_max* to store the max priority value of the particular sub-heap system. The elements of each *metaheap* \mathbb{M} of an inductive heap H_ℓ are pointers \mathbb{P} to heaps of type $H_{\ell-1}$.

2.3 The Depth λ_α of the Heap System H_λ

The time and space computational complexities associated with the operations inscribed to this heap system are defined by its level depth λ , or equivalently the shortest number of steps from level λ to the base which maintain all data elements. The quantity λ is determined by employing a small variation to the standard definition of the iterated logarithm [19].

Definition 2.1 (The Generalized Iterated Logarithm). Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_1^+$, then we define the generalized iterated logarithm as follows,

$$\log^{\alpha*} n := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n \leq \alpha \\ 1 + \log^{\alpha*}(\log n) & \text{if } n > \alpha \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

This expression defines the number of times the logarithm must be iteratively applied before the result is less than or equal to a small predefined constant value, α . Definition 2.1 is introduced as

extension to the common iterated logarithm, where $\alpha = 1$, and in order to guide the construction of sufficiently small base heaps H_0 , and consequently to enforce associated base heap operations with expected constant time complexities.

For convenience, we denote the level depth λ_α of the Logarithmic Funnel using Definition 2.1 as follows,

Definition 2.2 (Level Depth of the Logarithmic Funnel).

$$\lambda_\alpha \equiv \log^{\alpha*} n \quad (2.2)$$

Since the generalized iterated logarithm λ_α terminates strictly faster than the common iterated logarithm $\log^* n$ for all problem sizes where $n \leq 2^{65536}$ and $\alpha > 1$, the level depth $\lambda_{\alpha>1}$ is less than that for the common iterated logarithm λ_1 . In Figure 2, the expected base heap size n_0 is depicted as a function of the total heap size n_λ and for λ_α with values for $\lambda \in [2 \dots 4]$. The graph is suggestive of the notion that for total heap sizes n_λ up to and even more than 2^{420} elements, a 3-level heap system would enable robustly maintaining expected base heap sizes n_0 smaller than or around 4, for which very efficient and highly optimized sort algorithms do exist[17].




Figure 2: Expected base heap size n_0 as a function of total heap size n_λ and level depth λ . The level depth is defined through the generalized iterated binary logarithm (see Definition 2.1).

2.4 Heap Size Control

The heap system H_λ is designed such that the number of elements maintained on vertically adjacent heap level changes logarithmically (see Definition 2.3). The size of a *metaheap* k_ℓ and the expected number of maintained elements $n_{\ell-1} = \log n_\ell$ for each of its bidirectionally linked children $H_{\ell-1}$ is being determined by the total number of elements n_ℓ maintained by a heap H_ℓ . Thus, a λ -level heap system is defined such that at any level ℓ with $\ell \in [1 \dots \lambda]$, the elements are assumed to be distributed uniformly over all k_ℓ heaps of type $H_{\ell-1}$, and each with expected size $n_{\ell-1}$.

Formally, we define an implicit heap size control mechanism such that $\forall \ell \in [1 \dots \lambda]$, the size of a *metaheap* k_ℓ , i.e. the number of its children, heaps of type $H_{\ell-1}$, is defined by the following relation,

Definition 2.3 (Implicit *metaheap* Size Control in a H_λ System).

$$k_\ell := \frac{n_\ell}{\log n_\ell} = \frac{n_\ell}{n_{\ell-1}} = \frac{\overbrace{\log \dots \log n_\lambda}^{\lambda-\ell \text{ times}}}{\underbrace{\log \dots \log n_\lambda}_{\lambda-\ell+1 \text{ times}}} \quad (2.3)$$

3 Asymptotic Analysis of Time and Space Complexity

In the following sections, we define and analyze the runtime characteristics of the recursively defined operations inscribed onto the Logarithmic Funnel, an iterated, indexed heap data structure containing elements $[id : p]$, where id is a unique, immutable identifier and p a potentially degenerate, mutable priority of the element. In particular, we will consider mechanisms facilitating the insertion and deletion of elements, priority update operations, such as increase and decrease. The classical operations for obtaining and deleting the element containing the largest priority are also considered. Furthermore, we will evaluate a recursive construction mechanism for the heap system, and its associated space complexity.

For the most part, we focus the analysis of all supported operations only on the part of the algorithms acting on the inductive heaps H_ℓ where $0 < \ell \leq \lambda$. The operations on base heaps H_0 either mirror standard algorithms on array-based binary heaps or are trivial deviations of them. For details on the structure of base (H_0) and inductive (H_ℓ) heap types, please refer to sections 2.1 and 2.2, respectively. Recall that all operations on the heap are defined recursively. Thus, the proof structure will follow the typically associated schema of setting up and solving a recurrence relation including a base case ($\ell = 0$) and an inductive step ($0 < \ell \leq \lambda$).

3.1 Make-Heap

In order to construct a Logarithmic Funnel H_λ with λ inductive levels and a base level ($\ell = 0$), two distinct types of constructors are employed to generate empty heap instances H_ℓ ($\ell \in [1 \dots \lambda]$) and H_0 , respectively. Although recursively defined, these operations are different in nature from all other operations supported by the heap system because they are not acting on the system itself but actually creating it. Here, we will focus on and prove by induction Theorem 1 on the computational time complexity of the `make-heap` operation for inductive levels H_ℓ where $0 < \ell \leq \lambda$, and described by Algorithm 1.

Theorem 1. *Let H_λ be the Logarithmic Funnel constructed to maintain n_λ elements[§], i.e. with λ levels of inductive heaps H_ℓ ($0 < \ell \leq \lambda$), and let `make-heap` be the constructor system of the heap, then its associated time complexity described by Algorithm 1 is $T_\lambda = O(n_\lambda)$.*

Algorithm 1 `make-heap`($\ell, n, \text{addressOf}(bp)=\text{null}$)

Require: See Figure 1 and Section 2.2 for nomenclature.

```

1: back_ptr := bp
2: heap_max := (0, min_priority value)
3: instantiate metaheap, a  $k_\ell$ -sized array of pointers to  $H_{\ell-1}$  heaps
4: for ptr in metaheap do
5:   ptr := make-heap( $\ell-1, \lceil \log n \rceil, \text{addressOf}(ptr)$ )
6: end for
7: return addressOf(this  $H_\ell$  instance)

```

We will proceed demonstrating that the recurrence relation describing the running time of the `make-heap` operation described in Algorithm 1 can be stated as follows,

$$T_\ell = \begin{cases} c_0 & \text{if } \ell = 0 \\ k_\ell T_{\ell-1} + k_\ell + c_\ell & \text{if } 0 < \ell \leq \lambda \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

and whose associated asymptotic solution is $T_\ell = O(n_\ell)$.

Proof. The base level instance H_0 of the heap system is a simple class containing an empty vector of elements and a small collection of book-keeping variables. The construction thus requires only

[§]an increase by many orders of magnitude is feasible often for identical values of λ

constant time.

On the uppermost level λ , of which there exists only a single instance, we instantiate a globally used hash-map, the *location-table* optimized to deal with very roughly n_ℓ elements. This operation requires expected constant time.

More generally, for heaps H_ℓ where $0 < \ell \leq \lambda$, the **make-heap** operation is defined by Algorithm 1. On lines 1 and 2, we establish a back connection to the parent $H_{\ell+1}$ metaheap, and set initial values for *id* and *priority* of the local *heap-max* element. Both actions are constant time operations. In line 3, the metaheap for this H_ℓ instance with k_ℓ elements is created, taking $O(k_\ell) = O(n_\ell)$ time. Here you may recall definition 2.3, $k_\ell = n_\ell / \log n_\ell$. Consecutively, in lines 4 and 5, the k_ℓ child $H_{\ell-1}$ heaps are created and connected to the H_ℓ metaheap elements. These k_ℓ **make-heap** operations take $O(k_\ell T_{\ell-1})$ time. Finally, the address of the created H_ℓ instance is returned to its parent in a constant time operation. In summary, we can assert the respective recurrence relation for an H_ℓ heap to be $T_\ell = k_\ell T_{\ell-1} + k_\ell$. Thus, the recurrence relation of the entire **make-heap** constructor system is defined by Eq. 3.1, and which thus for a Logarithmic Funnel H_λ has the asymptotic solution $T_\lambda = O(n_\lambda)$. ■

3.2 Find-Max

The functionality **find-max**() is a part of the core set of heap operations, and by far the simplest operation supported by the Logarithmic Funnel. Below we describe its algorithm and determine its time complexity.

Theorem 2. *Let n_λ be the total number of elements maintained by the Logarithmic Funnel H_λ , then the runtime complexity of the operation **find-max**() described by Algorithm 2 is $O(1)$.*

Algorithm 2 **find-max**()

Require: See Figure 1 and Section 2.2 for nomenclature.

1: **return** *heap-max*

Proof. The base case is trivially true. Any base heap H_0 , an array-based binary heap, stores the maximum priority element in the first position and is thus retrievable in $O(1)$ time. For any heap type H_ℓ , the Algorithm 2 simply returns the value of the variable *heap-max*. Thus, the time complexity of the operation on any level ℓ with $0 < \ell \leq \lambda$ can be formulated using a first-order recurrence relation with constant coefficients exhibiting the solution $T_\lambda = O(1)$. ■

3.3 Delete-Max

The operation **delete-max** is also part of the core functionality that is supported by every heap system. We will describe an algorithm for this operation in the Logarithmic Funnel, analyze it and prove the following theorem:

Theorem 3. *Let n_λ be the total number of elements maintained by the Logarithmic Funnel H_λ , and let **delete-max** be the supported operation on the heap system described by Algorithm 3, then its associated time complexity is $T_\lambda = O(\log n_\lambda)$.*

Algorithm 3 **delete-max**()

Require: See Figure 1 and Section 2.2 for nomenclature.

1: *pHeap* := *metaheap*[0]
 2: *pHeap* → **delete-max**()
 3: restore heap-property in *metaheap*
 4: *heap-max* := *metaheap*[0] → **find-max**()

We will proceed verifying the correctness of the following recurrence relation,

$$T_\ell = \begin{cases} c_0 & \text{if } \ell = 0 \\ T_{\ell-1} + \log k_\ell + c_\ell & \text{if } 0 < \ell \leq \lambda \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

and whose associated asymptotic solution is $T_\lambda = O(\log n_\lambda)$.

Proof. On the base heap level ($\ell = 0$), **delete-max** is replicating the classical operation of an implicit array-based binary heap, i.e. it restores heap-order in $O(\log n_0)$ time, and in addition removes the unique identifier and its associated values from the *location_table* in expected constant time. Since the base heap size n_0 is defined to be a roughly constant δ , the operation requires expected constant time.

On level ℓ where $0 < \ell \leq \lambda$, lines 1 and 4 are constant time operations. On line 2, we refer work to the $H_{\ell-1}$ heap that lies on the iterated route down towards the particular base heap H_0 that currently contains the global max-priority element, and thus incurs $T_{\ell-1}$ time. On line 3, a downward-directed heap-order restoration of the *metaheap* on level ℓ is required as result of the heap-order violation induced by the max-priority element. This work requires $O(\log k_\ell) = O(\log n_\ell)$ time. Finally, the work T_ℓ of **delete-max** on any level ℓ may be summarized by $T_{\ell-1} + \log k_\ell + c_\ell$, and consequently the runtime complexity in a Logarithmic Funnel H_λ with n_λ elements, is thus expected $O(\log n_\lambda)$. ■

3.4 Insert-Delete-Decrease Functionality

The operations **insert**, **delete** and **decrease** recursively defined operation on the Logarithmic Funnel H_λ exhibit identical runtime complexities, namely $O(\log^* n_\lambda)$ time, and *metaheap* update probabilities $p = 1/n_{\ell-1}$. They may thus belong to the same category of functions, and are discussed together in the present section.

For Algorithms 4, 5 and 6, described in Sections 3.4.1, 3.4.2, 3.4.3 respectively, we show the correctness of the following recursion relation,

$$T_\ell = \begin{cases} c_0 & \text{if } \ell = 0 \\ T_{\ell-1} + c_\ell & \text{if } 0 < \ell \leq \lambda \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

and whose associated asymptotic solution is $T_\lambda = O(\lambda) \leq O(\log^* n_\lambda)$.

Theorem 4. *Let n_λ be the total number of elements maintained by the Logarithmic Funnel H_λ . The runtime complexity of the operations **insert**, **delete**, and **decrease** described by Algorithms 4, 5 and 6 is expected $O(\lambda) \leq O(\log^* n_\lambda)$ time.*

3.4.1 Insert

Algorithm 4 `insert(id, p)`

Require: See Figure 1 and Section 2.2 for nomenclature.

- 1: `pHeap := uniformly select a random $H_{\ell-1}$ heap via its associated pointer in the metaheap`
 - 2: `metaheap_update_required := (pHeap \rightarrow find-max().p < p)`
 - 3: `location_table[id][$\ell-1$] := pHeap`
 - 4: `pHeap \rightarrow insert(id, p)`
 - 5: **if** `metaheap_update_required` **then**
 - 6: `restore heap-property in metaheap`
 - 7: `heap_max := (heap_max.p < p) ? (id, p) : heap_max`
 - 8: **end if**
-

Proof. From section 2.1, we know the structural setup of a base heap H_0 . Briefly, on the base heap level ($\ell = 0$), **insert** is essentially replicating the action of an implicit array-based binary heap, i.e. it inserts an element by retaining heap-order in $O(\log n_0)$ time. Again, as with the previously described operations above, the base heap size n_0 is defined to be roughly a small constant δ , and thus the base heap operation may be considered requiring expected constant time.

For inductive heaps H_ℓ , i.e. where $0 < \ell \leq \lambda$, the `insert(id, p)` operation is defined by Algorithm 4 as follows. On line 1, a random $H_{\ell-1}$ heap is selected uniformly via the *metaheap* to distribute insertions across the *metaheap* accordingly. Then, on line 2, it is established in constant time whether the heap-property in the *metaheap* is going to be violated as a result of the element insertion. On line 3, we fill the *location_table* of the heap H_ℓ with required element location information. All three operations require expected constant time. Next, on line 4, we transfer the element insertion action to the corresponding `insert` functionality on level $\ell - 1$, consequently incurring a cost of $T_{\ell-1}$. Since the expected size of the $H_{\ell-1}$ heap that was earmarked for element insertion is $O(n_{\ell-1}) = O(\log n_\ell)$, and thus the associated update probability p_{update} of a uniformly random priority being larger than the local max is of reciprocal complexity, in particular, $\frac{1}{n_{\ell-1}} = \frac{1}{\log n_\ell}$, the associated probability of requiring a *metaheap* update-operation with associated cost $O(\log k_\ell) = O(\log n_\ell)$ is thus amortized cost of $O(1)$.

In summary, the work on any level ℓ may be summarized by $T_{\ell-1} + c_\ell$, and thus the recurrence relation of the `insert` operation is described by 3.3, and the associated time complexity in a Logarithmic Funnel H_λ with n_λ elements, is thus expected $O(\lambda)$, i.e. $O(\log^* n_\lambda)$ time. ■

3.4.2 Delete

Algorithm 5 `delete(id)`

Require: See Figure 1 and Section 2.2 for nomenclature.

```

1: pHeap := location_table[id][ℓ-1]
2: metaheap_update_required := ( pHeap→find-max().id == id )
3: pHeap→delete(id)
4: if metaheap_update_required then
5:   restore heap-property in metaheap
6:   heap_max := (heap_max.id == id) ? metaheap[0]→find-max() : heap_max
7: end if

```

Proof. Recall from Section 2.1 that the base case of this induction is true. Also at the base level, the unique identifier id and all associated values in the *location_table* are removed in expected constant time. Thus, we continue by exploring the situation for inductive heaps, H_ℓ ($0 < \ell \leq \lambda$), and where the `delete` operation is defined by Algorithm 5.

On level ℓ , using the location-table, we first identify the $H_{\ell-1}$ heap that is maintaining the element with identifier id on level $\ell - 1$. Then we proceed to check in $O(1)$ time whether the current max-priority element of the identified $H_{\ell-1}$ heap is the target for deletion. If this is not the case, we merely invoke the level $\ell - 1$ instance of the `delete` operation, and are done. Otherwise (line 5), we also need to restore the heap property in the level ℓ *metaheap* from the point of deletion since the operation potentially induced a violation of the heap order. Since the $H_{\ell-1}$ heap is of expected size $O(n_{\ell-1})$, and any deletion is assumed to be uniformly randomly distributed, this case occurs with probability $1/n_{\ell-1}$, and requires $O(\log k_\ell) = O(\log n_\ell) = O(n_{\ell-1})$ time. The amortized cost of this branch is then expected constant time. The total aggregated operational cost for `delete` on level ℓ , is thus the sum of constant time work performed on level ℓ , and a single operation referred to level $\ell - 1$. As a result and including the constant time base case, the total cost of `delete` can be expressed by the recurrence relation in Eq. 3.3. The total operational cost of `delete` may consequently be stated as expected $O(\lambda) = O(\log^* n_\lambda)$ time. ■

3.4.3 Decrease

Algorithm 6 decrease(*id*, *p'*)

Require: See Figure 1 and Section 2.2 for nomenclature.

```

1: pHeap := location_table[id][ℓ-1]
2: metaheap_update_required := ( id == pHeap→find-max().id )
3: pHeap→decrease(id, p')
4: if metaheap_update_required then
5:   restore heap-property in metaheap
6:   heap_max := (heap_max.id == id) ? metaheap[0]→find-max() : heap_max
7: end if

```

Proof. Using the properties of base heaps described in Section 2.1, the base case is true. Thus, we continue by exploring the situation for inductive heaps, H_ℓ ($0 < \ell \leq \lambda$), and where the decrease(*id*, *p'*) operation is defined by Algorithm 6.

On level ℓ , using the location-table and the unique identifier *id*, we first determine the particular $H_{\ell-1}$ heap that is maintaining the element on level $\ell - 1$. Then we proceed to check in $O(1)$ time whether the current max-priority element of the identified $H_{\ell-1}$ heap is the target of the decrease operation. If this is not the case, we merely invoke the level $\ell - 1$ instance of decrease on the identified $H_{\ell-1}$ heap, and are done. Otherwise (line 5), we also need to restore the heap property in the level ℓ metaheap from the point of change. Since the $H_{\ell-1}$ heap is of expected size $O(n_{\ell-1})$, and any priority decrease is assumed to be uniformly randomly distributed, this case occurs with probability $\frac{1}{n_{\ell-1}}$, and requires $O(\log k_\ell) = O(\log n_\ell)$ time, which is equivalent to an amortized cost for this branch of $O(1)$ time. Thus, the aggregated operational cost for decrease on level ℓ , is the sum of expected constant time work performed on level ℓ , and a single operation referred to level $\ell - 1$. Finally, the total cost of the operation in a Logarithmic Funnel H_λ can be summarized by the recurrence relation, Eq. 3.3 and whose operational cost may be stated as expected $O(\lambda)$, i.e. $O(\log^* n_\lambda)$ time. \blacksquare

3.5 Increase

The heap operations, **increase**, together with **decrease**, and **delete** constitute the set of operations of the heap system that facilitate the mutability of priority values in elements. All operations rely on a global hash table, the *location_table*, to retrieve the address of the particular $H_{\ell-1}$ heap that is en route to the element's base heap, whereby the table lookup requires expected constant time. Recall that elements only exist in base heaps, and that is where they are being modified.

For the operation **increase**, that is being discussed in this section, the analysis is not fully completed yet. Specifically, a derivation for the expression of the probability of requiring a *metaheap* update, p_{update} (line 4 in Algorithm 7), after the priority of a specific element has been increased is still outstanding. To fill this gap in the analysis, and to at least proceed with an estimate of this probability, \hat{p}_{update} , Monte Carlo simulations on an accessible range of heap sizes have been performed (Figure 3).

Conjecture 5. Let n_λ be the total number of elements maintained by the Logarithmic Funnel H_λ . The running time of the operation **increase** described by Algorithm 7 is expected $O(\log \log n_\lambda)$ time.

Algorithm 7 `increase(id, p')`

Require: See Figure 1 and Section 2.2 for nomenclature.

- 1: `pHeap := location_table[id][ℓ-1]`
 - 2: `metaheap_update_required := (pHeap → find-max().p < p')`
 - 3: `pHeap → increase(id, p')`
 - 4: **if** `metaheap_update_required` **then**
 - 5: `restore heap-property in metaheap`
 - 6: `heap_max := (heap_max.p < p') ? (id, p') : heap_max`
 - 7: **end if**
-

We proceed by conjecturing the correctness of the following recurrence relation,

$$T_\ell = \begin{cases} c_0 & \text{if } \ell = 0 \\ T_{\ell-1} + \log \log n_\ell + c_\ell & \text{if } 0 < \ell \leq \lambda \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

and whose associated asymptotic solution is $T_\lambda = O(\log \log n_\lambda)$.




Figure 3: Weak upper-bound estimate of the probability \hat{p}_{update} to require a *metaheap* update as a response to a heap-order violation caused by an **increase** operation. Due to limited memory and computing resources, Monte Carlo simulations have only been performed for each order of magnitude of total heap sizes n_λ in the range $[10^2 \dots 10^8]$. While probably not in the intended optimal operational domain of the Logarithmic Funnel, the graph should give a good indication of quantitative behavior.

Proof. Recall from Section 2.1 that the base case of this induction is true. Thus, we continue by exploring the situation for inductive heaps, H_ℓ ($\ell \in [1 \dots \lambda]$), and where the **increase**(*id*, *p*) operation is defined by Algorithm 7.

On level ℓ , and using the *location_table*, the $H_{\ell-1}$ heap that is maintaining the element with identifier *id* on level $\ell - 1$ is being identified via an expected constant time cost lookup. We proceed to check in $O(1)$ time whether the new priority value *p* for element *id* would become the new *heap_max* element for its $H_{\ell-1}$ heap. If this was not the case, we simply invoke the level $\ell - 1$ operation of **increase** on the identified $H_{\ell-1}$ heap, and are done. Otherwise (lines 5 & 6), since the $H_{\ell-1}$ heap received a new max priority which is now potentially violating the heap order within the level ℓ *metaheap*, we also need to restore the heap-property from the position of change up to its root. This update occurs with probability p_{update} , for which the estimate \hat{p}_{update} on level ℓ based on Monte Carlo simulations appears asymptotically weakly upper-bounded by the function $g(n) = \frac{\log \log n}{\log n}$ (see Figure 3). The simulations are only a guide for future work and in order to get a sense of the current expected runtime of the operation without actually deriving an analytical expression. A *metaheap* update operation on line 5 requires $O(\log k_\ell)$ time, which is equivalent to an amortized cost for this branch of $O(\log \log n_\ell)$ time.

Thus, the aggregated operational cost for `increase(id, p')` on level ℓ , is the sum of expected constant work performed on level ℓ , a single operation referred to level $\ell - 1$, and the amortized cost for the *metaheap* update branch, i.e. $O(\log \log n_\ell)$. As a result, the cost of `increase` on level ℓ can be expressed by the recurrence relation, $T_\ell = T_{\ell-1} + O(\log \log n_\ell) + c_1$ as stated in Eq. 3.4. Thus, upon inclusion of the constant time base case and asserting that $\lambda \geq 2$ for virtually any anticipated use case of this heap data structure, we obtain a computational cost in a Logarithmic Funnel H_λ for this operation of expected $O(\log \log n_\lambda)$ time. ■

3.6 Space Complexity

In the present section, we will analyze the space requirements of the Logarithmic Funnel H_λ , and arrive at the following theorem:

Theorem 6. *Let n_λ be the number of constant-size elements managed by a Logarithmic Funnel H_λ , then the space complexity of the data structure S_λ is $O(n_\lambda)$.*

We proceed by verifying the correctness of the following recurrence relation,

$$S_\ell = O(n_\lambda) + \begin{cases} c_0 & \text{if } \ell = 0 \\ k_\ell S_{\ell-1} + c_\ell & \text{if } 0 < \ell \leq \lambda \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

and whose associated asymptotic solution is $S_\lambda = O(n_\lambda)$.

Proof. Firstly, on the uppermost level λ , there is a single global *location_table* requiring $O(n_\lambda)$ space. Managed elements in the heap system require at least two constant-size data components, namely an identifier *id* and a comparable priority *p*. Thus, in addition to a simple constant-size data type to anchor back to its respective parent H_1 heap, a base-heap H_0 contains an array of expected $O(n_0)$, i.e. constant space.

An inductive heap H_ℓ contains an array, the *metaheap*, of expected $O(k_\ell)$ size, where each of the elements are linked to an $H_{\ell-1}$ heap of size $S_{\ell-1}$. Furthermore, each H_ℓ heap also contains two constant-size variables for bookkeeping and to anchor back to its parent $H_{\ell+1}$ heap. Aggregation of all partial space requirements leads to a total cost function for an inductive heap H_ℓ , that may be stated as $S_\ell = k_\ell S_{\ell-1} + c_\ell$. Thus, for an entire heap system H_λ , we establish the total space cost to be correctly represented by the recurrence relation 3.5. The total space complexity S_λ of a Logarithmic Funnel H_λ may therefore be stated as $O(n_\lambda)$. ■

4 Conclusion

The design and analysis of an efficient indexed priority queue with a comprehensive set of operations for priority value management is presented. We show the data structure to exhibit expected $O(\log^* n)$ running times for the operations `insert`, `delete` and `decrease`, while the expected running time of the `increase` operation is stipulated to be weakly upper-bound by a function $h(n) = \log \log n$. The time complexity of the heap construction operation as well as the space complexity are demonstrated to be $O(n)$. For `find-max` and `delete-max`, the standard running time complexities of $O(1)$ and $O(\log n)$ are established, respectively.

The practicality, robustness and flexibility of the presented data structure are yet to be explored. Despite its appealing computational complexity characteristics, it may well be too involved compared to lean implementations of other highly efficient heap systems in order to be reasonably competitive or useful. However, the outlined setup may have its own distinct benefits for a particular subset of massive graph and/or physical sciences problems if efficient implementations of the data structure can be realized, or necessary improvements can be found. On that note, an index-based as opposed to a pointer-based implementation, especially using contiguous storage for the current destinations of the pointers in the *metaheap*, will very likely exhibit substantially fewer cache misses, and thus proportionally correspond to lower constant factors in the running time characteristic. Thus, it is conceivable that interesting or other useful applications do exist for which this heap system shows great or potentially optimal utility with respect to other heap data structures in certain domains of interest.

Finally, with respect to future work on the Logarithmic Funnel, establishment of the actual running time of `increase` is an outstanding challenge. It is considered interesting to elucidate the concurrency potential of the data structure, as well as the exploration of avenues to create an approximately correct heap system albeit with strict error guarantees in turn for significantly increased speed on a *typical* sequence of operations.

References

- [1] Michael A. Gibson, Jehoshua Bruck. Efficient Exact Stochastic Simulation of Chemical Systems with Many Species and Many Channels, *J PHYS CHEM A*, 104 (9), pp 1876–1889, 2000
- [2] Anurag Ajay, Maria Bauza, Jiajun Wu, Nima Fazeli, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, Alberto Rodriguez, Leslie P. Kaelbling. Combining Physical Simulators and Object-Based Networks for Control, 2019 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA), pp 3217–3223, 2019
- [3] Jianrong Hou, Xiaofeng Zhao. Using a priority queuing approach to improve emergency department performance, *Journal of Management Analytics*, 7 (1), pp 28 – 43, 2020
- [4] C. Laksmi, A.I. Sivakumar. Application of queueing theory in health care: A literature review, *Operations Research for Health Care*, 2 (1-2), pp 25–39, 2013
- [5] Daniel H. Larkin, Siddhartha Sen, Robert E. Tarjan. A Back-To-Basics Empirical Study of Priority Queues, *Proceedings of the Meeting on Algorithm Engineering & Experiments*, pp 61–72, 2014
- [6] Gerth Stølting Brodal. A Survey on Priority Queues, in *Space-Efficient Data Structures, Streams, and Algorithms*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol 8066, pp 150-163, 2013
- [7] Williams, J.W.J. Algorithm 232: Heapsort, *Commun. ACM*, 7 (6), 347–348, 1964
- [8] van Emde Boas, P., Kaas, R., Zijlstra, E. Design and implementation of an efficient priority queue, *Math. Systems Theory*, Vol 10 (1), pp 99–127, 1976
- [9] M. L. Fredman, R. Sedgwick, D. D. Sleator, and R. E. Tarjan. The pairing heap: A new form of self-adjusting heap. *Algorithmica*, 1, pp 111–129, 1986
- [10] M. L. Fredman and R. E. Tarjan. Fibonacci heaps and their uses in improved network optimization algorithms. *J. ACM*, 34, pp 596–615, 1987
- [11] G. S. Brodal. Worst-case efficient priority queues. in *Proceedings of the Seventh ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pp 52–58, 1996
- [12] Bernhard Haeupler, Siddhartha Sen, Robert E. Tarjan. Rank-Pairing Heaps, *SIAM J. Comput.*, 40 (6), pp 1463–1485, 2011
- [13] Boris V. Cherkassky, Andrew V. Goldberg, Tomasz Radzik. Shortest Paths Algorithms: Theory and Experimental Evaluation, *Mathematical Programming*, 73 (2), pp 129–174, 1996
- [14] Boris V. Cherkassky, Andrew V. Goldberg, Craig Silverstein. Buckets, Heaps, Lists, and Monotone Priority Queues, *SIAM J. Comput.*, 28 (4), pp 1326–1346, 1999
- [15] Rajeev Raman. Fast Algorithms for Shortest Paths and Sorting, Technical Report TR 96-06, King’s College, London, 1996
- [16] Mikkel Thorup. On RAM Priority Queues, *SIAM J. Comput.*, 30 (1), 86–109., 2000
- [17] Mankowitz, D.J., Michi, A., Zhernov, A. et al. Faster sorting algorithms discovered using deep reinforcement learning. *Nature* 618, 257–263, 2023.
- [18] Gelmi, M., Introduce branchless sorting functions for sort3, sort4 and sort5. LLVM.org, <https://reviews.llvm.org/D118029>, 2022.
- [19] Iterated logarithm. (2023, January 28). Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iterated_logarithm