Optimal BST *vs* Huffman

The Optimal BST (Binary Search Tree) and Huffman Codes have many similarities which makes it all the more important to understand the vital differences. Note that the Huffman Code *is* an Optimal Prefix Code, so the remarks for Huffman Code apply to Prefix Code.

`Similarities`

1. Both have an alphabet Ω of symbols and the English alphabet $\Omega = \{a, \ldots, z\}$ provides an easy example.

2. For both each letter α is given a frequency $p(\alpha)$. (p, probability, and f, frequency are used interchangibly.) We generally assume $\sum_\alpha p(\alpha) = 1$, though this is only a technical convenience.

3. For both a binary tree T is created.

4. For both one wants that T which minimizes

$$\sum_{\alpha \in \Omega} p(\alpha) d(\alpha) \tag{1}$$

   where $d(\alpha)$ is the depth of α in the tree – meaning the distance from the root.

`Differences`

1. For the BST the letters of Ω are *ordered* and the labelling must have the property that all nodes in the left subtree (right subtree) of a node must occur before (after) that node in the ordering. For the Huffman code Ω is not ordered.

2. For the BST all nodes of T (both interior and leaf, including the root) receive a label $\alpha \in \Omega$. In the Huffman code the *leaves* of T receive labesl $\alpha \in \Omega$.

`Implementation` Both BST and Huffman codes have ingenious implementation that uses many of our techniques, but they are very different implementations.

`Application`

1. The Optimal BST allows for quick lookup of the average letter, where "average" is in terms of the given probabilities. We may consider the time to find α as $d(\alpha)$ and so (1) gives the average time.

2. The Huffman Code allows for data compression. A text in which each letter α appears with probability $d(\alpha)$ will become a string of binary bits. Summation (1) gives the average number of bits used per letter.

Don't confuse them!