Hashing

Thomas Schwarz, SJ

Dictionary

- ADS for key-value pairs
	- CRUD operations:
		- Create
		- Read
		- Update
		- Delete
	- Does not assume nor support ordering of keys

Dictionary

- Example:
	- A compiler takes a variable name $(= \text{key})$
	- and associates various data such as type etc. (value)

- If the key space is small
	- Use Direct Addressing
		- Array for all possible key values with pointers to values
		- Null-pointers (None) if key not in the dictionary

Direct Mapping Array

Associated Values

- Direct addressing:
	- Number of actual keys needs to be close to the number of possible keys
	- Keys need to be convertible to indices

- Direct addressing:
	- Number of actual keys needs to be close to the number of possible keys
	- Keys need to be convertible to indices

- Variants: The value can be stored directly in the array
	- E.g.: When the value has fixed length

- If the universe U of keys is large
	- Table with $|U|$ entries is too big
	- And most of its entries would be Nones
- Use a *hash* function
	- $h: U \longrightarrow \{0,1,...,m-1\}$
	- with few *collisions*
		- A collision are two elements of U that map to the same number
		- $u_1, u_2 \in U, u_1 \neq u_2, h(u_1) = h(u_2)$

Hash Table

0 Universe of Keys k_4 value₄ $1\overline{\nu}$ 2 h 3 h k_1 value₁ 4 ⊳l 5 Actual keys k_3 value₃ 65 ⊳ h 7 $k₂$ k_5 $k₁$ 8 9 k_4 10 k_3 h k_2 value₂ $\overline{11}$ 12 13 h14 $\overrightarrow{15}$ k_5 value₅ ⊳l

- Collisions happen and they must be resolved
	- Chaining:
		- create a linked list of key-value pairs

- Bucketing
	- A linked list is not necessarily the best way to store key-value pairs
	- If the hash table is large, the data will be stored in the pages of a storage system
	- Can have buckets with a given maximum capacity
		- However, we might need to have overflow buckets

- A potential design for buckets:
	- Each bucket has a next pointer to an overflow area
	- And in this case a fixed capacity to store key-value pairs

• Here: a full bucket with one overflow record

- Vocabulary:
	- A hash table T has slots *m*
	- with *n* records.
	- Its load factor is $\alpha = n/m$.

- Worst performance:
	- The hash function maps all record keys to the same slot
	- Finding a key-value pair then takes
		- n accesses to a key-value pair if the record is not there
		- On average $(n + 1)/2$ accesses if the record is there
			- because

$$
(1 + 2 + \dots + n)/n = \frac{(n+1)n}{2n} = \frac{n+1}{2}
$$

- Why would this happen:
	- The hash function is bad
		- This happens if people make up their own hash functions
	- The data is cooked
		- "Adversary model": Evaluate algorithms and ADS by finding the worst possible instance of data
		- Someone controls the input and is attacking your system
	- Bad luck
		- Murphy's law: If something bad can happen, it will happen eventually

- Average performance analysis:
	- Assume that a hash function is equally likely to send a record to a certain slot
	- This can be *de facto* guaranteed with cryptographically secure hash functions (see below)

- Call n_i the number of records (= key-value pairs) that are hashed to slot $i \ (i \in \{0,1,...,n-1\})$
- Then $n_0 + n_1 + ... n_{m-2} + n_{m-1} = n$
- Expected number of records accessed for an **unsuccessful search**:
	- Equal to the length of the chain, i.e. to n_i

• On average:
$$
\frac{n_0 + n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_{m-2} + n_{m-1}}{m} = \frac{n}{m} = \alpha
$$

- Total expected work: Need to calculate the hash function etc.
	- $\Theta(1 + \alpha)$ (the one because α can be zero.)

• Successful search:

• In a list of *r* records, we access on average
$$
\frac{r+1}{2}
$$
 records

- If each record **were** in a random slot:
	- Average number of records accessed during a successful search is therefore

$$
\frac{\frac{n_0+1}{2} + \frac{n_1+1}{2} + \dots + \frac{n_{m-2+1}}{2}}{m}
$$
\n
$$
\bullet = \frac{n_0 + n_1 + \dots + n_{m-2} + n_{m-1} + m}{2m}
$$
\n
$$
\bullet = \frac{n+m}{2m} = \frac{1}{2}\alpha + 1 = \Theta(1+\alpha)
$$

- Successful search:
	- But records are more likely to be in full slots
	- Therefore, this analysis is **false**
		- Probability that two keys are in the same slot is 1 *m*
		- A search for a record visits exactly those records that:
			- Are in the same slot
			- And have been inserted before

- Order all records $[k_0, v_0], [k_1, v_1], ..., [k_{n-1}, v_{n-1}]$ by insertion
	- Then search for k_i touches all records with $k_0, k_1, ..., k_{i-1}$
		- But only if they are inserted into the same slot
			- which happens with probability 1 *m*
	- Therefore:
		- Search for record *i* looks at $\frac{1}{m}$ records plus itself *i*

- Search for record *i* looks at $\frac{1}{m}$ records plus itself *i m*
- On average:

$$
\frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{i}{m} + 1 \right)
$$
\n
$$
= 1 + \frac{1}{nm} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} i
$$
\n
$$
= 1 + \frac{n(n-1)}{2nm}
$$
\n
$$
= 1 + \frac{n}{2m} - \frac{1}{2nm} = 1 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha - \frac{1}{2nm}
$$

- A good hash function:
	- each key is equally likely to hash to any of the *m* slots
	- independently where any other keys are hashed to
- Usually cannot be ascertained:
	- We do not know enough about the distribution of keys

- Example:
	- Assume that keys are random number between 0 and 1
	- Good hash function is:
		- $h(k) = |k \cdot m|$

import random

 $m=5$

def hash(u): return int(u*m)

- Interpreting keys as natural numbers
	- Many hash functions work on natural numbers
	- Need to translate to integers:
		- Example:
			- For strings:
				- convert encoding to numerical representation

```
def str to int(astring):
 result = 0 for letter in astring:
     result = ord(letter) + 256*result return result
```
• Example

def str_to_int(astring): result = 0 for letter in astring: result = ord(letter) + 256*result return result

- Caution:
	- The transformation and the hash function combination can have weird effects
		- E.g. A string obtained by swapping to letters might have the same hash
			- Which could be useful or could be very bad

- Simple hash functions:
	- Division method:
		- Convert keys to integers
		- Then hash to the integer obtained as remainder by division with *m*

```
def hash(key):
return key_2_int(key)%m
```
- Division method:
	- If m is a power of 2:
		- Hash is the last bits
			- Which is usually bad
	- If $m = 2^p 1$ and keys are strings:
		- swapping two letters does not change the hash value
	- Better experience:
		- Primes close to a power of 2

- **Multiplication Method:**
	- Key k is a l bit value
	- Use a constant *s* of size / bits
	- Multiply: ks , a 2*l* bit value
	- Select hash as upper bits of the lower half

• How to select s:

•

• D. Knuth proposes to use the first *l* bits of $5 - 1$ 2

- Example:
	- 32-bit keys
	- $s = \lfloor (\sqrt{5} 1)/2 \rfloor$
	- Extract 14 bits:
		- Shift right by $18 (14+18 = 32)$
		- Then mask with 14 ones: $b11 1111 1111 1111 =$ 0x3fff

```
s = int((math,sqrth.sqrt(5)-1)/2 * 2**32)def hash(x):
 return (s*x \gg 18) & 0x3fft
```
- Cryptographically secure hash functions:
	- Hash functions have applications in security
		- Instead of storing a password, store the hash of a password together with the user name
			- "user_name", h(pass_word)
		- When user enters the password:
			- System calculates the hash of the entered password
			- And compares with the hash

- Cryptographically secure hash functions:
	- Generate long hashes (224 512 bits)
	- If an attacker steals the user database:
		- Attacker has only the hash, but not the password
- Cryptographically secure hash function h :
	- Impossible to calculate x from $h(x)$

- This is why you should not choose words in a language as password: "peaches"
	- Attacker can try out
		- All words in English (~200,000),
		- All words in Hindi ShabdSagar (~93,000 250,000)

- Secure hash functions are the result of competitions and public scrutiny
	- Provide pre-image resistance:
		- Impossible to find x from $h(x)$
	- Provide collision resistance:
		- Impossible to find x and y such that $h(x) = h(y)$
	- Certified by NIST and similar institutions
		- SHA-3 (NIST)
		- Blake3 (latest considered to be safe)

- Should you use cryptographically secure hash functions?
	- If your data cannot be generated by an adversary
	- If you can live with small inadequacies
		- Not necessary
- Otherwise:
	- Extract as many bits as needed from a cryptographically secure hash function
	- Pay the performance costs

- Idea: Records (= key-value pair) are stored in the hash table itself
	- Collisions are resolved by storing a record elsewhere

- Linear probing:
	- If a slot is occupied, go to the next slot

- Linear Probing Example:
	- 16 slots
	- Hash function %16

- Linear Probing Example:
	- 16 slots
	- Hash function %16
	- Insert 100
	- 100% 16 = 4
		- Insert into slot 4

- Insert 85
- $85\%16 = 5$
- Insert into slot 5

- Insert 120
	- $120\%16 = 8$

- Insert 200
	- $200\%16 = 8$
	- But slot 8 is occupied
	- Put into slot 9

- Insert 255
	- $255\%16 = 15$

- Insert 20
	- $20\%16 = 4$
	- Try slot 4
	- Then slot 5
	- Then insert into slot 6

• Linear probing implementation

```
class Hashtable:
  def __init__(self, slots):
     self.array = [None]*slots self.hash = lambda x : x%slots
```
• Linear probing implementation

```
class Hashtable:
def repr (self):
     retVal = " for i in range(len(self.array)):
         retVal += '{} ; \{\}\n\in' . format(i, self.array[i])
      return retVal
```
• Linear probing implementation

```
class Hashtable:
 def insert(self, key, value):
     slot = self.hash(key) while True:
          if self.array[slot]:
              slot = (slot+1). len(self.array)
          else:
              self.array[slot] = (key, value) return
```
- Notice that the next slot can wrap around
	- Need to reset it to zero then

```
class Hashtable:
 def insert(self, key, value):
     slot = self.hash(key) while True:
           if self.array[slot]:
               slot = (slot+1).len(self.array)
          else:
              self.array[slot] = (key, value) return
```
- Linear probing: Reading
	- We need to follow the same sequence of slots

```
def read(self, key):
     slot = self.hash(key) while True:
           if not self.array[slot]:
               return None
           else:
               if key == self.array[slot][0]:
                   return self.array[slot][1]
               else:
                   slot = (slot+1) %len(self.array)
```
- This code contains an unspoken assumption:
	- There is a free slot:
		- Otherwise, we will loop forever!

```
def read(self, key):
     slot = self.hash(key) while True:
           if not self.array[slot]:
               return None
           else:
               if key == self.array[slot][0]:
                   return self.array[slot][1]
               else:
                   slot = (slot+1) %len(self.array)
```
• E.g. use a for loop

```
def read(self, key):
     slot = self.hash(key) for i in range(len(self.array)):
           if not self.array[slot]:
               return None
           else:
               if key == self.array[slot][0]:
                   return self.array[slot][1]
               else:
                  slot = (slot+1) %len(self.array)
```
- This type of unspoken assumption can destroy your application
	- A bug that only happens under very specific circumstances
	- Address this by
		- limiting the loop to at most *m* iterations

- Intuitive Analysis for failed search with probing
	- We go to the slot $h(\mathsf{key})$:
		- 1 access
	- With probability α , that slot is occupied and we need to go to the next one:
		- $1 + \alpha$ accesses
		- With probability α , that next one is occupied too, with total probability α^2 :
			- 1 + α + α^2 accesses

- Intuitive Analysis for failed search with probing
	- In total: $1 + \alpha + \alpha^2 + \alpha^3 + \dots$ accesses

$$
\bullet = \frac{1}{1-\alpha}
$$

- E.g.: $\alpha = 0.5$: two slots accessed
- E.g.: $\alpha = 0.9$: ten slots accessed

• Expected number in a successful search:

$$
\bullet \ \frac{1}{\alpha} \log_e(\frac{1}{1-\alpha})
$$

- E.g.: $\alpha = 0.5$: 1.387 slots accessed
- E.g.: $\alpha = 0.9$: 2.559 slots accessed

- Probe sequence
	- Linear probing for key c :
		- $h(c)$, $h(c) + 1$, $h(c) + 2$,...
	- Can lead to conveying / **primary clustering**:
		- Contiguous areas of slots
- Use a **secondary** hash function h_2
	- Should have a range co-prime to the number of slots
	- Linear probing with secondary hash function for key *c*
		- $h(c)$, $h(c) + 1 \cdot h_2(c)$, $h(c) + 2 \cdot h_2(c)$, $h(c) + 3 \cdot h_2(c)$, …

- Quadratic probing:
	- Use a probe sequence
		- $h(c)$, $h(c) + 1^2$, $h(c) + 2^2$, $h(c) + 3^2$, $h(c) + 4^2$, ...
			- wrapping around 0, i.e. modulo *m*

- In practice:
	- Linear probing can still be faster because cache loads transfer contiguous sets of memory

Hashing

- Hash schemes work extremely well:
	- If load factor can be estimated
- If size of the hash table needs to grow dynamically, things are no longer so easy
	- Extendible hashing
	- Linear hashing