# 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 (= 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  $\mid U \mid$  entries is too big
  - And most of its entries would be Nones
- Use a *hash* function
  - $h: U \longrightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$
  - 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 value<sub>4</sub>  $k_4$  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}}$ 2 h 3 h value<sub>1</sub> k<sub>1</sub> -4⊳ ⊳ 5 Actual keys value<sub>3</sub> k<sub>3</sub> 6 ⊳ h 7  $k_2$  $k_5$ k<sub>1</sub> 8 9  $k_4$ 10 k<sub>3</sub> h value<sub>2</sub>  $k_2$ 11 12 13 h 14 15 value<sub>5</sub>  $k_5$ ⊳

- 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
     *m* slots
  - 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

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

- 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  $n_0 + n_1 + \dots + n_{m-2} + n_{m-1} = n$
- 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  $\alpha$  can be zero.)

• Successful search:

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

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

$$\frac{\frac{n_0+1}{2} + \frac{n_1+1}{2} + \dots \frac{n_{m-2+1}}{2} + \frac{n_{m-1}+1}{2}}{m}$$

$$= \frac{n_0 + n_1 + \dots + n_{m-2} + n_{m-1} + m}{2m}$$

$$= \frac{n+m}{2m} = \frac{1}{2}\alpha + 1 = \Theta(1+\alpha)$$

- 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  $\frac{1}{m}$
    - 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  $k_0, k_1, \ldots, k_{i-1}$ 
    - But only if they are inserted into the same slot
      - which happens with probability  $\frac{1}{m}$
  - Therefore:
    - Search for record i looks at -i records plus itself

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

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

- 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:
    - $h(k) = \lfloor k \cdot m \rfloor$

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



- 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 l bits
  - Multiply: *ks*, a 2/ bit value
  - Select hash as upper bits of the lower half



• How to select *s*:

• D. Knuth proposes to use the first / bits of  $\frac{\sqrt{5}-1}{2}$ 

 $\bullet$ 

- 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.sqrt(5)-1)/2 * 2**32)
def hash(x):
    return (s*x >> 18) & 0x3fff
```

- 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'.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(key):
    - 1 access
  - With probability α, that slot is occupied and we need to go to the next one:
    - $1 + \alpha$  accesses
    - With probability  $\alpha$ , that next one is occupied too, with total probability  $\alpha^2$ :
      - $1 + \alpha + \alpha^2$  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:

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

- 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* 
    - $h(c), h(c) + 1 \cdot h_2(c), h(c) + 2 \cdot h_2(c), h(c) + 3 \cdot h_2(c), \dots$

- Quadratic probing:
  - Use a probe sequence
    - $h(c), h(c) + 1^2, h(c) + 2^2, h(c) + 3^2, h(c) + 4^2, \dots$ 
      - 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