

# **Dynamic Space Efficient Hash Tables**

Tobias Maier, Peter Sanders



### **Peter Sanders**



**General:** Algorithm engineering, basic algorithmic toolbox, graphs, parallel algorithms, big data, randomized algorithms

### Hashing Related Previous Work up to 2017

- *d*-ary cuckoo hashing
  Fotakis, Pagh, S, Spirakis 03
- analysis of 2-way bucket cuckoo hashing
- fast construction for the above
- cache-, hash-, and space-efficient Bloom filters Putze, S, Singler 07
- perfect hashing applied to model checking Edelkamp, S, Simecek 08
- fast retrieval and perfect hashing using fingerprinting S, Zhou,[...] 14
- hashing vs sorting for aggregation in column-based DB with SAP 15
- concurrent hash tables
- space efficient dynamic hash tables

S, Egner, Korst 00

Cain, S, Wormald 07

Maier, S. Dementiev 16





- the problem and why standard solutions do not work
- simple solutions
- DySECT Dynamic Space Efficient Cuckoo Table
- ESA 2017 and Algorithmica 2019 (with Stefan Walzer)

### What we want

- constant amortized time insert, find, erase
- space close to lower bound (just the elements) load factor  $\delta = \frac{1}{1+\epsilon}$  for small  $\epsilon$
- good constant factors

### nice to have

- worst case constant time find
- whp constant time insert





# Hashing with Chaining?



- + grows dynamically and "smoothly"
- overhead for pointers
- eventually needs to grow basic table



- + can in principle be arbitrarily full
- + no overhead for pointers etc.

Linear Probing?

- + cache efficient
- reallocate when full
   ⇒temporarily at least doubles space
   consumption
   (during the migration)
- slow insert, erase and unsuccessful find when near full





# **Engineering Linear Probing**



 $(1 + \varepsilon)^2$ 

# Modulo Operations • mapping (hash value $\rightarrow$ table index) usual: idx(k) = hash(k) % capfor cap = $2^k$ : idx(k) = hash(k) & (cap-1)• circular vs. non-circular Mapping by Scaling

new: idx(k) = hash(k) \*

different for circular tables





- Recompute alternative cells using additional hash functions.
- Do this until you find a free cell
- + shorter search distances
- disadvantages similar to linear probing
- less cache efficient





- Recompute alternative cells using additional hash functions.
- Do this until you find a free cell
- + shorter search distances
- disadvantages similar to linear probing
- less cache efficient





- Recompute alternative cells using additional hash functions.
- Do this until you find a free cell
- + shorter search distances
- disadvantages similar to linear probing
- less cache efficient





- Recompute alternative cells using additional hash functions.
- Do this until you find a free cell
- + shorter search distances
- disadvantages similar to linear probing
- less cache efficient



- Similar to rehashing
- Move items to reduce hash functions





- Similar to rehashing
- Move items to reduce hash functions





- Similar to rehashing
- Move items to reduce hash functions





- Similar to rehashing
- Move items to reduce hash functions





- Similar to rehashing
- Move items to reduce hash functions





### 8 Tobias Maier, Peter Sanders: Dynamic Space Efficient Hash Tables

- Similar to rehashing
- Move items to reduce hash functions





### H-ary Bucket Cuckoo Hashing



### based on Pagh Rodler 01, Fotakis Pagh S Spirakis 03, Dietzfelbinger Weidling 05

- H hash functions address H buckets
- buckets can store B elements each
- insert can move elements around (BFS or random walk)



### H-ary Bucket Cuckoo Hashing



### based on Pagh Rodler 01, Fotakis Pagh S Spirakis 03, Dietzfelbinger Weidling 05

- H hash functions address H buckets
- buckets can store B elements each
- insert can move elements around (BFS or random walk)



### H-ary Bucket Cuckoo Hashing

- + highly space efficient even for H = 2, B = 4
- + worst case constant find, erase
- + empirically  $\approx 1/\epsilon$  average insertion time when not too close to capacity limit
- reallocate when full





### Folklore (?): The Subtable Trick



most significant bits of hash address one of *T* subtables

- + reallocation space overhead affects only a single subtable
- + low overhead for small T when upper level fits into cache
- + works for linear probing and cuckoo
- frequent reallocations lead to expensive insertions
- worst case insertion time determined by subtable reallocation
- danger of memory fragmentation with many different subtable sizes (past and present)



# Mitigation: Cache Efficient Reallocation



- interpret bits of hash functions as number in [0, 1)
- scale to actual table size by multiplication
- reallocation "essentially" becomes a sweep through memory







# DySECT



- inherits most advantages from ordinary cuckoo worst case constant find/erase, space efficiency (?), fast insert
- elements are migrated rarely ~> fast insert
- subtable sizes are powers of two ~> no fragmentation
- reallocation in small increments for large T → constant insertion time whp when T = Ω(n)



### **Dynamic Insertion Time**







### **Successful Find**





### **Unsuccessful Find**









### Summary



- first (?) "truly" space efficient dynamic hash tables
- subtables help (once more)
- scaling allows cache-efficient reallocation
- virtual memory overallocation helps (but not needed for DySECT)
- DySECT allows fast and non-amortized insertion

