

COP 3502: 11/12/21

Hash Tables

- inserts
 - deletes
 - searches
- } faster $O(\lg n)$

~~A~~ Goal: Average case $O(1)$ for each
not worry too much about worst case.
(Impossible to make an input force worst case.)

Hash function

Input: Anything (arbitrary string)

Output: fixed integer in some range

0 to $n-1$, for some given n .

many-to-one (multiple inputs may map to the same output.)

Properties of a good hash function

- 1) each output value is equally likely.
- 2) Given some output value it should be difficult to construct an input that "creates" that value. [Given y , it's hard to find x s.t. $f(x) = y$.]
- 3) If we make small changes to x , then (say x and x'), there should many changes btw $f(x)$ and $f(x')$.

How to create a hash table w/a hash function?

Array of size n 1. Insert ("cat")

0	dog
1	elephant
2	
3	
4	cat
	⋮
$n-1$	

Calculate $f(\text{"cat"}) = 4$

2. Place cat in index 4.

$f(\text{"elephant"}) = 1$

$f(\text{"dog"}) = 0$

Problem?

What if $f(\text{"giraffe"}) = 4$ but cat's already there?

COLLISION

4 methods of dealing w/ collisions

1) Overwrite data, lose the old data.

- ADVANTAGE (EASY)

- DISADVANTAGE (LOSE STUFF)

2) Linear Probing

if a slot, k , is full when you try to insert go to slot $(k+1) \% n$ and see if it's empty. Continue until you find the first empty slot.

- ADVANTAGE (DON'T LOSE STUFF)

- DISADVANTAGE (FINDING ISN'T AS FAST)

When looking for my giraffe, I can't stop looking after index 4 until I find an empty slot, so ~~they~~ this could slow me down a lot.

- Clustering

As there are more collisions, the probability of hitting a cluster increases and linear probing ensures those clusters will grow, if hit.

3) When looking for new places go to these indexes:

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} k \\ (k+1) \bmod p \\ (k+4) \bmod p \\ (k+9) \bmod p \\ (k+16) \bmod p \\ \vdots \\ (k+i^2) \bmod p \\ \vdots \\ (k+(\frac{p-1}{2})^2) \bmod p \end{array} \right]$$

Quadratic Probing

(a) table size prime

(b) less than half full

Prove each # of this list is unique.

Assume the opposite that

$$k+i^2 \equiv k+j^2 \pmod{p} \Rightarrow (i \neq j, 0 < i, j < \frac{p}{2})$$

$$i^2 - j^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$$

$$(i-j)(i+j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$$

$$\Rightarrow p \mid [(i-j)(i+j)]$$

Since $p \in \text{Prime}$, $p \mid (i-j)$ or $p \mid (i+j)$

FALSE

because $i \neq j, p \nmid |i-j| < \frac{p}{2}$

FALSE

$0 < i+j < p$

For both linear + quadratic probing, double table size when it gets half full

4) Separate Chaining Hashing

At each index have a linked list



$$f(\text{cat}) = 4$$

$$f(\text{dog}) = 0$$

$$f(\text{elephant}) = 1$$

$$f(\text{giraffe}) = 4$$

Idea is runtimes are ~~probability~~ based on the probability of searching in each slot. Longer ~~then~~ lists $\Rightarrow$ worse run times.

Why would someone use Quadratic Probing over this? (Index math in an array is faster than mallocing + ~~too~~ following links in lists.)

Hash Functions

$f(\text{"cat"}) = ('c' + 'a' + 't') \% n$ bad, many values map to the same spot + for most words sum of ascii values clusters in the 200-1500 range.

Improvement $f(\text{"cat"}) = ('c' \times 128^2 + 'a' \times 128 + 't' \times 128^0) \% n$
writing a string in some "base"

$$p(\text{search List}) = \frac{\# \text{ words in list}}{\text{Total Words}}$$

$$\text{Avg Run Time (List)} = \frac{\text{list len} + 1}{2}$$

$$\sum_{\text{lists}} \frac{\# \text{ word is list}}{\text{TW}} \times \frac{(\text{list len} + 1)}{2}$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{100} \text{freq}[i] \times i \times (i+1) / 2$$

ans for each list of length i

num lists length i

TW