

## Hashing: Lecture II

### Predicting Record Distribution

Throughout this section we assume a random distribution for the hash function.

Let

$N$  = number of available addresses, and  
 $r$  = number of records to be stored.

Let  $p(x)$  be the probability that a given address will have  $x$  records assigned to it.

It can be shown that

$$p(x) = \frac{r!}{(r-x)!x!} \left[1 - \frac{1}{N}\right]^{r-x} \left[\frac{1}{N}\right]^x$$

and for  $N$  and  $r$  large this can be approximated by :

$$p(x) \sim \frac{(r/N)^x e^{-(r/N)}}{x!}$$

Example :  $N = 1,000$   $r = 1,000$

$$p(0) \sim \frac{1^0 e^{-1}}{0!} = 0.368$$

$$p(1) \sim \frac{1^1 e^{-1}}{1!} = 0.368$$

$$p(2) \sim \frac{1^2 e^{-1}}{2!} = 0.184$$

$$p(3) \sim \frac{1^3 e^{-1}}{3!} = 0.061$$

For  $N$  addresses the expected number of addresses with  $x$  records is  $N \cdot p(x)$ .

So in the example above about:

- 368 addresses have no records assigned to it
- 368 addresses have 1 records assigned to it
- 184 addresses have 2 records assigned to it
- 61 addresses have 3 records assigned to it

## Reducing Collision by Increasing the Number of Available Addresses

packing density =  $r/N$

500 records to be spread over 1000 addresses result in packing density =  $500/1000 = 0.5 = 50\%$ .

Some questions :

1. How many addresses go unused ? *More precisely: What is the **expected** number of addresses with no key mapped to it?*

$$N \cdot p(0) = 1000 \cdot 0.607 = 607$$

2. How many addresses have no synonyms ? *More precisely: What is the expected number of address with only one key mapped to it?*

$$N \cdot p(1) = 1000 \cdot 0.303 = 303$$

3. How many addresses contain 2 or more synonyms ? *More precisely: What is the expected number of addresses with two or more keys mapped to it ?*

$$N \cdot (p(2) + p(3) + \dots) = N \cdot (1 - (p(0) + p(1))) = 1000 \cdot 0.09 = 90$$

4. Assuming that only one record can be assigned to an address, how many overflow records are expected ?

$$1 \cdot N \cdot p(2) + 2 \cdot N \cdot p(3) + 3 \cdot N \cdot p(4) + \dots = N \cdot [p(2) + 2 \cdot p(3) + 3 \cdot p(4) + \dots] \sim 107.$$

The justification for the above formula is that there is going to be  $(i-1)$  overflow records for all the table positions that have  $i$  records mapped to it, which are expected to be as many as  $N \cdot p(i)$ .

Now, there is a simpler formula derived by students of Section B of the course (the solution below is due to Tanya Scheffler and Pat Wisking):

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{expected \# of overflow records} = \\ & = (\text{total \# of records}) - (\text{expected \# of nonoverflow records}) \\ & = r - (N \cdot p(1) + N \cdot p(2) + N \cdot p(3) + \dots) \\ & = r - N \cdot (1 - p(0)) \quad (\text{since probabilities add up to 1}) \\ & = N \cdot p(0) - (N - r) \\ & = (\text{expected \# of empty positions for random hash function}) \\ & \quad - (\text{\# of empty positions for perfect hash function}) \end{aligned}$$

Using this formula we get the same result as before:

$$N \cdot p(0) - (N - r) = 607 - 500 = 107$$

5. What is the expected percentage of overflow records ?

$$107/500 = 0.214 = 21.4\%$$

Note that using either formula, the percentage of overflow records depend only on the packing density ( $PD = r/N$ ), and not on the individual values of  $N$  or  $r$ .

Indeed, using the formulas derived in 4., we get that the percentage of overflow records is:

$$\frac{r - N \cdot (1 - p(0))}{r} = 1 - \frac{1}{PD} \cdot (1 - p(0))$$

and the Poisson function that approximate  $p(0)$  is a function of  $r/N$  which is equal to  $PD$  (for hashing without buckets).

So, hashing with packing density  $PD = 50\%$  always yield 21% of records stored outside their home addresses.

For this reason, we can compute the expected percentage of overflow records, given the packing density. This is shown in the following table:

packing density %	number of records away from home %
10%	4.8%
20%	9.4%
30%	13.6%
40%	17.6%
50%	21.4%
60%	24.8%
70%	28.1%
80%	31.2%
90%	34.1%
100%	36.8%

## Collision Resolution by Progressive Overflow/Linear Probing

Progressive overflow/linear probing works as follows :

### Insertion of key k:

- Go to the home address of k :  $h(k)$
- If free, place the key there
- If busy, try the next position until an empty position is found  
(the 'next' position for the last position is position 0, i.e. wrap around)

### Example :

key - k	Home address - $h(k)$
COLE	20
BATES	21
ADAMS	21
DEAN	22
EVANS	20

Table size = 23.

After inserting previous keys :

0	DEAN
1	EVANS
⋮	⋮
19	
20	COLE
21	BATES
22	ADAMS

**Searching for key k:**

- Go to the home address of k :  $h(k)$
- If k is in home address, we are done.
- Otherwise try the next position until: key is found or empty space is found or home address is reached (in the last 2 cases, the key is not found)

Ex :

A search for 'EVANS' probes places : 20, 21, 22, 0, 1, finding the record at position 1.

Search for 'MOURA', if  $h(\text{MOURA})=22$ , probes places 22, 0, 1, 2 where it concludes 'MOURA' is not in the table.

Search for 'SMITH', if  $h(\text{SMITH})=19$ , probes 19, and concludes 'SMITH' is not in the table.

**Advantage :** Simplicity

**Disadvantage :** If there are lots of collisions, clusters of records can form, as in the previous example.

### Search length

- Number of accesses required to retrieve a record.

average search length = (sum of search lengths)/(numb.of records)

In the previous example :

key	Search Length
COLE	1
BATES	1
ADAMS	2
DEAN	2
EVANS	5

Average search length =  $(1+1+2+2+5)/5 = 2.2$ .

Refer to figure 11.7 in page 489. It shows that a packing density up to 60% gives an average search length of 2 probes, but higher packing densities make search length to increase rapidly.