Problem Set 2

Problem 2-1. [20 points] Hash functions and load

(a) [3 points] Imagine that an algorithm requires us to hash strings containing English phrases. Knowing that strings are stored as sequences of characters, Alyssa P. Hacker decides to simply use the sum of those character values (modulo the size of her hash table) as the string's hash.

Will the performance of her implementation match the expected value shown in lecture? Argue that it will or provide a compelling reason why it will not (and propose a solution).

(b) [3 points] Imagine that we plan to hash the addresses of small, in-memory data structures. After much optimization (and reading over Alyssa's shoulder), Ben Bitdiddle manages to get this data struture to fit in 32 bytes (one cache line of the computer she's using). He then writes an algorithm that allocates a contiguous block of memory containing many of these data structures and inserts some of their addresses into a hash table whose size is some appropriate power of two.

Will the performance of his implementation match the expected value shown in lecture? Argue that it will or provide a compelling reason why it will not (and propose a solution).

- (c) [3 points] Ben then decides that he needs to hash unordered sets of plain integers. He gives implementing this a try, but something seems to be wrong. His code is given in setHash. Explain what the problem is and provide an implementation that is a valid hash function producing a plain integer. (You may not use any built-in Python hash functions in your solution.)
- (d) [5 points] The ability to quantitatively measure the performance of a hash function will be useful; we'd like to be able to validate our intuition regarding which hash functions are good and which ones are not.

In hasheval.py, you'll find a stub called hashEval. It takes a hash function, a "hash table size", and a collection of values and produce some statistics about what a hash table of the given size using the given function and storing the given values would look like.

A simple wrapper called printHashEval that pretty-prints your results is included. The six statistics that your implementation of hashEval should return are listed above the stub; they are (in order) the load factor, the proportion of nonempty slots, the number of values that collide with another value, the mean size of the nonempty slots, the median size of the nonempty slots, and the number of items in the most-filled slot.

You should also implement randInts, which generates a uniformly-distributed sequence of random integers that we can use to experiment with hashEval.

- (e) [3 points] A hash function is provided that is based on Python's own hashing scheme for integers (that is, the hash is the integer itself, modulo table size). Start with a table size of 8 and use hashEval to evaluate the provided hash function on a set of 4 values generated with randInt. Experiment with different table sizes and ratios of slots to values. Does this strategy seem to work well? What load factor, approximately, can you reliably achieve? Provide a few statistics to support your conclusion.
- (f) [3 points] As you've just seen in a practical setting, the simple uniform hashing assumption has two parts; it requires that a particular value have an equal chance of being placed in any slot (uniformity) and that the slot a particular value is placed in be unaffected by which slot any other value is placed in (independence). Briefly describe a situation in which each is violated but the other holds.

Problem 2-2. [25 points] Collision resolution and dynamic resizing

In this problem, we'll consider two very serious, real-world challenges that face hash table implementations: collision resolution and dynamic resizing. A simple hash table implementation called Footable is provided in footable.py. As provided, it cannot dynamically resize itself, and it will raise an exception if a collision occurs.

(The implementation of Footable uses a list internally, for which lookup is O(n). We're going to ignore this-that is, treat it as though it were O(1)-for the purposes of this problem; dictionaries are so central to the Python way of thinking that it's not otherwise possible to do what we want without using them!)

- (a) [2 points] If we have a collision resolution strategy, why do we need to consider dynamically resizing our hash table? It sounds like a lot of work, after all—both for us *and* for our computers!
- (b) [2 points] What about the other way around? If we're going to bother dynamically resizing our hash table, why do we need a collision resolution strategy? Why don't we just resize whenever a collision occurs?

- (c) [3 points] One simple method for resolving collisions is linear probing. Implement this strategy in a subclass named FootableLinear. Provide in a function named badLinear a test case demonstrating a situation in which this strategy is *not* good, and explain what undesirable behavior it produces and why.
- (d) [3 points] Another simple method for resolving collisions is chaining. Implement this strategy in a sublcass named FootableChaining.
- (e) [3 points] Implement quadratic probing in a subclass called FootableQuadratic.
- (f) [3 points] Implement double hashing in a subclass called FootableDouble.
- (g) [3 points] Compare and constrast, in terms of the problems that they can prevent and the problems that they can cause, the four strategies you've implemented. (Say two things about each method.)
- (h) [3 points] Now think about dynamically resizing your hash table. Provide a description of an algorithm that would turn a FooTable of size n into a FooTable of size n + m. What is the asymptotic time complexity of your algorithm?
- (i) [3 points] In lecture, we discussed doubling the size of our hash table. Ivy H. Crimson begins to implement this (that is, she lets m = n) but stops when it occurs to her that she might be able to avoid wasting half of the memory the table occupies on empty space by letting m = k instead, where k is some constant. Does this work? If so, why do you think we don't do it? There is a good theoretical reason as well as several additional practical concerns; a complete answer will touch on both points.

Problem 2-3. [15 points] Python dictionaries

As you should know by now (and you're probably in trouble if you don't), Python's dictionaries are hash tables. They're a handy data structure, and you should use them whenever appropriate—but they're also heavily used internally! For this reason, their performance is very important to Python's overall performance; a correspondingly large amount of work has been done on tuning their implementation.

- (a) [1 points] We're going to get started by checking out a file from Python's Subversion repository at svn.python.org. The Python project operates a web frontend to their version control system, so we'll be able to do this using a browser. Visit http://svn.python.org/projects/python/trunk/Objects/dictnotes.txt. These are actual notes prepared by contributors to the Python project, as they currently exist in the Python source tree. (Cool! Actually, this document is a fascinating read—and you should be able to understand most of it.) List the seven different use cases that have been identified in this document.
- (b) [2 points] Let's examine the "membership testing" use case. Describe in more detail how this scenario will use hash tables, and what the primary concerns of this use case will be (in terms of the hash table's behavior).

- (c) [3 points] If you were to pick a hash function, size, collision resolution strategy, and so forth (all of the characeristics of a hash table we've seen so far) in order to make a hash table perfectly suited to this use case alone, what would you choose? Why?
- (d) [3 points] Some use cases, such as the "global variables" use case, have requirements that conflict with these. Describe the requirements of this second use case and where the conflict emerges. Do you have any ideas about how these concerns might be balanced?
- (e) [3 points] Further into the document are a list of five "tunable parameters"-things that can be changed in the C source code to modify the behavior of the hash table implementation. Briefly describe how each of these five parameters lines up with the "tunables" we've seen on the theory side of things; or, if it doesn't, explain why the item is important practically but not relevant theoretically.
- (f) [3 points] How would you adjust each of these tunables to result in the best performance for the "membership testing" use case that you examined previously? Briefly describe and justify your choices (no more than a sentence per tunable).

Problem 2-4. [40 points] Matching DNA sequences

Ben Bitdiddle has recently moved into the Kendall Square area, which is full of biotechnology companies and their shiny, window-laden office buildings. While mocking their dorky lab coats makes him feel slightly better about himself, he is secretly jealous, and so he sets out to earn one of his very own. To pick up the necessary geek cred, he begins experimenting with DNA-matching technologies.

Ben would like to create mutants to do his bidding, and to get started, he'd like to know how closely related the creatures he's collected a number of samples from are. If two sequences contain mostly the same subsequences in mostly the same places, then they're likely closely related; if they don't, they probably aren't. (This is, of course, a gross oversimplification.)

For our purposes, we'll represent a DNA sequence as a string of characters. (These characters will all be upper-case. You can look at the Wikipedia page on nucleotides for a list of code characters and their meanings.) These sequences are very long, so comparing subsequences of them quickly is important. DNA also varies a little bit from individual to individual, so we'll need the ability to find inexact matches.

- (a) [1 points] In lecture, we mentioned something called a rolling hash. Describe what it is and what problem it solves. Why is it a better solution to that problem than a normal hash? Why might it be useful to Ben Bitdiddle in his quest for biotech riches?
- (b) [7 points] Propose and describe a rolling hash function that is appropriate to our situation, and then implement it in the RollingHash class in dnaseq.py.
- (c) [5 points] Now we'll work towards implementing getExactSubmatches, the nucleotide sequence comparison function described above. Let's start with subsequenceHashes,

which returns all k-length subsequences and their hashes (and perhaps other information, if there's anything else you might find useful).

Hint: There will likely be many of these; the DNA sequences are tens of millions of nucleotides long. To avoid keeping them all in memory at once, implement your function as a generator. See the Python reference materials available online for details if you aren't familiar with this important language construct.

- (d) [7 points] Another issue you'll encounter is that of hash collisions. From your work in problem 2, you should know several ways to resolve collisions (although a simple approach like chaining is probably a good place to start). Implement Multidict and verify that your work passes the simple sanity tests provided. You *may* use the Python dictionary in your implementation.
- (e) [5 points] Now it's time to implement getExactSubmatches. Ignore the parameter *m* for the time being; we'll get to that in a moment. Again, implementing this function as a generator is probably a good idea. (You will probably have many, many matches—think about the combinatorics of the situation briefly.) As a hint, consider that much of the work has already been done by Multidict, RollingHash, and subsequenceHashes. Your solution probably does not need to be very complex. We've provided a simple sanity test (that may stop working once you support *m*, depending on how you do so; don't worry about this). Your solution should be correct at this point (that is, able to run compareSequences) but it'll probably be too slow to be useful. You can try running it on the first portion of two inputs. The .fa files are just text files; you can use head to siphon a few tens of thousands of lines off into a different file if you'd like to see some results.
- (f) [5 points] The most significant reason why your solution is presently too slow to be useful is that you are hashing and inserting into your hash table tens of millions of elements, and then performing tens of millions of lookups into that hash table. Implement intervalSubsequenceHashes, which returns the same thing as subsequenceHashes except that it hashes only one in *m* subsequences. (A good implementation will not do more work than is necessary.) Modify your implementation of getExactSubmatches to honor *m* only for sequence A. Why should we still see approximately the same result? Why can't we further improve performance by applying this technique to sequence B as well?
- (g) [5 points] Run comparisons between the two human samples (paternal and maternal) and between the paternal sample and each of the animal samples. What do you notice? Attach and interpret the images that you produce.

As it turns out, all of the samples provided are relatively closely related, but given that we are only currently plotting exact matches, some will not appear quite as correlated as they really are. Which samples are these, and why might you expect these samples to show this result?

(h) [5 points] Ben Bitdiddle feels that some of his mutants will have sufficiently different genomes that exact matching might not suffice. Consider a single-mismatch variant

of getExactSubmatches (that is, one that reports a match even if one base pair is a mismatch). What parts of your implementation would have to change, and what modifications would you have to make to them? What information would have to be hashed? Describe (but do not implement) your algorithm.