“Every program depends on algorithms and data structures, but few programs depend on the invention of brand new ones.”

– Kernighan & Pike
Reminder – Midterm Exam!

This Wednesday – Oct 11, 10:00am – 10:50am
P01 – P05: Friend 101 (Here!)
P06 – P10: Guyot 10

Review Session: Tonight at 7:30 in the CS building, Room 104

Goals of this Lecture

Help you learn (or refresh your memory) about:
- Common data structures: linked lists and hash tables

Why? Deep motivation:
- Common data structures serve as “high level building blocks”
- A mature programmer:
  - Rarely creates programs from scratch
  - Often creates programs using high level building blocks

Why? Shallow motivation:
- Provide background pertinent to Assignment 3
- ... especially for those who haven’t taken COS 226
- ... especially\(^2\) for those who skipped COS 126
Symbol Table Data Structure

Goal: maintain a collection of key/value pairs

- For now, each key is a string; each value is an int
- Lookup by key, get value back
- Unknown number of key-value pairs

Examples

- (student name, class year)
- (baseball player, number)
- (variable name, value)
  - (“maxLength”, 2000), (“i”, 7), (“j”, -10)
Agenda

Linked lists
Hash tables
Hash table issues
Symbol table key ownership
Linked List Data Structure (for a Symbol Table)

```c
struct Node {
    const char *key;
    int value;
    struct Node *next;
};

struct List {
    struct Node *first;
};
```

Your Assignment 3 data structures will be more general and perhaps more elaborate.
struct Node {
    const char *key;
    int value;
    struct Node *next;
};

struct List {
    struct Node *first;
};

Your Assignment 3 data structures will be more general and perhaps more elaborate.

Really this is the address at which a string with contents “Ruth” resides.
# list.h

```c
struct Node {
    const char* key; // The key of the node
    int value;      // The value associated with the key
    struct Node *next; // Pointer to the next node
};

struct List {
    struct Node *first; // Pointer to the first node
};
```

```c
struct List *new();
void insert(struct List *p, const char* key, int value);
void concat(struct List *p, struct List *q);
int nth_value(struct List *p, int n);
```

### client.c

```c
#include "list.h"

int f(void) {
    struct List *p, *q;
    p = new();
    q = new();
    insert(p, "six", 6);
    insert(p, "sept", 7);
    insert(q, "cinq", 5);
    concat(p, q);
    concat(q, p);
    return nth_value(q, 1);
}
```

### list_linked.c

```c
#include "list.h"

struct List *new() {
    struct List *p;
    p = calloc(1, sizeof(*p));
    if(p == NULL) { cry(); return NULL; }
    return p;
}

void insert(struct List *p, const char* key, int value) {...}
void concat(struct List *p, struct List *q) { ... }
int nth_value(struct List *p, int n) { ... }
```
Now this code won't compile!

p->first = NULL;

Including only the declaration in header file enforces the abstraction: it keeps clients from accessing fields of the struct, allowing implementation to change.

**list.h**

```c
struct List;
typedef struct List *List_T;

List_T new();
void insert(List_T p, const char* key, int value);
void concat(List_T p, List_T q);
int nth_value(List_T p, int n);
```

**client.c**

```c
#include "list.h"

int f(void) {
    List_T p, q;
    p = new();
    q = new();
    insert(p,"six",6);
    insert(p,"sept",7);
    insert(q,"cinq",5);
    concat(p,q);
    concat(q,p);
    return nth_value(q,1);
}
```

**list_linked.c**

```c
#include "list.h"

struct Node {const char *key; int value; struct Node *next;};
struct List {struct Node *first;};

struct List *new() {
    struct List *p;
    p = calloc(1, sizeof(*p));
    if(p == NULL) {cry(); return NULL;}
    return p;
}

void insert(struct List *p, const char* key, int value) {...}
void concat(struct List *p, struct List *q) { ... }
int nth_value(struct List *p, int n) { ... }
```
struct Node {
    const char *key;
    int value;
    struct Node *next;
};

struct List {
    struct Node *first;
};

struct List lineup;
struct Node g;
struct Node* r = calloc(1,sizeof(struct Node));
g.key = "Gehrig";
lineup.first = &g;
(*lineup.first).value = 4;
(*lineup.first).next = r;
lineup.first->value = 4;
(lineup.first).next = r;

Accessing a Linked List
Linked List Algorithms

Create
- Allocate List structure; set first to NULL
- Performance: \( O(1) \Rightarrow \text{fast} \)

Add (no check for duplicate key required)
- Insert new node containing key/value pair at front of list
- Performance: \( O(1) \Rightarrow \text{fast} \)

Add (check for duplicate key required)
- Traverse list to check for node with duplicate key
- Insert new node containing key/value pair into list
- Performance: \( O(n) \Rightarrow \text{slow} \)
Search

• Traverse the list, looking for given key
• Stop when key found, or reach end
• Performance: ???
Q: How fast is searching for a key in a linked list?

A. Always fast – $O(1)$
B. Always slow – $O(n)$
C. On average, fast
D. On average, slow

Not well specified:
Depends on order of inserts, queries, etc.

Best answer is D.
Linked List Algorithms

Search
• Traverse the list, looking for given key
• Stop when key found, or reach end
• Performance: $O(n)$ ⇒ slow

Free
• Free Node structures while traversing
• Free List structure
• Performance: $O(n)$ ⇒ slow
Agenda

Linked lists

Hash tables

Hash table issues

Symbol table key ownership
Hash Table Data Structure  
(For COS 226 nerds – hashing with separate chaining)

enum { BUCKET_COUNT = 1024 };

struct Binding {
    const char *key;
    int value;
    struct Binding *next;
};

struct Table {
    struct Binding *buckets[BUCKET_COUNT];
};
Hash Table Data Structure

Hash function maps given key to an integer

Mod integer by BUCKET_COUNT to determine proper bucket
Example: \( \text{BUCKET\_COUNT} = 7 \)

Add (if not already present) bindings with these keys:
  
  • the, cat, in, the, hat
First key: “the”
  • hash("the") = 965156977; 965156977 % 7 = 1

Search buckets [1] for binding with key “the”; not found
Hash Table Example (cont.)

Add binding with key “the” and its value to buckets[1]
Second key: “cat”
  • hash(“cat”) = 3895848756; 3895848756 % 7 = 2

Search buckets [2] for binding with key “cat”; not found
Add binding with key “cat” and its value to buckets [2]
Hash Table Example (cont.)

Third key: “in”

- hash(“in”) = 6888005; 6888005% 7 = 5

Search buckets [5] for binding with key “in”; not found
Add binding with key “in” and its value to buckets [5]
Fourth word: “the”
  • hash(“the”) = 965156977; 965156977 % 7 = 1

Search buckets [1] for binding with key “the”; found it!
  • Don’t change hash table
Fifth key: “hat”
  • $\text{hash(“hat”) = 865559739; 865559739 \% 7 = 2}$

Search buckets [2] for binding with key “hat”; not found
Add binding with key “hat” and its value to buckets [2]

- At front or back?
Hash Table Algorithms

Create
- Allocate Table structure; set each bucket to NULL
- Performance: $O(1) \Rightarrow$ fast

Add
- Hash the given key
- Mod by $\text{BUCKET\_COUNT}$ to determine proper bucket
- Traverse proper bucket to make sure no duplicate key
- Insert new binding containing key/value pair into proper bucket
- Performance: ???
Q: How fast is adding a key to a hash table?

A. Always fast
B. Usually fast, but depends on how many keys are in the table
C. Usually fast, but depends on how many keys hash to the same bucket
D. Usually slow
E. Always slow

C

If bindings are spread across buckets, this is fast (though B is a concern).

Worst case: everything hashes to the same bucket – \( O(n) \)
Hash Table Algorithms

Search
- Hash the given key
- Mod by BUCKET_COUNT to determine proper bucket
- Traverse proper bucket, looking for binding with given key
- Stop when key found, or reach end
- Performance: Usually $O(1)$ ⇒ fast

Free
- Traverse each bucket, freeing bindings
- Free Table structure
- Performance: $O(n)$ ⇒ slow
Agenda

Linked lists
Hash tables
\textbf{Hash table issues}
Symbol table key ownership
How Many Buckets?

Many!
- Too few ⇒ large buckets ⇒ slow add, slow search

But not too many!
- Too many ⇒ memory is wasted

This is OK:
What Hash Function?

Should distribute bindings across the buckets well
- Distribute bindings over the range 0, 1, ..., BUCKET_COUNT–1
- Distribute bindings evenly to avoid very long buckets

This is not so good:

What would be the worst possible hash function?
How to Hash Strings?

Simple hash schemes don't distribute the keys evenly

- Number of characters, mod BUCKET_COUNT
- Sum the numeric codes of all characters, mod BUCKET_COUNT
- ...

A reasonably good hash function:

- Weighted sum of characters $s_i$ in the string $s$
  - $(\sum a^i s_i) \mod \text{BUCKET}_{\text{COUNT}}$
  - Best if $a$ and BUCKET_COUNT are relatively prime (i.e., their GCD is 1)
    - e.g., $a = 65599$, BUCKET_COUNT = 1024
How to Hash Strings?

A bit of math, and translation to code, yields:

```c
size_t hash(const char *s, size_t bucketCount) {
    enum { HASH_MULT = 65599 };  
    size_t i;
    size_t h = 0;
    for (i = 0; s[i] != '\0'; i++)
        h = h * HASH_MULT + (size_t)s[i];
    return h % bucketCount;
}
```
Agenda

Linked lists
Hash tables
Hash table issues

Symbol table key ownership
How to Protect Keys?

Suppose a hash table function `Table_add()` contains this code:

```c
void Table_add(struct Table *t, const char *key, int value) {
    struct Binding *p =
        (struct Binding*)malloc(sizeof(struct Binding));
    p->key = key;
    ...
}
```
Problem: Consider this calling code:

```c
struct Table *t;
char k[100] = "Ruth";
...
Table_add(t, k, 3);
```
How to Protect Keys?

Problem: Consider this calling code:

```c
struct Table *t;
char k[100] = "Ruth";
...
Table_add(t, k, 3);
strcpy(k, "Gehrig");
```

What happens if the client searches `t` for "Ruth"? For "Gehrig"?

k is REALLY &k[0]!
How to Protect Keys?

Solution: Table_add() saves a defensive copy of the given key

```c
void Table_add(struct Table *t, const char *key, int value) {
    …
    struct Binding *p = (struct Binding*)malloc(sizeof(struct Binding));
    p->key = (const char*)malloc(strlen(key) + 1);
    strcpy((char*)p->key, key);
    …
}
```

Why add 1?

What is missing from this code that you should have in yours?
How to Protect Keys?

Now consider same calling code:

```c
struct Table *t;
char k[100] = "Ruth";
...
Table_add(t, k, 3);
```
Now consider same calling code:

```c
struct Table *t;
char k[100] = "Ruth";
...
Table_add(t, k, 3);
strcpy(k, "Gehrig");
```

Hash table is not corrupted!
Then the hash table **owns** its keys

- That is, the hash table allocated the memory in which its keys reside
- `Table_remove` function must also free the memory in which the key resides, not just the binding containing the key
Summary

Common data structures and associated algorithms

- Linked list
  - (Maybe) fast add
  - Slow search
- Hash table
  - (Potentially) fast add
  - (Potentially) fast search
  - Very common

Hash table issues

- (Initial) Bucket array size
- Hashing algorithms

Symbol table concerns

- Key ownership