

1 Assignment No. 5: Search Operation in Hash Tables

Open Addressing with Quadratic Probing

Allocated time: 2 hours

1.1 Implementation

You are required to implement **correctly** and **efficiently** the *insert* and *search* operations in a hash table using *open addressing* and *quadratic probing*.

You may find relevant information and pseudo-code in your course notes, or in the book (Cormen), in section 11.4 *Open addressing*.

The notions of closed/open specify whether you are compelled to use a certain position or a data structure.

1.1.1 Hashing (refers to the hash table)

- Open Hashing
 - Free to leave the hash table to hold more elements at a certain index (e.g. chaining)
- Closed Hashing
 - Not more than one element can be stored at a certain index (e.g. linear/quadratic probing)

1.1.2 Addressing (refers to the final position of the element with respect to its initial position)

- Open Addressing
 - The final address is not completely determined by the hash code, it also depends on the elements which are already in the hash table (e.g. linear/quadratic probing)
- Closed Addressing
 - The final address is always the one initially calculated (there is no probing, e.g. chaining)

For the purpose of this assignment, the hash table will not contain integers, but a custom data structure defined as follows:

```
typedef struct {
    int id;
    char name[30];
} Entry;
```

The *position* of each Entry in the Hash Table will be calculated by applying the required hash function on the *id* member of the struct. The *name* member of the struct will be used only to exemplify the correctness of the search and delete operations and is not needed when evaluating the performance (i.e., the *name* member will be printed to the console if the search operation finds the *id*, otherwise print “not found”).

1.2 Minimal requirements for grading

- Interpret the chart and write your observations in the header (block comments) section at the beginning of your *main.cpp* file.
- Prepare a demo for each algorithm implemented.
- We do not accept assignments without code indentation and with code not organized in functions (for example where the entire code is in the main function).
- *The points from the requirements correspond to a correct and complete solution, quality of interpretation from the block comment and the correct answer to the questions from the teacher.*

1.3 Requirements

1.3.1 Implementation of the insert and search operations using the required data structure (5p)

You will have to prove your algorithm(s) work on a small-sized input (*ex. 10*).

1.3.2 Evaluate the search operation for a single fill factor 95% (2p)

! Before you start to work on the algorithms evaluation code, make sure you have a correct algorithm!

You are required to evaluate the *search* operation for hash tables using open addressing and quadratic probing, in the **average case** (remember to perform 5 runs for this). You will do this in the following manner:

1. Select N , the size of your hash table, as a prime number around 10000 (e.g., 9973, or 10007);
2. For each of several values for the filling factor $\alpha = 0.95$ do:
 - a. Insert n random elements, such that you reach the required value for α ($\alpha = n/N$)
 - b. Search, in each case, m random elements ($m \sim 3000$), such that approximately half of the searched elements will be *found* in the table, and the rest will *not* be *found* (in the table). *Make sure that you sample uniformly the elements in the found category, i.e., you should*

search elements which have been inserted at different moments with equal probability (there are several ways in which you could ensure this – it is up to you to figure this out)

- c. Count the operations performed by the search procedure (i.e., the number of cells accessed during the search)
- d. Pay attention to the values that you search for, they should be in random order of introduction. *If you look for the first 1500 values introduced in the table, implicitly the average found effort will be 1.*

3. Output a table in the following form:

Table 1: Effort measurements at various filling factors

Filling factor	Avg. Effort (<i>found</i>)	Max Effort (<i>found</i>)	Avg. Effort (<i>not-found</i>)	Max Effort (<i>not-found</i>)
0.95

Avg. Effort = total_effort / no_elements

Max. Effort = maximum number of accesses performed by one search operation

1.3.3 Complete evaluation for all fill factors (2p)

Respecting the requirements of point 2 with $\alpha \in \{0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95, 0.99\}$, output a table in the following form:

Table 2: Effort measurements at various filling factors

Filling factor	Avg. Effort (<i>found</i>)	Max Effort (<i>found</i>)	Avg. Effort (<i>not-found</i>)	Max Effort (<i>not-found</i>)
0.80				
0.85				
...	

1.3.4 Implement delete operation in a hash table, *demo (size 10)* and evaluation of the search operation after deletion of some elements (1p)

For the evaluation of the search operation after deletion, fill the hash table until a fill factor of 0.99. Delete elements from the table until you get a filling

factor of 0.8 and afterwards search m random elements ($m \sim 3000$) such that approximately half of the searched elements will be *found* in the table, and the rest will *not be found* (in the table). Count the operations performed by the *search* and add it in the previous table.