



Lecture 8: Hash Maps (with separate chaining)


CSE 373: Data Structures and
Algorithms

Warm Up!

Keep an eye on loop bounds!

Write a mathematical model of the following code

```
for (int i = 0; i < n; i++) {  
    for (int j = 0; j < i; j++) {  
        System.out.println("Hello!")  
    }  
}
```



Take 2 Minutes

1. www.pollev.com/cse373 activity for participating in our active learning questions.
2. <https://www.pollev.com/cse373studentqs> to ask your own questions

Which of the following is a mathematical model for the runtime of the code given?

a.) $f(n) = 2n$


b.) $f(n) = n + n$

c.) $f(n) = n^2$

d.) $f(n) = \sum_{i=n}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{j-1} 1$

Modeling Complex Loops

```
for (int i = 0; i < n; i++) {
    for (int j = 0; j < i; j++) {
        System.out.print("Hello! ");
    }
    System.out.println();
}
```



$$T(n) = \underbrace{(0 + 1 + 2 + 3 + \dots + i - 1)}$$

How do we model this part?

Summations!

$$1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + \dots + n = \sum_{i=1}^n i$$

Definition: Summation

$$\sum_{i=a}^b f(i) = f(a) + f(a + 1) + f(a + 2) + \dots + f(b-2) + f(b-1) + f(b)$$

$$T(n) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} 1$$

What is the Big O?

Simplifying Summations

Find closed form using summation identities
([given on exams](#))

```
for (int i = 0; i < n; i++) {  
    for (int j = 0; j < i; j++) {  
        System.out.println("Hello!");  
    }  
}
```



$$T(n) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} 1$$



closed form



simplified tight big O

$$T(n) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} 1 = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 1 \cdot i = 1 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} i = \frac{n(n-1)}{2} = \frac{1}{2}n^2 - \frac{1}{2}n = \mathbf{O(n^2)}$$

Summation of a constant

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c = cn$$

Factoring out a constant

$$\sum_{i=a}^b cf(i) = c \sum_{i=a}^b f(i)$$

Gauss's Identity

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} i = \frac{n(n-1)}{2}$$

Traversing Data

Array

```
for (int i = 0; i < arr.length; i++) {  
    System.out.println(arr[i]);  
}
```

List

```
for (int i = 0; i < myList.size(); i++) {  
    System.out.println(myList.get(i));  
}
```

```
for (T item : list) {  
    System.out.println(item);  
}
```

← **Iterator!**

Review: Iterators

iterator: a Java interface that dictates how a collection of data should be traversed. Can only move in the forward direction and in a single pass.

Iterator Interface

behavior

hasNext() – true if elements remain
next() – returns next element

supported operations:

hasNext() – returns true if the iteration has more elements yet to be examined


next() – returns the next element in the iteration and moves the iterator forward to next item

```
ArrayList<Integer> list = new ArrayList<Integer>();  
//fill up list  
  
Iterator itr = list.iterator();  
while (itr.hasNext()) {  
    int item = itr.next();  
}
```

```
ArrayList<Integer> list = new ArrayList<Integer>();  
//fill up list  
  
for (int i : list) {  
    int item = i;  
}
```

Implementing an Iterator

hasNext()




Result

true




false

next()



4



2

Administrivia

Project 1 Due today

- Experiments are also partner work – submit via canvas
- Individual Feedback on canvas for extra credit

Project 2 out today

- Due Wednesday April 29th (two weeks)

Midterm next Friday

- But we need your feedback

Need feedback on remote logistics

- Survey for extra credit


Current Exam Format Proposal

1 hour exam

24 hour open window

2 hour completion time from start

On Canvas



Questions

Roadmap for lecture content today

- Maps/Dictionary review
- DirectAccessMap
 - a map implemented with an array with only integer keys
- SimpleHashMap
 - a more flexible version of DirectAccessMap that uses a hash function on the key of interest to figure out where it is in the array
- SeparateChainingHashMap
 - fixes some limitations of the above Maps while still being very fast (in-practice).
 - It's what you'll implement in project 2 / what Java's official HashMap does -- it's the back-bone data structure that powers so many Java programs and that you will definitely use if you keep programming. Get hyped!

Dictionaryes (aka Maps)

Every Programmer's Best Friend

You'll probably use one in almost every programming project.


- Because it's hard to make a big project without needing one sooner or later.

```
// two types of Map implementations supposedly covered in CSE 143
Map<String, Integer> map1 = new HashMap<>();
Map<String, String> map2 = new TreeMap<>();
```

Review: Maps

map: Holds a set of distinct *keys* and a collection of *values*, where each key is associated with one value.

- a.k.a. "dictionary"



Dictionary ADT

state

Set of items & keys
Count of items

behavior

put(key, item) add item to collection indexed with key
get(key) return item associated with key
containsKey(key) return if key already in use
remove(key) remove item and associated key
size() return count of items

supported operations:

- **put(key, value):** Adds a given item into collection with associated key,
 - **if the map previously had a mapping for the given key, old value is replaced.**
- **get(key):** Retrieves the value mapped to the key
- **containsKey(key):** returns true if key is already associated with value in map, false otherwise
- **remove(key):** Removes the given key and its mapped value

	KEYS	VALUES	
	Jan	327.2	
	Feb	368.2	
	Mar	197.6	
	Apr	178.4	
	May	100.0	
	Jun	69.9	
	Jul	32.3	
Aug →	Aug	37.3	→ 37.3
	Sep	19.0	
	Oct	37.0	
	Nov	73.2	
	Dec	110.9	
	Annual	1551.0	

Implementing a Map with an Array

Map ADT

state

Set of items & keys
Count of items

behavior

put(key, item) add item to collection indexed with key
get(key) return item associated with key
containsKey(key) return if key already in use
remove(key) remove item and associated key
size() return count of items

ArrayMap<K, V>

state

Pair<K, V>[] data

behavior

put find key, overwrite value if there. Otherwise create new pair, add to next available spot, grow array if necessary
get scan all pairs looking for given key, return associated item if found
containsKey scan all pairs, return if key is found
remove scan all pairs, replace pair to be removed with last pair in collection
size return count of items in dictionary

Big O Analysis – (if key is the last one looked at / not in the dictionary)

put () O(N) linear
get () O(N) linear
containsKey () O(N) linear
remove () O(N) linear
size () O(1) constant

Big O Analysis – (if the key is the first one looked at)

put () O(1) constant
get () O(1) constant
containsKey () O(1) constant
remove () O(1) constant
size () O(1) constant

```
containsKey('c')
get('d')
put('b', 97)
put('e', 20)
```

0	1	2	3	4
('a', 1)	('b', 97)	('c', 3)	('d', 4)	('e', 20)

Implementing a Map with Nodes

Map ADT

state

Set of items & keys
Count of items

behavior

put(key, item) add item to collection indexed with key
get(key) return item associated with key
containsKey(key) return if key already in use
remove(key) remove item and associated key
size() return count of items

LinkedMap<K, V>

state

front
size

behavior

put if key is unused, create new with pair, add to front of list, else replace with new value
get scan all pairs looking for given key, return associated item if found
containsKey scan all pairs, return if key is found
remove scan all pairs, skip pair to be removed
size return count of items in dictionary


Big O Analysis – (if key is the last one looked at / not in the dictionary)

put ()	O(N) linear
get ()	O(N) linear
containsKey ()	O(N) linear
remove ()	O(N) linear
size ()	O(1) constant

Big O Analysis – (if the key is the first one looked at)

put ()	O(1) constant
get ()	O(1) constant
containsKey ()	O(1) constant
remove ()	O(1) constant
size ()	O(1) constant

```
containsKey('c')
get('d')
put('b', 20)
```



Can we do better?

Let's simplify the problem we're working with + combine it with some facts about arrays.

- problem simplification: only worry about supporting integer keys
- array facts: accessing (`data[i]`) or updating an element (`data[i] = ...`) at a given index takes $\Theta(1)$ runtime.
- If we store the Key-Value pairs at the `data[key]` then we don't have to do any looping to find it. For example consider `containsKey` or `get` -- we can just jump directly to `data[key]` to figure out the return answer.

DirectAccessMap<Integer, V>

state

```
Data[]  
size
```

behavior

```
put put item at given index  
get get item at given index  
containsKey if data[] null at  
index, return false, return  
true otherwise  
remove nullify element at index  
size return count of items in  
dictionary
```

Can we do better?

Let's simplify the problem we're working with + combine it with some facts about arrays.

- problem simplification: only worry about supporting integer keys
- array facts: accessing (`data[i]`) or updating an element (`data[i] = ...`) at a given index takes $\Theta(1)$ runtime.
- If we store the Key-Value pairs at the `data[key]` then we don't have to do any looping to find it. For example consider `containsKey` or `get` -- we can just jump directly to `data[key]` to figure out the return answer.


DirectAccessMap<Integer, V>

state

Data[]
size

behavior

put put item at given index
get get item at given index
containsKey if `data[]` null at index, return false, return true otherwise
remove nullify element at index
size return count of items in dictionary



```
put(3, "Sherdil");  
get(3);
```

Can we do better?

Let's simplify the problem we're working with + combine it with some facts about arrays.

- problem simplification: only worry about supporting integer keys
- array facts: accessing (`data[i]`) or updating an element (`data[i] = ...`) at a given index takes $\Theta(1)$ runtime.
- If we store the Key-Value pairs at the `data[key]` then we don't have to do any looping to find it. For example consider `containsKey` or `get` -- we can just jump directly to `data[key]` to figure out the return answer.

DirectAccessMap<Integer, V>

state

Data[]
size

behavior

put put item at given index
get get item at given index
containsKey if data[] null at index, return false, return true otherwise
remove nullify element at index
size return count of items in dictionary

indices 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

data

			(3, Sherdil)							
--	--	--	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

```
put(3, "Sherdil");  
get(3);
```

Can we do better? -- Direct Access Map impl.

```
public void put(int key, V value) {
    this.array[key] = value;
}

public boolean containsKey(int key)
    return this.array[key] != null;
}

public V get(int key) {
    return this.array[key];
}

public void remove(int key) {
    this.array[key] = null;
}
```

DirectAccessMap<Integer, V>

state

Data[]
size

behavior

put put item at given index
get get item at given index
containsKey if data[] null at index, return false, return true otherwise
remove nullify element at index
size return count of items in dictionary

Operation		Array w/ indices as keys
put(key,value)	best	$\Theta(1)$
	worst	$\Theta(1)$
get(key)	best	$\Theta(1)$
	worst	$\Theta(1)$
containsKey(key)	best	$\Theta(1)$
	worst	$\Theta(1)$

Direct Access Map tradeoffs:

take 1 second to review what DirectAccessMap is in your notes and send some ideas in the activity polleverywhere:

- what's a benefit of using DirectAccessMap?
- what's a bad thing when using DirectAccessMap?

- 😞 wasted space
 - what if we want to store two keys: 0 and 9999999999? Our current setup would just be wasting all that array space in-between
- 😞 only integer keys
 - kind of annoying that we could only have this for ints, but **being able to quickly go from the key to the array index is super valuable because its array lookups are fast (constant time)**. When we can just jump to the right position, we avoid the looping that ArrayMap/LinkedMap had to do where you might have to loop and look at every element. We'll keep this core idea of "knowing the index" and jumping there right away for all the versions of the dictionaries we talk about today.
- 😊 super fast though: $\Theta(1)$ runtime for everything


Can we do this for any integer?

Idea 1:

Create a GIANT array with every possible integer as an index

Problems:

- Can we allocate an array big enough?
- Super wasteful




Idea 2:

Create a smaller array, but create a way to translate given integer keys into available indices. Way less wasteful space-wise.

Problem:

- How can we pick a good translation?



Hash functions: translating a piece of data to an int

Hash function definition

A **hash function** is any function that can be used to map data of arbitrary size to fixed-size values.

In our case: we want to translate int keys to a valid index in our array. If our array is length 10 but our input key is 500, we need to make sure we have a way of mapping that to a number between 0 and 9 (the valid indices for a length 10 array). This mapping that we decide on is a **hash function**.

One simple thing we can do (and that you will do when you implement this in your project):

Hash function: take your key and % it by the length of the array.

ex: key is 500, and array is length 10 – if you take $500 \% 10$, you will get the number 0, so we'd just plop 500 and its value at index 0.

“review”: Integer remainder with % “mod”

The % operator computes the remainder from integer division.

14 % 4 is 2

$$\begin{array}{r} 3 \\ 4 \overline{) 14} \\ \underline{12} \\ 2 \end{array}$$

218 % 5 is 3

$$\begin{array}{r} 43 \\ 5 \overline{) 218} \\ \underline{20} \\ 18 \\ \underline{15} \\ 3 \end{array}$$

Equivalently, to find $a \% b$ (for $a, b > 0$):

```
while (a > b-1)
```

```
    a -= b;
```

```
return a;
```

Applications of % operator:

- Obtain last digit of a number: $230857 \% 10$ is 7
- See whether a number is odd: $7 \% 2$ is 1, $42 \% 2$ is 0
- Limit integers to specific range: $8 \% 12$ is 8, $18 \% 12$ is 6



Limit keys to indices
within array

First Hash Function: % table size

indices	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
elements	"foo"	"biz"				"bar"			"bop"	

```
put(0, "foo"); 0 % 10 = 0
put(5, "bar"); 5 % 10 = 5
put(11, "biz"); 11 % 10 = 1
put(18, "bop"); 18 % 10 = 8
```


Implement First Hash Function

```
public void put(int key, int value) {  
    data[hashToValidIndex(key)] = value;  
}
```

```
public V get(int key) {  
    return data[hashToValidIndex(key)];  
}
```

```
public int hashToValidIndex(int k) {  
    return k % this.data.length;  
}
```


Note: % is just a math operator like +, -, /, *, so it's constant runtime

SimpleHashMap<Integer>

state
Data[]
size

behavior
put mod key by table size, put item at result
get mod key by table size, get item at result
containsKey mod key by table size, return data[result] == null
remove mod key by table size, nullify element at result
size return count of items in dictionary

Operation		Array w/ indices as keys
put(key,value)	best	$\Theta(1)$
	worst	$\Theta(1)$
get(key)	best	$\Theta(1)$
	worst	$\Theta(1)$
containsKey(key)	best	$\Theta(1)$
	worst	$\Theta(1)$



Questions?

things we talked about:

- review of ArrayMap + LinkedHashMap
- DirectAccessMap
- % as a hash function and SimpleHashMap

First Hash Function: % table size

indices	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
elements	":(' ' "	"biz"				"bar"			"bop"	

```
put (0, "foo");    0 % 10 = 0
```

```
put (5, "bar");   5 % 10 = 5
```

```
put (11, "biz");  11 % 10 = 1
```

```
put (18, "bop");  18 % 10 = 8
```

```
put (20, ":( ' ' "); 20 % 10 = 0
```

 Collision!

Hash Obsession: Collisions

Collision: multiple keys translate to the same location of the array

Future big idea: the fewer the collisions, the better the runtime! (we'll see this when we figure out that resolving these leads to worse runtime)

Two questions:

1. When we have a collision, how do we resolve it?
2. How do we minimize the number of collisions?

Roadmap for lecture content today

- Maps/Dictionary review
- DirectAccessMap
 - a map implemented with an array with only integer keys
- SimpleHashMap
 - a more flexible version of DirectAccessMap that uses a hash function on the key of interest to figure out where it is in the array
- **SeparateChainingHashMap**
 - fixes some limitations of the above Maps while still being very fast (in-practice).
 - It's what you'll implement in project 2 / what Java's official HashMap does -- it's the back-bone data structure that powers so many Java programs and that you will definitely use if you keep programming. Get hyped!

Strategies to handle hash collision

There are multiple strategies. In this class, we'll cover the following ones:

1. Separate chaining
2. Open addressing
 - Linear probing
 - Quadratic probing
 - Double hashing

Separate chaining

Solution 1: Separate Chaining


Each index in our array represents a “bucket”. When an item x hashes to index h :

- If the bucket at index h is empty: create a new list containing x
- If the bucket at index h is already a list: add x if it is not already present

in other words:

If multiple things hash to the same index, then we'll just put all of those in that same index bucket. Often, you'll see the data structure chosen is a linked-list like structure.

indices




Separate chaining

Reminder: the implementations of put/get/containsKey are all very similar, and almost always will have the same complexity class runtime

indices

```
// some pseudocode  
public boolean containsKey(int key) {  
    int bucketIndex = key % data.length;  
    loop through data[bucketIndex]  
        return true if we find the key in  
        data[bucketIndex]  
    return false if we get to here (didn't  
    find it)  
}
```



Separate chaining


Reminder: the implementations of put/get/containsKey are all very similar, and almost always will have the same complexity class runtime

indices

```
// some pseudocode
```

```
public boolean containsKey(int key) {  
    int bucketIndex = key % data.length;  
    loop through data[bucketIndex]  
        return true if we find the key in  
        data[bucketIndex]  
    return false if we get to here (didn't  
    find it)  
}
```

runtime analysis: Take a second to think about this question: are there different possible states for our Hash Map that make this code run slower/faster, assuming there are already n key-value pairs being stored?




Separate chaining

Reminder: the implementations of put/get/containsKey are all very similar, and almost always will have the same complexity class runtime

indices

```
// some pseudocode  
public boolean containsKey(int key) {  
    int bucketIndex = key % data.length;  
    loop through data[bucketIndex]  
        return true if we find the key in  
        data[bucketIndex]  
    return false if we get to here (didn't  
    find it)  
}
```

runtime analysis: Take a second to think about this question: are there different possible states for our Hash Map that make this code run slower/faster, assuming there are already n key-value pairs being stored?



Yes! If we had to do a lot of loop iterations to find the key in the bucket, our code will run slower.

A worst case situation for separate chaining




It's possible that everything (by chance) hashes to the same bucket! (in other words: this is how collisions will hurt our runtime)

If all n of our key-value pairs are in the same bucket, `containsKey` could take $\Theta(n)$ runtime in the worst case.


Consider what happens if we ask `containsKey(555)` on this dictionary?

We'd have to go to index 5 and check all n elements in the bucket to see if they were the key `555`.



Note: we lost our $\Theta(1)$ worst-case runtime from `DirectAccessMap` when we have to deal with collisions, but we'll see in a bit how to prevent this situation as best we can.

A best case situation for separate chaining



It's possible (and likely if you follow some best-practices) that everything is spread out across the buckets pretty evenly. This is the opposite of the last slide: when we have minimal collisions, our runtime should be less. For example, if we have a bucket with only 0 or 1 element in it, checking `containsKey` for something in that bucket will only take a constant amount of time.

We're going to try a lot of stuff we can do to make it more likely we achieve this beautiful state 😊.

In-practice situations for separate chaining

Generally we can achieve something close to the best case situation from the previous slide and maintain our Hash Map so that every bucket only has a small constant number of items. There may be some outliers that have slightly more buckets, but generally if we follow all the best practices, the runtime will still be $\Theta(1)$ for most cases!

(The worst case is still $\Theta(n)$ but again, we'll try really hard to prevent that)


Operation		Array w/ indices as keys
put(key,value)	best	$\Theta(1)$
	In-practice	$\Theta(1)$
	worst	$\Theta(n)$
get(key)	In-practice	$\Theta(1)$
	average	$\Theta(1)$
	worst	$\Theta(n)$
remove(key)	best	$\Theta(1)$
	In-practice	$\Theta(1)$
	worst	$\Theta(n)$

Reminder: the in-practice runtimes are assuming an even distribution of the keys inside the array and following of best-practices to ensure the average chain length is low.

Best practices (pay attention to this for the hw)

- what about resizing?

- for data structures like `ArrayMap` or `ArrayList` or `ArrayStack` we had to resize when we're full just because we couldn't store any more things! But our `Separate Chaining Hash Map` is a little bit different: we aren't ever **forced** to resize our main array, since the buckets are flexible size.



It turns out we still want to resize "every so often" to make sure the average/expected length of each bucket is a small number.

Consider what happens if we had the array length 10 like on the left, but had 100 key-value pairs?

Assuming our in-practice niceness (not-worst case) you would expect on average each of the 10 buckets has about 10 key-value pairs in it.

What happens if we stick with the same size array but add 100 more key-value pairs? Each bucket gets about 10 more –key-value pairs and the runtime is getting worse and worse.

Best practices (pay attention to this for the hw)

It turns out we still want to resize “every so often” to make sure the average/expected length of each bucket is a small number.

Consider what happens if we had the array length 10 like on the left, but had 100 key-value pairs?

Assuming our in-practice niceness (not-worst case) you would expect on average each of the 10 buckets has about 10 key-value pairs in it.

What happens if we stick with the same size array but add 100 more key-value pairs? Each bucket gets about 10 more key-value pairs and the runtime is getting worse and worse.

The pattern we’re getting to is that the expected runtime is approximately: # of pairs / array.length (AKA n / c where n is the number of elements and c is the number of possible chains). If array.length is fixed for your whole program, then this is an order- n runtime, but if the array.length also increases (because you re-size) and you redistribute out the values evenly across the buckets, you can keep your runtime low. In particular, if you resize when when your n / c ratio increases to about 1, you’re expected to have 1 element or fewer in each bucket at all times. (do this on your homework).

Tip: make sure you re-hash (re-distribute) your keys by the new array length after re-sizing so they don’t get clustered in the old array length range.


Lambda + resizing rephrased

To be more precise, the in-practice runtime depends on λ , the current average chain length.

However, if you resize once you hit that 1:1 threshold, the current λ is expected to be less than 1 (which is a constant / constant runtime, so we can simplify to $O(1)$).

Operation		Array w/ indices as keys
put(key,value)	best	$\Theta(1)$
	In-practice	$\Theta(\lambda) = \Theta(1)$
	worst	$\Theta(n)$
get(key)	best	$\Theta(1)$
	in-practice	$\Theta(\lambda) = \Theta(1)$
	worst	$\Theta(n)$
remove(key)	best	$\Theta(1)$
	In-practice	$\Theta(\lambda) = \Theta(1)$
	worst	$\Theta(n)$

indices



“In-Practice” Case:

Depends on average number of elements per chain

Load Factor λ

If n is the total number of key-value pairs

Let c be the capacity of array

$$\text{Load Factor } \lambda = \frac{n}{c}$$

What about non integer keys?

Hash function definition

A **hash function** is any function that can be used to map data of arbitrary size to fixed-size values.

Let's use define another hash function to change stuff like Strings into ints!

Best practices for designing hash functions:

Avoid collisions

- The more collisions, the further we move away from $O(1+\lambda)$
- Produce a wide range of indices, and distribute evenly over them

Low computational costs

- Hash function is called every time we want to interact with the data

(Before we % by length, we have to convert the data into an int)

Implementation 1: Simple aspect of values

```
public int hashCode(String input) {  
    return input.length();  
}
```

Pro: super fast

Con: lots of collisions!

Implementation 2: More aspects of value

```
public int hashCode(String input) {  
    int output = 0;  
    for(char c : input) {  
        out += (int)c;  
    }  
    return output;  
}
```

Pro: still really fast

Con: some collisions

Implementation 3: Multiple aspects of value + math!

```
public int hashCode(String input) {  
    int output = 1;  
    for (char c : input) {  
        int nextPrime = getNextPrime();  
        out *= Math.pow(nextPrime, (int)c);  
    }  
    return Math.pow(nextPrime, input.length());  
}
```

Pro: few collisions

Con: slow, gigantic integers

Java's hashCode (relevant for project)

- Luckily, most of these design decisions have been made for us by smart people. All objects in java come with a `hashCode()` method that does some magic (see previous slide for the not-magic version) to turn any object type (like String, ArrayList, Point, Scanner) into an integer. These hashCodes are designed to distribute pretty evenly / not have lots of collisions, so we use them as the starting point for determining the bucket index.
- high level steps to figure out which bucket a key goes into
 - call the key.hashCode() to get an int representation of the object
 - % by the array table length to convert it to a valid index for your hash map

Best practices for an nice distribution of keys recap


- resize when lambda (number of elements / number of buckets) increases up to 1
- when you resize, you can choose a the table length that will help reduce collisions if you multiply the array length by 2 and then choose the nearest prime number
- design the hashCode of your keys to be somewhat complex and lead to a distribution of different output numbers

Practice

Consider an IntegerDictionary using separate chaining with an internal capacity of 10. Assume our buckets are implemented using a LinkedList where we append new key-value pairs to the end.

Now, suppose we insert the following key-value pairs. What does the dictionary internally look like?

(1, a) (5,b) (11,a) (7,d) (12,e) (17,f) (1,g) (25,h)




Practice

Consider a StringDictionary using separate chaining with an internal capacity of 10. Assume our buckets are implemented using a LinkedList. Use the following hash function:

```
public int hashCode(String input) {
    return input.length() % arr.length;
}
```

Now, insert the following key-value pairs. What does the dictionary internally look like?

("a", 1) ("ab", 2) ("c", 3) ("abc", 4) ("abcd", 5) ("abcdabcd", 6) ("five", 7) ("hello world", 8)



Java and Hash Functions

Object class includes default functionality:

- equals
- hashCode

If you want to implement your own hashCode you should:

- Override BOTH hashCode() and equals()

If `a.equals(b)` is true then `a.hashCode() == b.hashCode()` **MUST** also be true

That requirement is part of the Object interface.

Other people's code will assume you've followed this rule.

Java's HashMap (and HashSet) will assume you follow these rules and conventions for your custom objects if you want to use your custom objects as keys.