

Fully-Dynamic Space-Efficient Dictionaries and Filters with Constant Number of Memory Accesses*

Ioana O. Bercea[†] Guy Even*

November 13, 2019

Abstract

A fully-dynamic dictionary is a data structure for maintaining sets that supports insertions, deletions and membership queries. A filter approximates membership queries with a one-sided error. We present two designs:

1. The first space-efficient fully-dynamic dictionary that maintains both sets and random multisets and supports queries, insertions, and deletions with a constant number of memory accesses in the worst case with high probability. The comparable dictionary of Arbitman *et al.* [ANS10] works only for sets.
2. By a reduction from our dictionary for random multisets, we obtain a space-efficient fully-dynamic filter that supports queries, insertions, and deletions with a constant number of memory accesses in the worst case with high probability (as long as the false positive probability is $2^{-O(w)}$, where w denotes the word length). This is the first in-memory space-efficient fully-dynamic filter design that provably achieves these properties.

We also present an application of the techniques used to design our dictionary to the static Retrieval Problem.

1 Introduction

We consider the problem of maintaining datasets subject to insert, delete, and membership query operations. Given a set \mathcal{D} of n elements from a universe \mathcal{U} , a membership query asks if the queried element $x \in \mathcal{U}$ belongs to the set \mathcal{D} . When exact answers are required, the associated data structure is called a *dictionary*. When one-sided errors are allowed, the associated data structure is called a *filter*. Formally, given an error parameter $\varepsilon > 0$, a filter always answers “yes” when $x \in \mathcal{D}$ and when $x \notin \mathcal{D}$, it makes a mistake with probability at most ε . We refer to such an error as a *false positive event*¹.

When false positives can be tolerated, the main advantage of using a filter instead of a dictionary is that the filter requires much less space than a dictionary [CFG⁺78, LP10]. Let $u \triangleq |\mathcal{U}|$ be the size of the universe and n denote an upper bound on the size of the set at all points in time. The information theoretic lower bound for the space of dictionaries is $\lceil \log_2 \binom{u}{n} \rceil = n \log(\frac{u}{n}) + \Theta(n)$

*This research was supported by a grant from the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF), Jerusalem, Israel, and the United States National Science Foundation (NSF)

[†]Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel. Email: ioana@cs.umd.edu, guy@eng.tau.ac.il.

¹The probability is taken over the random choices that the filter makes.

bits.²³⁴ On the other hand, the lower bound for the space of filters is $n \log(1/\varepsilon)$ bits [CFG⁺78]. In light of these lower bounds, we call a dictionary *space-efficient* when it requires $(1+o(1)) \cdot n \log(\frac{u}{n}) + \Theta(n)$ bits, where the term $o(1)$ converges to zero as n tends to infinity. Similarly, a space-efficient filter requires $(1+o(1)) \cdot n \log(1/\varepsilon) + O(n)$ bits.⁵

When the set \mathcal{D} is fixed, we say that the data structure is *static*. When the data structure supports insertions as well, we say that it is *incremental*. Data structures that handle both deletions and insertions are called *fully-dynamic* (in short, dynamic).

The goal is to design dictionaries and filters that achieve “the best of both worlds” [ANS10]: they work in the fully-dynamic setting, are space-efficient and perform operations in constant time in the worst case with high probability.⁶

On the fully-dynamic front, one successful approach for designing fully-dynamic filters was suggested by Pagh *et al.* [PPR05]. Static (resp., incremental) filters can be obtained from static (resp., incremental) dictionaries for sets by a reduction of Carter *et al.* [CFG⁺78]. This reduction does not directly lead to filters that support deletions. To extend the reduction to the fully-dynamic setting, Pagh *et al.* [PPR05] propose to reduce instead from a stronger dictionary that maintains multisets rather than sets (i.e., elements in multisets have arbitrary multiplicities). This extension combined with a fully-dynamic dictionary for multisets yields in [PPR05] a fully-dynamic filter that is space-efficient but performs insertions and deletions in amortized constant time, not in the worst case. It is still an open problem whether one can design a fully-dynamic dictionary on multisets that is space-efficient and performs operations in constant time in the worst case whp [ANS10].

In this paper, we present the first fully-dynamic space-efficient filter with constant time operations in the worst case whp. Our result is based on the observation that it suffices to use the reduction of Carter *et al.* [CFG⁺78] on dictionaries that support *random* multisets rather than arbitrary multisets. We then design the first fully-dynamic space-efficient dictionary that works on random multisets and supports operations in constant time in the worst case whp. Applying the reduction to this new dictionary yields our fully-dynamic filter. We also show how a static version of our dictionary can be used to design a data structure for the static retrieval problem.

1.1 Our Contributions

Fully-Dynamic Dictionary for Random Multisets. We consider a new setting for dictionaries in which the dataset is a random sample (with replacements) of the universe. We refer to such datasets as *random multisets*. We present the first space-efficient fully-dynamic dictionary for random multisets that performs inserts, deletes, and queries in constant time in the worst case whp. The motivating application for random multi-sets is in designing fully-dynamic filters (see Sec. 3). We note that our dictionary can also maintain regular sets.

In the following theorem, we summarize the properties of our dictionary, called the Crate Dictionary. Note that we analyze the number of memory accesses in the RAM model in which every memory access reads/writes a word of $w = \Omega(\log n)$ contiguous bits. All operations we

²All logarithms are base 2 unless otherwise stated. $\ln x$ is used to denote the natural logarithm.

³We consider the case in which the bound n on the cardinality of the dataset is known in advance. The scenario in which n is not known is addressed in Pagh *et al.* [PSW13].

⁴This equality holds when u is significantly larger than n .

⁵An asymptotic expression that mixes big-O and small-o calls for elaboration. If $\varepsilon = o(1)$, then the asymptotic expression does not require the $O(n)$ addend. If ε is constant, the $O(n)$ addend only emphasizes the fact that the constant that multiplies n is, in fact, the sum of two constants: one is almost $\log(1/\varepsilon)$, and the other does not depend on ε . Indeed, the lower bound in [LP10] excludes space $(1+o(1)) \cdot n \log(1/\varepsilon)$ for constant values of ε .

⁶By with high probability (whp), we mean with probability at least $1 - 1/n^{O(1)}$. The constant in the exponent can be controlled by the designer and only affects the $o(1)$ term in the space of the dictionary or the filter.

perform in one memory access take constant time. We also analyze the probability that the space allocated for the dictionary does not suffice; such an event is called an *overflow*.

Theorem 1. *The Crate Dictionary with parameter n is a fully-dynamic dictionary that maintains sets and random multisets with up to n elements from a universe \mathcal{U} with the following guarantees: (1) For every polynomial in n sequence of insert, delete, and query operations, the dictionary does not overflow whp. (2) If the dictionary does not overflow, then every operation (query, insert, delete) can be completed using at most $4 \cdot \frac{\log(|\mathcal{U}|/n)}{w} + O(1)$ memory accesses. (3) The required space is $(1 + o(1)) \cdot n \log(|\mathcal{U}|/n) + O(n)$ bits.*

The comparable dictionary of Arbitman *et al.* [ANS10] also achieves constant time memory accesses, is space-efficient and does not overflow with high probability, but works only for sets. We remark that dictionary constructions for arbitrary multisets exist [CKRT04, PPR05, DadHPP06, KR10, PT14] with weaker performance guarantees.

Fully-Dynamic Filter. One advantage of supporting random multisets is that it allows us to use our dictionary to construct a fully-dynamic filter. We show a reduction that transforms a fully-dynamic dictionary on random multisets into a fully-dynamic filter on sets (see Lemma 13). Applying this reduction to the Crate Dictionary in Theorem 1, we obtain the Crate Filter in Theorem 2. The Crate Filter is the first in-memory space-efficient fully-dynamic filter that supports all operations in constant time in the worst case whp. The filter does not overflow with high probability. We summarize its properties in the following:⁷

Theorem 2. *The Crate Filter with parameters n and ε is a fully-dynamic filter that maintains a set of at most n elements from a universe \mathcal{U} with the following guarantees: (1) For every polynomial in n sequence of insert, delete, and query operations, the filter does not overflow whp. (2) If the filter does not overflow, then every operation (query, insert, and delete) can be completed using at most $4 \cdot \frac{\log(1/\varepsilon)}{w} + O(1)$ memory accesses. (3) The required space is $(1 + o(1)) \cdot n \log(1/\varepsilon) + O(n)$ bits. (4) For every query, the probability of a false positive event is bounded by ε .*

Static Retrieval. We also present an application of the Crate Dictionary design for the static Retrieval Problem [CKRT04]. In the static retrieval problem, the input consists of a fixed dataset $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ and a function $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^k$. On query x , the output y must satisfy $y = f(x)$ if $x \in \mathcal{D}$ (if $x \notin \mathcal{D}$, any output is allowed). The data structure can also support updates in which $f(x)$ is modified for an $x \in \mathcal{D}$.

We employ a variant of the Crate Dictionary design to obtain a Las Vegas algorithm for constructing a practical data structure in linear time whp. The space requirements of this data structure are better than previous constructions under certain parametrizations (see [DW19] and references therein). In particular, the $o(1)$ term in the required space is similar to the one we obtain for our dictionary.

Theorem 3. *There exists a data structure for the static Retrieval Problem with the following guarantees: (1) Every query and update to $f(x)$ can be completed using at most $4 \cdot \frac{k}{w} + O(1)$ memory accesses. (2) The time it takes to construct the data structure is $O(n)$ whp. (3) The required space is $(1 + o(1)) \cdot nk + O(n)$ bits.*

⁷Note that the theorem holds for all ranges of ε , in particular, ε can depend on n or w . Moreover, even when $\varepsilon = 2^{-O(w)}$, each operation in the filter requires a constant number of memory accesses.

1.2 Our Model

Memory Access Model. We assume that the data structures are implemented in the RAM model in which the basic unit of one memory access is a word. Let w denote the memory word length in bits. We assume that $w = \Omega(\log n)$. Performance is measured in terms of memory accesses. We do not count the number of computer word-level instructions because the computations we perform over words per memory access can be implemented with $O(1)$ instructions using modern instruction sets and lookup tables [Rei13, PBJP17, BFG⁺17].

We note that comparable dictionary designs assume words of $\log(|\mathcal{U}|)$ bits [PPR05, DadHPP06, ANS10]. When the dictionaries are used to obtain filters [PPR05, ANS10], they assume that the word length is $\log(1/\varepsilon)$. If $w = \log(|\mathcal{U}|)$, then our designs always require a constant number of memory accesses per operation (hence, constant time). However, we prefer to describe our designs using a model in which the word length does not depend on the size of the universe [PT14].

Success Probability. Our constructions succeed with high probability in the following sense. Upfront, space is allocated for the data structure and its components. An *overflow* is the event that the space allocated for one of the components does not suffice (e.g., too many elements are hashed to the same bin). We prove that overflow occurs with probability at most $1/\text{poly}(n)$ and that one can control the degree of the polynomial (the degree of the polynomial only affects the $o(1)$ term in the size bound). In the case of random multisets, the probability of an overflow is a joint probability distribution over the random choices of the dictionary and the distribution over the realizations of the multiset. In the case of sets, the probability of an overflow depends only on the random choices that the dictionary/filter makes.

Hash Functions. We assume that we have access to perfectly random hash functions and permutations with constant evaluation time. We do not account the space these hash functions occupy. A similar assumption is made in [BM99, RR03, CKRT04, DP08, BFG⁺18, DW19]. See [FKS82, KNR09, ANS10, PT11, CRSW13, MRRR14] for further discussion on efficient storage and evaluation of hash functions.

Worst Case vs. Amortized. An interesting application that emphasizes the importance of worst-case performance is that of handling search engine queries. Such queries are sent in parallel to multiple servers, whose responses are then accumulated to generate the final output. The latency of this final output is determined by the slowest response, thus reducing the average latency of the final response to the worst latency among the servers. See [BM01, KM07, ANS09, ANS10] for further discussion on the shortcomings of expected or amortized performance in practical scenarios.

1.3 Main Ideas and Techniques

We review the general techniques which we employ in our design and highlight the main issues that arise when trying to design a fully-dynamic filter. We then describe how our construction addresses these issues.

1.3.1 Relevant Techniques and Issues

Dictionary Based Filters. Carter *et al.* [CFG⁺78] observed that one can design a static filter using a dictionary that stores hashes of the elements. The reduction is based on a random hash function $h : U \rightarrow [\frac{n}{\varepsilon}]$. We refer to $h(x)$ as the *fingerprint* of x . A static dictionary over the

set of fingerprints $h(\mathcal{D})$ becomes a static filter over the set \mathcal{D} . Indeed, the probability of a false positive event is at most ε because $\Pr[h(x) \in h(\mathcal{D})] \leq \varepsilon$, for every $x \notin \mathcal{D}$. This reduction yields a space-efficient static filter if the dictionary is space-efficient.

Delete Operations in Filters. Delete operations pose a challenge to the design of filters based on dictionaries [PPR05]. Consider a collision, namely $h(x) = h(y)$ for some $x \in \mathcal{D}$ and $y \in \mathcal{U}$. One must make sure that a `delete(y)` operation does not delete x as well. We consider two scenarios. In the first scenario, $y \notin \mathcal{D}$ and a `delete(y)` causes $h(x)$ to be deleted from the filter. A subsequent `query(x)` operation is then responded with a “no”, rendering the filter incorrect. To resolve this issue, we assume that a delete operation is only issued for elements in the dataset.⁸

Assumption 4. *At the time a `delete(x)` is issued to the filter, the element x is in the dataset.*

In the second scenario, both $x \in \mathcal{D}$ and $y \in \mathcal{D}$ when `delete(y)` is issued. In this case, the dictionary underlying the filter must be able to store duplicate elements (or their multiplicities), so that `delete(y)` deletes only one duplicate leaving the other one intact (or subtracts the counter).⁹ Pagh *et al.* [PPR05] propose a solution that requires the underlying dictionary to support a multiset rather than a set.

Quotienting. The space lower bound of $n \log(|\mathcal{U}|/n)$ bits suggests that one should be able to save $\log n$ bits in the representation of each element. Indeed, the technique of *quotienting* [Knu73] saves $\log n$ bits by storing them implicitly in an array of n entries. This technique has been successfully used in several filter and dictionary constructions (see [Pag01, PPR05, DadHPP06, ANS10, BFJ⁺12, BFG⁺18] and references therein). The idea is to divide the $\log(|\mathcal{U}|)$ bits of an element $x \in \mathcal{U}$ into the first $\log n$ bits called the *quotient* $q(x)$ (which are stored implicitly), and the remaining $\log(|\mathcal{U}|/n)$ bits called the *remainder* $r(x)$ (which are stored explicitly). An array $A[0 : n-1]$ is then used to store the elements, where $A[q]$ stores the multiset of remainders $r(x)$ such that $q(x) = q$.¹⁰ The benefit is that one does not need to store the quotients explicitly because they are implied by the location of the remainders.

Load Balancing and Spares. When quotients are random locations in $[n]$, it is common to analyze dictionaries and filters using the balls-into-bins paradigm [Wie17]. In the case of dictionary/filter design, the remainders are balls, and the quotients determine the bins. The balls that cannot be stored in the space allocated for their bin are stored in a separate structure called the *spare*. A balls-into-bins argument implies that, under certain parametrizations, the number of balls stored in the spare is small compared to n and can be accommodated by the $o(1)$ term in the space bounds [DadH90, DadHPP06, PP08, ANS10, BFG⁺18]. Since the spare stores a sublinear number of elements, space inefficient dictionaries can be employed to implement the spare.

Two challenges with this approach need to be addressed: (1) Organize the spare such that it can be accessed and updated in a constant number of memory accesses. (2) Manage the spare so that it does not overflow. In particular, to avoid an overflow of the spare in the fully-dynamic setting, one must make sure that balls are not only added to the spare but also moved back to their bins. For the balls-into-bins analysis to remain valid over a sequence of insertions and deletions, an invariant is maintained that requires that a ball be stored in the spare only when its bin is

⁸This assumption is unavoidable if one wants to design a filter using the reduction of Carter *et al.* [CFG⁺78].

⁹This is why a fully-dynamic dictionary for sets cannot be used out-of-the-box as a fully-dynamic filter.

¹⁰We abuse notation and interpret $q(x)$ both as a number in $[n]$ and a binary string of $\log n$ bits.

full (Invariant 16). This means that whenever a ball from a full bin is deleted, one needs to move another ball from the spare back to the bin.

The implementation of the spare plays a crucial role in whether the dictionary supports deletions, duplicates, or operations in constant time. The dictionary of Arbitman *et al.* [ANS10] manages the spare as a de-amortized cuckoo hash table [ANS09] (so operations are in constant time). Each time an element is relocated within the cuckoo hash table, it checks if its corresponding bin is not full. If so, it leaves the spare and returns to its bin (hence, deletions are supported). However, the implementation of the spare in [ANS10] does not extend to filters with deletions because their implementation does not support duplicate elements.

Sparse vs. Dense Cases. Most dictionary and filter constructions consider two cases (sparse/dense) based on the relative size of the dataset with respect to the size of the universe (see [BM99,RR03,DadHPP06,ANS10,BFG⁺18]). In the case of filters, the two cases are separated based on the value of ε . (See Def. 11).

In the dense case, elements are short enough (in bits) that a bin can pack all the elements that hash into it within a word (so an element can be found by searching its corresponding bin in constant time). The challenge in the sparse case is that the remainders are long, and bins no longer fit in a constant number of words. Arbitman *et al.* [ANS10] employ additional structures in this case (i.e., global lookup tables) that point to the location in which the remainder of an element is (separately) stored.

1.3.2 Our Techniques

Reduction Using Random Multisets. We introduce a relaxation of the Pagh *et al.* [PPR05] condition that a dictionary must support multisets to function as a fully-dynamic filter (Sec. 3). This relaxation is based on the observation that it suffices for the dictionary to support random multisets for the reduction of Carter *et al.* [CFG⁺78] to succeed. Theorem 1 provides the first such dictionary. Applying the reduction to the Crate Dictionary gives Theorem 2. While random invertible permutations yield a reduction from a set to a random set [DadHPP06,ANS10] (see Assumption 25), this is not the case for multisets. Indeed, the image of a multiset with respect to a random permutation is not a random multiset.

Pocket Dictionary. The starting point of our dictionary construction is the idea that the bins the elements hash to (based on their random quotients) should behave like self-contained dictionaries. Moreover, these dictionaries should be space-efficient and fit in a constant number of words so that all operations on them can be executed in a constant number of memory accesses.

Specifically, the basic building blocks of our design are small local data structures that we employ in a modular, black-box fashion (Sec. 4). To this end, we construct a simple space-efficient dictionary for small general multisets of elements whose quotients belong to a limited range. We refer to this construction as a *pocket dictionary*. These small dictionaries function as bins; elements choose a bin based on their (random) quotient.

Pocket dictionaries are space-efficient and use at most two extra bits per element overall. This is an improvement over previous packing techniques in which the number of bits per element is 3 [Cle84,BFJ⁺12] and 17/8 [PBJP17]. We note that the practical filter proposed in Pagh *et al.* [PPR05] also uses two extra bits per element. However, they use a variant of linear probing and therefore, the runtime of the operations is not constant (in the worst case) and depends on the load. Arbitman *et al.* [ANS10] manage the bins by employing a global lookup table for storing the encodings of all possible subsets stored in a bin.

The simplicity of the pocket dictionary design gives it flexibility. In particular, we also construct variants that support variable-length remainders (VarPD) or count multiplicities of elements (CSD).

Distributed Spares. To facilitate constant time access in the spare, we propose to manage the spare by partitioning it across intervals of pocket dictionaries (hereafter referred to as *crates*). Specifically, we allocate one distributed spare per crate such that each distributed spare stores the overflow only from the pocket dictionaries in its crate (see Section 5.4). With high probability, at most $\text{poly}(w)$ elements are stored in each distributed spare (however, the elements no longer form a random multiset). Each distributed spare is implemented as a *space-inefficient dictionary* (SID).

The key advantage of distributed spares is that doubly linked lists of elements from the same pocket dictionary can be implemented by storing pointers of length $O(\log w)$ alongside the elements (as opposed to pointers of length $\log n$ in the case of a global spare). These linked lists enable us to move an element from the spare back to its bin in a constant number of memory accesses.

The first technical challenge with this approach is that the elements stored in a SID no longer form a random multiset. To this end, we implement each SID as an array of CSDs that can maintain general multisets (See Appendix B). The second technical challenge is that the probability of overflow of the components in each SID must be exponentially small in their size. (Indeed, their size is $O(w)$ and the tolerated failure probability is at most $1/\text{poly}(n)$.) We formalize the properties of the SID in the following lemma.

Lemma 5. *The SID with parameter $n' = \text{poly}(w)$ is a fully-dynamic dictionary that maintains (general) multisets of cardinality at most n' from a universe \mathcal{U} with the following guarantees: (1) For every polynomial in n' sequence of insert, delete, and query operations, the SID does not overflow with probability at least $1 - e^{-\Omega(w)}$. (2) If the SID does not overflow, then every operation (query, insert, delete) can be completed using at most $2 \cdot \frac{\log(|\mathcal{U}|)}{w} + O(1)$ memory accesses. (3) The required space is $O(w n' \log(|\mathcal{U}|))$ bits.*

Note the extra w factor in the space requirement that justifies the term space-inefficient dictionary. The SID also supports a special delete operation called pop, with the same performance guarantees (for an elaboration on the pop operation, see Sec. 5.4.1).

Variable-Length Adaptive Remainders. In the sparse case, reading even one remainder of an element might require more than $O(1)$ memory accesses. (The word length might be smaller than $\log(|\mathcal{U}|/n)$, the length of a remainder.) We propose to solve this problem by maintaining variable-length prefixes of the remainders (Sec. 6.1). We call such prefixes *adaptive remainders*. We maintain the adaptive remainders dynamically such that they are minimal and prefix-free (Invariant 26).

The full remainder of an element is stored separately from its adaptive remainder but their locations are synchronized. Specifically, the key property of the adaptive remainders is that they allow us to find the location of an element x using a constant number of memory accesses, regardless of the length of x .¹¹ Indeed, one may view this technique as a method for dynamically maintaining a perfect hashing of the elements in the same bin with the same quotient. As opposed to typical perfect hashing schemes in which the images of the elements are of the same length, we employ variable-length images. The adaptive remainders have, on average, constant length so they do not affect space efficiency. Indeed, considering variable-length adaptive remainders allows us to

¹¹The “location” of an element x is ambiguous since x might not even be in the dataset. More precisely, we can certify whether x is in the dataset or not by reading at most two full remainders and these full remainders can be located in a constant number of memory accesses (see Claim 30).

bypass existing space bounds on dynamic perfect hash functions that depend on the size of the universe [MPP05].

Prefix-free variable-length adaptive fingerprints are employed in the adaptive Broom filter of Bender *et al.* [BFG⁺18] to fix false positives and maintain distinct fingerprints for elements in the filter. Their adaptive fingerprints are computed by accessing an external memory reverse hash table that is not counted in the filter’s space.¹² We emphasize that all our adaptive remainders are computed in-memory.

1.4 Related Work

The topic of dictionary and filter design is a fundamental theme in the theory and practice of data structures. We restrict our focus to the results that are closest to our setting.

Dictionaries. To the best of our knowledge, the dictionary of Arbitman *et al.* [ANS10] is the only space-efficient fully-dynamic dictionary for sets that performs queries, insertions, and deletions in constant time in the worst case with high probability.

Several other fully-dynamic constructions support operations in constant time with high probability [DadH90,DDMM05,DadHPP06,ANS09] but are not space-efficient. On the other hand, some dictionaries are space-efficient but do not have constant time guarantees with high probability for all of their operations [RR03,FPSS05,Pan05,DW07]. For the static case, several space-efficient constructions exist that perform queries in constant time [BM99,Pag01,Pät08].

Filters. In the context of filters, to the best of our knowledge, only a few space-efficient constructions have proven guarantees. We focus here on space-efficient filters that perform operations in a constant number of memory accesses (albeit with different probabilistic guarantees). The fully-dynamic filter of Pagh *et al.* [PPR05] supports constant time queries and insertions and deletions in amortized expected constant time. The incremental filter of Arbitman *et al.* [ANS10] performs queries in constant time and insertions in constant time with high probability. The construction of Bender *et al.* [BFG⁺18] describes an adaptive filter¹³ equipped with an external memory reverse hash table that supports queries, insertions and deletions in constant time with high probability. (The space of the reverse hash table is not counted in the space of their filter.) Space-efficient filters for the static case have been studied extensively [Mit02,DW07,DP08,Por09]. Several heuristics such as the cuckoo filter [FAKM14], the quotient filter [BFJ⁺12,PBJP17] and variations of the Bloom filter [Blo70] have been reported to work well in practice.

1.5 Paper Organization

The preliminaries are in Section 2. In Section 3, we discuss the reduction from a fully-dynamic dictionary on random multisets to a fully-dynamic filter on sets. In Section 4, we describe the structure of the pocket dictionary and its variants. We also briefly mention some auxiliary data structures which we employ and whose complete description can be found in Appendix B.

The description and analysis of the Crate Dictionary are covered in two parts. In Section 5, we discuss the Crate Dictionary construction and analysis in the dense case. The distributed spares are described in Section 5.4. Section 6 covers the Crate Dictionary in the sparse case. Section 7 describes the modifications required to perform static retrieval.

¹²The reverse hash table allows the filter to look up an element based on its fingerprint in the filter. [BFG⁺18].

¹³Loosely speaking, an adaptive filter is one that fixes false positives after they occur [BFG⁺18,MPR18].

2 Preliminaries

Notation. The *indicator function* of a set S is the function $\mathbb{1}_S : S \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ defined by

$$\mathbb{1}_S(x) \triangleq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in S, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \notin S. \end{cases}$$

For any positive k , let $[k]$ denote the set $\{0, \dots, [k] - 1\}$. For a string $a \in \{0, 1\}^*$, let $|a|$ denote the length of a in bits.

We define the range of a hash function h to be a set of natural numbers $[k]$ and also treat the image $h(x)$ as a binary string, i.e., the binary representation of $h(x)$ using $\lceil \log_2 k \rceil$ bits.

Given two strings, $a, b \in \{0, 1\}^*$, the concatenation of a and b is denoted by $a \circ b$. We denote the fact that a is a prefix of b by $a \subseteq b$.

Definition 6. A sequence of strings $A \triangleq \{a_1, \dots, a_s\}$ is prefix-free if, for every $i \neq j$, the string a_i is not a prefix of a_j .

2.1 Filter and Dictionary Definitions

Let \mathcal{U} denote the universe of all possible elements.

Operations. We consider three types of operations:

- $\text{insert}(x_t)$ - insert $x_t \in \mathcal{U}$ to the dataset.
- $\text{delete}(x_t)$ - delete $x_t \in \mathcal{U}$ from the dataset.
- $\text{query}(x_t)$ - is $x_t \in \mathcal{U}$ in the dataset?

Dynamic Sets and Random Multisets. Every sequence of operations $R = \{\text{op}_t\}_{t=1}^T$ defines a *dynamic set* $\mathcal{D}(t)$ over \mathcal{U} as follows.¹⁴

$$\mathcal{D}(t) \triangleq \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } t = 0 \\ \mathcal{D}(t-1) \cup \{x_t\} & \text{if } \text{op}_t = \text{insert}(x_t) \\ \mathcal{D}(t-1) \setminus \{x_t\} & \text{if } \text{op}_t = \text{delete}(x_t) \\ \mathcal{D}(t-1) & \text{if } t > 0 \text{ and } \text{op}_t = \text{query}(x_t). \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Definition 7. A multiset \mathcal{M} over \mathcal{U} is a function $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. We refer to $\mathcal{M}(x)$ as the multiplicity of x . If $\mathcal{M}(x) = 0$, we say that x is not in the multiset. We refer to $\sum_{x \in \mathcal{U}} \mathcal{M}(x)$ as the cardinality of the multiset and denote it by $|\mathcal{M}|$.

The *support* of the multiset is the set $\{x \mid \mathcal{M}(x) \neq 0\}$. The *maximum multiplicity* of a multiset is $\max_{x \in \mathcal{U}} \mathcal{M}(x)$.

¹⁴ The definition of state in Equation 1 does not rule out a deletion of $x \notin \mathcal{D}(t-1)$. However, we assume that $\text{op}_t = \text{delete}(x_t)$ only if $x_t \in \mathcal{D}(t-1)$. See Assumption 4 and the discussion therein.

A *dynamic multiset* $\{\mathcal{M}_t\}_t$ is specified by a sequence of insert and delete operations. Let \mathcal{M}_t denote the multiset after t operations.¹⁵

$$\mathcal{M}_t(x) \triangleq \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t = 0 \\ \mathcal{M}_{t-1}(x) + 1 & \text{if } \text{op}_t = \text{insert}(x) \\ \mathcal{M}_{t-1}(x) - 1 & \text{if } \text{op}_t = \text{delete}(x) \\ \mathcal{M}_{t-1}(x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We say that a dynamic multiset $\{\mathcal{M}_t\}_t$ has cardinality at most n if $|\mathcal{M}_t| \leq n$, for every t .

Definition 8. A *dynamic multiset* \mathcal{M} over \mathcal{U} is a random multiset if for every t , the multiset \mathcal{M}_t is the outcome of independent uniform samples (with replacements) from \mathcal{U} .

Fully-Dynamic Filters. A *fully-dynamic filter* is a data structure that maintains a dynamic set $\mathcal{D}(t) \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ and is parameterized by an error parameter $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Consider an input sequence that specifies a dynamic set $\mathcal{D}(t)$, for every t . The filter outputs a bit for every query operation. We denote the output that corresponds to $\text{query}(x_t)$ by $\text{out}_t \in \{0, 1\}$. We require that the output satisfy the following condition:

$$\text{op}_t = \text{query}(x_t) \Rightarrow \text{out}_t \geq \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}(t)}(x_t) . \quad (2)$$

The output out_t is an approximation of $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}(t)}(x_t)$ with a one-sided error. Namely, if $x_t \in \mathcal{D}(t)$, then out_t must equal 1.

Definition 9 (false positive event). Let FP_t denote the event that $\text{op}_t = \text{query}(x_t)$, $\text{out}_t = 1$ and $x_t \notin \mathcal{D}(t)$.

The error parameter $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ is used to bound the probability of a false positive error.

Definition 10. We say that the false positive probability in a filter is bounded by ε if it satisfies the following property. For every sequence R of operations and every t ,

$$\Pr [FP_t] \leq \varepsilon .$$

The probability space in a filter is induced only by the random choices (i.e., choice of hash functions) that the filter makes. Note also that if $\text{op}_t = \text{op}_{t'} = \text{query}(x)$, where $x \notin \mathcal{D}(t) \cup \mathcal{D}(t')$, then the events FP_t and $FP_{t'}$ may not be independent (see [BFG⁺18, MPR18] for a discussion of repeated false positive events and adaptivity).

Fully-Dynamic Dictionaries. A *fully-dynamic dictionary* with parameter n is a fully-dynamic filter with parameters n and $\varepsilon = 0$. In the case of multisets, the response out_t of a fully-dynamic dictionary to a $\text{query}(x_t)$ operation must satisfy $\text{out}_t = 1$ iff $\mathcal{M}_t(x_t) > 0$.¹⁶

When we say that a filter or a dictionary has parameter n , we mean that the cardinality of the input set/multiset is at most n at all points in time.

¹⁵As in the case of fully-dynamic sets, we require that $\text{op}_t = \text{delete}(x_t)$ only if $\mathcal{M}_{t-1}(x_t) > 0$.

¹⁶One may also define $\text{out}_t = \mathcal{M}_t(x_t)$.

Success Probability and Probability Space. We say that a dictionary (filter) *works* for sets and random multisets if the probability that the dictionary does not overflow is high (i.e., it is $\geq 1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$). The probability in the case of random multisets is taken over both the random choices of the dictionary and the distribution of the random multisets. In the case of sets, the success probability depends only on the random choices of the dictionary.

Relative Sparseness. The relative sparseness [BM99] of a set (or multiset) $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ is the ratio $|\mathcal{U}|/|\mathcal{D}|$. We denote the relative sparseness by ρ . In the fully-dynamic setting, we define the relative sparseness to be $\rho \triangleq |\mathcal{U}|/n$, where n is the upper bound on $|\mathcal{D}(t)|$.

Recall that $w = \Omega(\log n)$ denotes the memory word length. We differentiate between two cases in the design of dictionaries, depending on the ratio w/ρ .

Definition 11. *The dense case occurs when $w/\rho = \Omega_n(1)$. The sparse case occurs when $w/\rho = o_n(1)$.*¹⁷

The reduction from dictionaries (see Sec 3) implies that the dictionaries used to implement the filter have a relative sparseness $\rho = 1/\varepsilon$. Hence, in the case of filters, we differentiate between the *high error* case, in which $\varepsilon = \Omega_n(1/w)$, and the *low error* case in which $\varepsilon = o_n(1/w)$.

3 Reduction: Filters Based on Dictionaries

In this section, we extend the reduction of Carter *et al.* [CFG⁺78] to construct fully-dynamic filters out of fully-dynamic dictionaries for random multisets. Our reduction can be seen as a relaxation of the reduction of Pagh *et al.* [PPR05]. Instead of requiring that the underlying dictionary support multisets, we require that it only supports random multisets.

Claim 12. *Consider a random hash function $h : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow [\frac{n}{\varepsilon}]$ and let $\mathcal{D}(t) \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ denote a dynamic set whose cardinality never exceeds n . Then $h(\mathcal{D}(t))$ is a random multiset of cardinality at most n .*

Since h is random, an “adversary” that generates the sequence of insertions and deletions for $h(\mathcal{D}(t))$ is an oblivious adversary in the following sense. When inserting, it inserts a random element (which may be a duplicate of a previously inserted element¹⁸). When deleting at time t , it specifies a previous time $t' < t$ in which an insertion took place, and requests to delete the element that was inserted at time $t' < t$.

Let Dict denote a fully-dynamic dictionary for random multisets of cardinality at most n from the universe $[\frac{n}{\varepsilon}]$. The following lemma proves that Theorem 2 is implied by Theorem 1.

Lemma 13. *For every dynamic set $\mathcal{D}(t)$ of cardinality at most n , the dictionary Dict with respect to the random multiset $h(\mathcal{D}(t))$ and universe $[\frac{n}{\varepsilon}]$ is a fully-dynamic filter for $\mathcal{D}(t)$ with parameters n and ε .*

Proof Sketch. The Dict records the multiplicity of $h(x_t)$ in the multiset $h(\mathcal{D}(t))$ and so deletions are performed correctly. The filter outputs 1 if and only if the multiplicity of $h(x_t)$ is positive. False positive events are caused by collisions in h . Therefore, the probability of a false positive is bounded by ε because of the cardinality of the range of h . \square

¹⁷By $w/\rho = o_n(1)$, we mean that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{w}{\rho} = 0$. By $w/\rho = \Omega_n(1)$, we mean that there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $w/\rho \geq c$, for sufficiently large values of n .

¹⁸Duplicates in $h(\mathcal{D}(t))$ are caused by collisions (i.e., $h(x) = h(y)$) rather than by reinsertions.

4 The Pocket Dictionary

In this section, we propose a fully-dynamic dictionary construction for the special case of small multisets of elements consisting of quotient/remainder pairs (q_i, r_i) . This construction works provided that the quotients belong to a small interval. We emphasize that the data structure works for multisets in general, without the assumption that they are random.

Let $F \triangleq \{(q_i, r_i)\}_{i=0}^{f-1}$ denote the multiset of quotient/remainder pairs to be stored in the dictionary, with $q_i \in [m]$ and $|r_i| = \ell$, for every $i \in [f]$. Namely, m is the length of the interval that contains the quotients $q_i \in [m]$, f is an upper bound on the number of elements (q_i, r_i) that will be stored in the dictionary, and ℓ is the length in bits of each remainder r_i . We store F in a data structure called a *pocket dictionary* denoted by $\text{PD}(m, f, \ell)$.

The pocket dictionary data structure uses two binary strings, denoted by $\text{header}(F)$ and $\text{body}(F)$, as follows. Let $n_q \triangleq |\{i \in [f] \mid q_i = q\}|$ denote the number of elements that share the same quotient q . The header $\text{header}(F)$ stores the vector (n_0, \dots, n_{m-1}) in unary as the string $1^{n_0} \circ 0 \circ \dots \circ 1^{n_{m-1}} \circ 0$. The length of the header is $m + f$. The body $\text{body}(F)$ is the concatenation of remainders r_i sorted in nondecreasing lexicographic order of $\{(q_i, r_i)\}_{i \in [f]}$. The length of the body is $f \cdot \ell$. We refer the reader to Figure 1 for a depiction.




Figure 1: **Pocket Dictionary Encoding.** Given $F = \{(0, 001011), (0, 011111), (0, 100100), (1, 101111), (3, 001010), (3, 011111), (4, 000111), (4, 000111)\}$, on the left we have its open address hash table representation and on the right, the way it is encoded in a $\text{PD}(5, 8, 6)$.

Let $|\text{PD}(m, f)| = |\text{header}(F)| + |\text{body}(F)|$ denote the number of bits used to store F . Recall that the word length w satisfies $w = \Omega(\log n)$.

Claim 14. *The number of bits that $\text{PD}(m, f, \ell)$ requires is $m + f(1 + \ell)$. If $f = O(m)$, $\ell \leq w$ and $m = O(\frac{w}{\ell})$, then $\text{PD}(m, f, \ell)$ fits in a constant number of words.*

One can decode F given $\text{header}(F)$ and $\text{body}(F)$. Moreover, one can modify $\text{header}(F)$ and $\text{body}(F)$ to reflect updates (insertions and deletions) to F . When the pocket dictionary fits in a constant number of words, all operations on the multiset can, therefore, be executed using a constant number of memory accesses.

We say that a pocket dictionary $\text{PD}(m, f, \ell)$ overflows if more than f quotient/remainder pairs are stored in it.

4.1 Variable-Length Pocket Dictionary

The use of variable-length adaptive remainders for the sparse case requires a variant of the pocket dictionary that supports variable-length values. We refer to this construction as the *variable-length*

symbol	value	role
μ	$\sqrt{\frac{3}{m} \cdot \ln(6w^{\beta/3})}$	extra capacity (over the average) per PD
ℓ	$\log \rho$	length of $r(x)$
m	$\frac{w}{\ell}$	interval of quotients per PD
f	$(1 + \mu)m$	capacity of PD
β	$6 + \delta$	exponent affecting number of crates, for $\delta > 0$
β'	$5 + 0.75 \cdot \delta$	exponent affecting size of SID
C	w^β	n/C is the number of crates.
C'	$w^{\beta'}$	capacity of the SID

Table 1: Internal parameters of a Crate Dictionary with parameter n . Recall that $\rho = |U|/n$.

pocket dictionary (VarPD). This variant shares most of its design with the pocket dictionary with fixed size remainders. We briefly describe the required modifications.

We denote this modified pocket dictionary by $\text{VarPD}(M, F, L)$. This new dictionary is in charge of storing at most F variable-length remainders $\{r_i\}_{i \in [F]}$ with quotients $q_i \in [M]$, where $\sum_{i \in [F]} |r_i| \leq L$. The header of the dictionary is the same as in $\text{PD}(M, F, L)$. The body consists of the list of remainders separated by an “end-of-string” symbol. The list of remainders appears in the body in nondecreasing lexicographic order of the strings (q_i, r_i) . We suggest to simply use two bits to represent the ternary alphabet, so the space requirement of the pocket dictionary for variable-length remainders at most doubles.

Claim 15. *The number of bits that $\text{VarPD}(M, F, L)$ requires is $|\text{VarPD}(M, F, L)| \leq M + 3F + 2L$. If $\max\{M, F, L\} = O(w)$, then $\text{VarPD}(M, F, L)$ fits in a constant number of words.*

We say that a variable-length pocket dictionary $\text{VarPD}(M, F, L)$ overflows if the cardinality of the multiset exceeds F or the total length of the remainders exceeds L .

4.2 Auxiliary Data Structures

We employ two additional data structures for storing elements whose pocket dictionaries overflow. The first data structure is a space-inefficient variant of the pocket dictionary, called a *counting set dictionary* (CSD). Its variable-length counterpart is called a *variable-length counting set dictionary* (VarCSD). These data structures need not be space-efficient since, across all distributed spares, they store only a sublinear number of elements. A key property of the CSD is that its failure probability (i.e. overflow) is exponentially small in its capacity. The implementation details of these auxiliary data structures appear in Appendix B.

5 Crate Dictionary - Dense Case

In this section, we present a fully-dynamic dictionary for sets and random multisets for the case in which the relative sparseness satisfies $w/\rho = \Omega_n(1)$. We refer to this construction as the Crate Dictionary for the dense case.

5.1 Structure

The Crate Dictionary is parametrized by the cardinality n of the dynamic random multiset. The dictionary consists of two levels of dictionaries. The dictionaries in the first level are called *crates*.

Each crate consists of two main parts: a set of pocket dictionaries (in which most of the elements are stored) and a space-inefficient dictionary (SID) that stores elements whose corresponding pocket dictionary is full. The internal parameters of the Crate Dictionary are summarized in Table 1. See Fig. 2 for a depiction of the structure of each crate.

The number of crates is n/C . The number of pocket dictionaries in each crate is C/m , and each pocket dictionary is a $\text{PD}(m, f, \ell)$. The space inefficient dictionary $\text{SID}(\tilde{f}, \tilde{\ell})$ stores at most \tilde{f} elements, each of length $\tilde{\ell}$ bits. Each SID is implemented using counting set dictionaries (Sec. B.1). We elaborate on the structure and functionality of the SID separately in Sec. 5.4.




Figure 2: **Crate Structure.** Each crate has C/m PD's, an array of C/m pointers (i.e, one pointer per PD) and a $\text{SID}(\tilde{f}, \tilde{\ell})$. The SID consists of \tilde{f} CSD's that store elements and pointers.

5.2 Element Representation

Without loss of generality, we have that $\mathcal{U} = [\rho n]$. Since the multiset is random, its elements are chosen with replacements u.a.r. and independently from $[\rho n]$. We represent each $x \in [\rho n]$ by a 4-tuple $(h^c(x), h^b(x), q(x), r(x))$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
 h^c(x) &\triangleq \left\lfloor \frac{x}{\lceil \rho \cdot C \rceil} \right\rfloor \in \left[\frac{n}{C} \right] && \text{(crate index)} \\
 h^b(x) &\triangleq \left\lfloor \frac{x \pmod{\lceil \rho \cdot C \rceil}}{\lceil \rho m \rceil} \right\rfloor \in \left[\frac{C}{m} \right] && \text{(PD index)} \\
 q(x) &\triangleq \left\lfloor \frac{x \pmod{\lceil \rho \cdot C \rceil} \pmod{\lceil \rho m \rceil}}{\lceil \rho \rceil} \right\rfloor \in [m] && \text{(PD quotient)} \\
 r(x) &\triangleq x \pmod{\lceil \rho \cdot C \rceil} \pmod{\lceil \rho m \rceil} \pmod{\lceil \rho \rceil} \in [\rho] && \text{(PD remainder)}
 \end{aligned}$$

Informally, consider the binary representation of x , then $r(x)$ is the least significant $\log \rho$ bits, $q(x)$ is the next $\log m$ bits, and so on.

An element x is stored in the crate of index $h^c(x)$. Within its crate, the element x is stored in one of two places: (1) in the pocket dictionary of index $h^b(x)$ that stores $(q(x), r(x))$, or (2) in

the SID that stores $(h^b(x), q(x), r(x))$. (Storing $h^b(x)$ in the SID avoids spurious collisions since elements from all the full pocket dictionaries in the crate are stored in the same SID.)

5.3 Functionality

An operation on element $x \in \mathcal{U}$ is forwarded to the crate whose index is $h^c(x)$. We elaborate here on how a crate $h^c(x)$ supports queries, insertions, and deletions involving an element x . Operations to the SID are described in Sec. 5.4.

A $\text{query}(x)$ is implemented by searching for $(q(x), r(x))$ in the pocket dictionary of index $h^b(x)$ in the crate. If the pocket dictionary is full and the element has not been found, the query is forwarded to the SID.

An $\text{insert}(x)$ operation first attempts to insert $(q(x), r(x))$ in the pocket dictionary of index $h^b(x)$ in the crate. If the pocket dictionary is full, it forwards the insertion to the SID.

To make sure that the SID does not overflow whp in the fully-dynamic setting, we maintain the following invariant.

Invariant 16. *An element y is stored in the SID only if the pocket dictionary of index $h^b(y)$ in crate $h^c(y)$ is full.*

As a consequence, an element stored in the SID must be moved to its corresponding pocket dictionary whenever this pocket dictionary is no longer full due to a deletion. We refer to the operation of retrieving such an element from the SID as a *pop* operation (Sec. 5.4.1).

To maintain Invariant 16, a $\text{delete}(x)$ differentiates between the following cases depending on where x is stored and whether its pocket dictionary is full:

1. If $(q(x), r(x))$ is in the pocket dictionary of index $h^b(x)$ and the pocket dictionary was not full before the deletion, we simply delete x from the pocket dictionary and return.
2. If $(q(x), r(x))$ is in the pocket dictionary of index $h^b(x)$ and the pocket dictionary was full before the deletion, we delete $(q(x), r(x))$ from the pocket dictionary and issue a $\text{pop}(h^b(x))$ to the SID. The pop operation returns a triple $(h^b(y), q(y), r(y))$, where $h^b(y) = h^b(x)$ (if any). We then insert $(q(y), r(y))$ into the pocket dictionary of index $h^b(y)$ and return.
3. If $(h^b(x), q(x), r(x))$ is found in the SID of crate $q_c(x)$, we delete it from the SID.

Note that duplicate elements must be stored to support random multisets. In particular, a deletion should erase only one duplicate (or decrease the counter in the SID appropriately). This description allows for copies of the same element to reside both in the SID and outside the SID. Precedence is given to storing elements in the pocket dictionaries because the SID is used only for elements that do not fit in their pocket dictionaries due to overflow. (One could consider a version in which deletions and insertions of duplicates are first applied to the SID.)

5.4 A Space-Inefficient Dictionary (SID)

The space-inefficient dictionary (SID) is a fully-dynamic dictionary for arbitrary dynamic multisets. It is used for storing elements whose pocket dictionaries are full. A SID supports queries, insertions, deletions, and pop operations (see Sec. 5.4.1 for a specification of pop operations). A key property of a SID is that the probability of overflow is at most $1/\text{poly}(n)$. Note that this bound on the probability of overflow can be exponentially small in the cardinality of the multiset stored by a

symbol	value	role
\tilde{f}	$O(C')$	bound on the cardinality of the multiset and the number of CSDs per SID
$\tilde{\ell}$	$O(\log w)$	length of $(h^b(x), q(x), r(x))$
\hat{f}	$cw/\hat{\ell}$	cardinality of the support of the multiset in CSD
$\hat{\ell}$	$\tilde{\ell} + O(\log w)$	length element plus pointers
\hat{c}	\hat{f}	bound on multiplicity of element in CSD
c	$O(1)$	constant affecting exponent in overflow probability

Table 2: Parametrization of the SID.

CSD in the SID.^{19,20} The explicit bits of an element x stored in the SID are $(h^b(x), q(x), r(x))$. See Fig. 3 for a depiction.

Counting Set Dictionaries. The basic building block of the SID is a data structure called the *counting set dictionary* (CSD). Each CSD stores a multiset of elements. The data structure is parametrized by the cardinality of the support set of the multiset and by the maximum multiplicity of elements in the multiset. The CSD stores $(h^b(x), q(x), r(x))$ and pointers of length $O(\log w)$ used to support **pop** operations. More details on the CSD can be found in Appendix B.1.

Structure. The parameters used for the design of the SID are summarized in Table 2. A SID consists of \tilde{f} counting set dictionaries $\text{CSD}(\hat{f}, \hat{\ell}, \hat{c})$.²¹ By Claim 37, each CSD fits in a constant number of words. An independent fresh random hash function $\tilde{h} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow [\tilde{f}]$ is utilized to map each element to one of the CSDs in the SID. We note that \tilde{h} must be independent of h^b for the analysis of the maximum loads in each CSD to work (the same hash function \tilde{h} may be used for all SIDs).²²

Functionality. Each insert, delete and query operation on an element x is forwarded to the CSD of index $\tilde{h}(x)$. Multiplicities are counted using counters in the CSD. If the counter becomes zero after a deletion, the element is lazily removed from the CSD. The pop operation is described separately in Sec. 5.4.1. Since each CSD fits in a constant number of words, all these operations require only a constant number of memory accesses.

5.4.1 Pop Operations

To maintain Invariant 16 after $\text{delete}(x)$, a **pop** operation is issued to the SID of crate $h^c(x)$ whenever the pocket dictionary of index $h^b(x)$ transitions from full to non-full. The input is the index $h^b(x)$ of the pocket dictionary and the output $(h^b(y), q(y), r(y))$ is the explicit part of an element y stored in the SID with the property that $h^b(y) = h^b(x)$. A copy of the element y is then deleted from the SID and inserted into the pocket dictionary of index $h^b(x)$.

¹⁹Maybe previous dictionary designs such as [PT14, DadHPP06] can be parameterized to work with exponentially small failure probabilities.

²⁰The probability space over which overflow is bounded depends only on the random hash function of the SID.

²¹We pessimistically set the upper bound \hat{c} on the maximum multiplicity of any element in a CSD to be the cardinality \hat{f} of the dynamic multiset stored in the SID.

²²We note that if $(h^b(x), q(x), r(x)) = (h^b(y), q(y), r(y))$ are stored in the same SID, then $x = y$.




Figure 3: **SID Structure.** Each CSD_i explicitly stores $(h^b(x), q(x), r(x))$ contiguously in non-decreasing lexicographic order for every element x with $\tilde{h}(x) = i$ that is not stored in the PDs. We remark that no attempt to save space is made since the SID stores a sublinear number of elements. Each distinct element stored in the CSD has an associated counter and `next` and `prev` pointers for maintaining doubly-linked lists. The pointers refer to indices of CSDs. The same pointers are stored across all elements in a given CSD that belong to the same PD. In the figure, the doubly linked list for PD_b starts with CSD_k , goes to CSD_0 and ends at $CSD_{\tilde{f}-1}$.

Structure. In order to support `pop` operations, the SID keeps a doubly linked list per PD_i (see Fig. 3). The doubly linked list L_i of PD_i contains the indexes of the CSDs that store elements x such that $h^b(x) = i$. The doubly linked list L_i is implemented by storing pointers to CSDs alongside the elements $\{h^b(x), q(x), r(x) \mid h^b(x) = i\}$ stored in the CSDs.

The fact that each crate has its own SID implies that the pointers we store require only $\log \tilde{f} = O(\log w)$ bits. A separate array is used to store the list heads.

Functionality. Insertion of a new element x to the SID is implemented as follows. Recall that x is mapped to the CSD of index $\tilde{h}(x)$. If $CSD_{\tilde{h}(x)}$ already contains an element y such that $h^b(y) = h^b(x)$, then x is inserted using the same pointers of y . Otherwise, x is inserted to the CSD, its pointer is set to the head of $L_{h^b(x)}$, and the head of the list is updated to $\tilde{h}(x)$.

If a duplicate element is inserted, the counter is merely incremented. Deletion of x from the SID decrements the counter. If there is no other remaining element y in $CSD_{\tilde{h}(x)}$ with $h^b(y) = h^b(x)$, then we update pointers in $L_{h^b(x)}$ to skip over $CSD_{\tilde{h}(x)}$.

A `pop` operation with input i returns the first element y from the CSD pointed to by the head

L_i with $h^b(y) = i$. The counter of y is decremented. If y 's counter reaches zero, we continue as if y is deleted. The overhead in memory accesses required to support the doubly linked lists is constant.

5.4.2 Analysis: Proof of Lemma 5 in the dense case

Even if the cardinality of the dynamic multiset stored in the SID is at most \tilde{f} , there are two possible causes for an overflow of the SID: (1) more than \hat{f} distinct elements are stored in a CSD or, (2) more than \hat{c} copies of the same element are stored.

Two technical challenges arise when we try to bound the probability of overflow in the SID: (1) The triples $(h^b(x), q(x), r(x))$ stored in the SID are neither independent nor distributed u.a.r. and, (2) The number of elements stored in the SID is \tilde{f} , yet we seek an upper bound on the overflow probability that is $1/\text{poly}(n)$.

Consider a dynamic multiset stored in the SID over a polynomial number of insertions and deletions to the Crate Dictionary.

Claim 17. *If the cardinality of the dynamic multiset stored in the SID is at most \tilde{f} , then the counting set dictionaries in the SID do not overflow whp.*

Proof. Since we set $\hat{c} = \tilde{f}$, the maximum multiplicity of an element in a CSD never exceeds the cardinality of the multiset in the SID. To complete the proof, we show that no more than \hat{f} distinct elements are stored per CSD.

Let k be the number of distinct elements that are stored in the SID. The probability that more than L distinct elements are mapped to a specific CSD is bounded by $\binom{k}{L} \cdot \tilde{f}^{-L} \leq (\frac{e}{L})^L$. Setting $L = \hat{f} \geq c \cdot w / O(\log(w))$ gives a probability that is at most a polynomial fraction of n (the exponent is linear in c). The claim follows by applying a union bound over all the CSDs in a SID and all time steps. \square

Claim 18. *If no CSD overflows, then every query, insert, delete, and pop to the SID requires a constant number of memory accesses.*

Proof. Every insert, delete, or query operation is executed by accessing the corresponding CSD. The parametrization of the CSD implies that it fits in a constant number of words (Claim 37) and therefore these operations require a constant number of memory accesses. Maintaining the doubly linked lists accesses one entry in the array and affects at most three different CSDs: one CSD that stores the element, its predecessor, and its successor. \square

Claim 19. *The number of bits required for storing a SID is $O(\tilde{f}w) + o(C)$.*

Proof. The SID has \tilde{f} counting set dictionaries, each of which fits in a constant number of words. Hence, the total space occupied by the CSDs is $O(\tilde{f} \cdot w)$ bits. The array of list head pointers requires $O(\log w \cdot C/m) = o(C)$ bits because each pointer takes $\log(\tilde{f}) = O(\log w)$ bits.²³ \square

5.5 Analysis: Proof of Theorem 1 in the dense case

Consider a dynamic random multiset of cardinality at most n specified by a sequence of $\text{poly}(n)$ insertions and deletions. We bound the number of memory accesses of each operation:

²³A shared datastructure for all the elements that do not fit in the ‘bins’ appears in [ANS10] and also [BFG⁺18]). However, in our case, such a shared SID would require $\Omega(n \log n)$ bits just for the array of pointers. This would render the Crate Dictionary space-inefficient.

Claim 20. *If none of the components of the Crate Dictionary for the dense case overflow, then every insert, delete, and query operation requires a constant number of memory accesses.*

Proof. Each operation accesses one pocket dictionary, forwards the operation to the SID, or issues a pop operation to the SID. By Claim 14, each pocket dictionary fits in a constant number of words, and hence each operation on a pocket dictionary requires only a constant number of memory accesses. Operations on the SID require only a constant number of memory accesses by Claim 18. \square

We now show that the Crate Dictionary in the dense case is space-efficient. We set $\mu \triangleq \sqrt{\frac{3}{m} \cdot \ln(6w^{\beta/3})}$. Since $m = w/\log(\rho)$, by the assumption that $w = \Omega(\log n)$ and given that we are in the dense case), we have that $\mu = \sqrt{\frac{\ln(w)\log(\rho)}{w}} = o(1)$. We first observe that only a polylogarithmic fraction of the bins in a crate will overflow whp.

Claim 21. *For every crate, at most $\frac{w^{2\beta/3}}{m}$ pocket dictionaries are full in the crate whp.*

Proof. Fix a crate. Let Z_i denote the number of elements that hash to the pocket dictionary of index i and let X_i be the indicator random variable that is 1 if $Z_i \geq (1 + \mu) \cdot m$ (i.e. the pocket dictionary of index i is full) and 0 otherwise. The total number of full pocket dictionary is denoted by $Y = \sum X_i$.

Since each element x is drawn independently and u.a.r., we have that $h^b(x)$ and $h^c(x)$ are values also chosen independently and u.a.r. We get that $E[Z_i] \leq m$. By Chernoff's bound, we have that $\Pr[Z_i \geq (1 + \mu) \cdot m] \leq \exp(-m \cdot \mu^2/3)$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[Z_i \geq (1 + \mu) \cdot m] &= \Pr\left[Z_i \geq (1 + \mu) \frac{m}{E[Z_i]} \cdot E[Z_i]\right] \\ &\leq \Pr\left[Z_i \geq \left(1 + \mu \frac{m}{E[Z_i]}\right) \cdot E[Z_i]\right] \\ &\leq \exp\left(-E[Z_i] \cdot \frac{\mu^2 m^2}{3E[Z_i]^2}\right) = \exp\left(-m\mu^2/3 \cdot \frac{m}{E[Z_i]}\right) \\ &\leq \exp(-m\mu^2/3) . \end{aligned}$$

The expected number of full pocket dictionaries satisfies:

$$E[Y] \leq \frac{C}{m} \cdot \exp(-m\mu^2/3) .$$

Note that by our choice of μ , we have that

$$6 \cdot E[Y] \leq 6 \cdot \frac{C}{m} \cdot \exp(-m\mu^2/3) = \frac{w^{2\beta/3}}{m} .$$

The random variables X_i are negatively associated, hence by Chernoff's bound [DR98],

$$\Pr\left[Y \geq \frac{w^{2\beta/3}}{m}\right] \leq 2^{-w^{2\beta/3}/m} .$$

For $\beta \geq 6 + \delta$, we have $2\beta/3 \geq 4 + 2\delta/3$, hence $\Pr\left[Y \geq \frac{w^{2\beta/3}}{m}\right]$ is at most $2^{-(3+\frac{2}{3}\delta)w}$. Since $w = \Omega(\log n)$, the claim follows. \square

In the following claim we bound the maximum number of elements that are assigned to the same pocket dictionary in a crate. Recall the notation of the proof of Claim 21, where Z_i denotes the number of elements assigned to pocket dictionary i .

Claim 22. *For every i and any random multiset set \mathcal{M} such that $|\mathcal{M}| \leq n$,*

$$\Pr [Z_i \geq m \log n] \leq n^{-\omega(1)} .$$

Proof. The random variable Z_i satisfies $E[Z_i] \leq m$. By Chernoff's bound, we have that

$$\Pr [Z_i \geq m \log n] \leq 2^{-m \log n} = n^{-m} ,$$

and the claim follows. □

Combining Claim 21 and Claim 22, we get that:

Claim 23. *The maximum number of elements stored in the SID of a crate is $O(w^{2\beta/3} \cdot \log n)$ whp. Therefore, whp, no more than \tilde{f} elements get stored in a specific SID if $\beta' > 1 + 2\beta/3$.*

We summarize the space requirements of the Crate Dictionary in the dense case.

Claim 24. *If $\beta - 1 > \beta' > 1 + 2\beta/3$, then the number of bits required for storing the Crate Dictionary in the dense case with parameters n and ρ is*

$$(1 + o(1)) \cdot n \log(\rho) + (2 + o(1))n .$$

Proof. We have n/m pocket dictionaries $\text{PD}(m, (1 + \mu)m, \log(1/\varepsilon))$, each of which takes

$$m + f(1 + \log(\rho)) = m \cdot (2 + \mu + (1 + \mu) \log(\rho))$$

bits (Claim 14). In total, the pocket dictionaries of the crates take $(1 + \mu)n \log(\rho) + (2 + \mu)n$ bits. There are n/C SID's. By Claim 19, all the SIDs require $O(\frac{n}{C} \cdot (fw + o(C))) = o(n)$ bits. The claim follows. □

Note that $\beta = 6 + \delta$ and $\beta' = 5 + 0.75 \cdot \delta$ satisfy the premise of the claim.

This completes the proof of Theorem 1 in the dense case.

5.6 The Case of Sets

In this section we discuss modifications in the design and analysis of a Crate Dictionary so that it supports sets rather than random multisets. (Note that this case is not relevant for the design of a filter based on a dictionary.)

One can simplify the design by replacing the counting set dictionaries with set dictionaries (simply omit the counters). This modification does not affect the number of memory accesses or the space efficiency.

The representation of the elements needs to be modified as follows. Following [ANS10], we employ a random invertible permutation $\tau : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$. This transformation implies that instead of maintaining the set \mathcal{D} , we maintain the set $\tau(\mathcal{D})$. Moreover, for every \mathcal{D} , the set $\tau(\mathcal{D})$ is a random subset of \mathcal{U} of cardinality $|\mathcal{D}|$. Invoking τ reduces the worst-case dataset to an average case one, as summarized by the following assumption.

Assumption 25. *By applying a random permutation, one may assume that the dataset \mathcal{D} in the case of a dictionary for sets is a random subset of at most n elements from $\{0,1\}^u$.*

Using Assumption 25, we can now proceed with the analysis as in the case of random multisets. The same guarantees follow since we obtain random hash values $h^c(x)$ and $h^b(x)$ that are uniformly distributed without replacements. The random variable Z_i is a sum of negatively associated random variables and the standard Chernoff bounds apply [DR98].

6 The Crate Dictionary - Sparse Case

In this section, we present a fully-dynamic dictionary for sets and random multisets for the case that the relative sparseness ρ satisfies $w/\rho = o_n(1)$. We refer to this construction as the Crate Dictionary for the sparse case.

6.1 Adaptive Remainders

Recall that the element x can be represented as the 4-tuple $(h^c(x), h^b(x), q(x), r(x))$, where each component is a disjoint block of bits of x . The main challenge in the sparse case comes from the fact that the PD remainder $r(x)$ can no longer be stored by a pocket dictionary or might not even fit in a word.

To overcome the fact that $r(x)$ is potentially too long, we compute a prefix $\alpha(x)$ of $r(x)$, called the *adaptive remainder* (see Fig. 4). The *adaptive fingerprint* of x is $(h^c(x), h^b(x), q(x), \alpha(x))$ and it satisfies : (1) distinct elements have distinct adaptive fingerprints that are prefix-free, (2) a pointer to the location of $r(x)$ is associated with the adaptive fingerprint of x , and (3) the adaptive remainder $\alpha(x)$ is short enough, on average, so that it can be stored in a variable-length pocket dictionary²⁴.

To ensure that the adaptive fingerprints of distinct elements are distinct and prefix-free, the adaptive remainders are variable-length; we adaptively lengthen and shorten them (see also [BFG⁺18]). Specifically, we maintain the following invariant for every subset $S \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ of elements that either: (1) reside in the same PD and share a common PD quotient $q(x)$, or (2) reside in the same CSD_i and share the same PD index $h^b(x)$ and PD quotient $q(x)$.

Invariant 26. *For every $S \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ defined above, the sum of the lengths of the adaptive remainders is minimal subject to the constraint that the set of adaptive fingerprints of distinct elements in S is prefix-free.*²⁵




Figure 4: **Adaptive Fingerprints.** The adaptive fingerprint for the Crate Dictionary is $(h^c(x), h^b(x), q(x), \alpha(x))$. The adaptive remainder $\alpha(x)$ is a prefix of $r(x)$.

²⁴Hence, $\alpha(x)$ is stored twice: one time as an adaptive remainder and a second time as part of $r(x)$.

²⁵We note that the invariant does not exclude the possibility that multiple copies of the same adaptive fingerprint are stored. Two adaptive fingerprints are equal if and only if they correspond to the same element.

Maintaining Invariant 26. During insertions, adaptive remainders are minimally extended until the adaptive fingerprints of distinct elements are prefix-free.²⁶ Consider the following greedy procedure : when a new element x is inserted, we start with $\alpha(x)$ as the empty string and extend it as long as the adaptive fingerprint of x is a prefix of another adaptive fingerprint of an element $y \neq x$. Additionally, we may also need to extend the adaptive remainder of another element. Since the set of adaptive remainders before the insertion is prefix-free (Invariant 26), at most one such adaptive fingerprint needs to be extended. When duplicate elements are inserted, we store duplicate adaptive remainders. See Appendix C for a detailed description of the procedure for computing the adaptive remainders. We note that this procedure is applied separately to subsets of fingerprints that are stored in the same PD or CSD and that share the same PD-quotient. Upon deletions, adaptive remainders are greedily shrunk while maintaining the prefix-freeness property.

Pointers and Pocket Motels. Since the adaptive remainder $\alpha(x)$ may be a proper prefix of $r(x)$, we employ a separate data structure for maintaining a dynamic multiset of PD-remainders values. We refer to this data structure as a *pocket motel*. The pocket motel supports insertions, deletions, and direct access via a pointer. See Appendix A for a more detailed description of the implementation.

Let $\text{ptr}(x)$ denote the pointer to the entry in the pocket motel that stores $r(x)$. There is one pocket motel for each PD in the Crate Dictionary (similarly, there is one pocket motel for each CSD in the SID). The cardinality of the multiset stored in the pocket motel is equal to the cardinality of the multiset stored in the corresponding PD or CSD. Since each PD and CSD is responsible for less than w elements, the length of $\text{ptr}(x)$ is at most $\log w$ bits.

6.2 Structure

The Crate Dictionary for the sparse case employs a variant of the Crate Dictionary for the dense case to store the set of pointers $\{\text{ptr}(x) \mid x \in \mathcal{D}\}$. The dictionary is augmented to handle adaptive remainders and pocket motels. The basic building block of the Crate Dictionary for the sparse case consists of three synchronized components: (1) PDs and CSDs that store pointers $\text{ptr}(x)$, (2) variable-length PDs and CSDs for adaptive remainders (Sec. 4.1) and, (3) pocket motels for storing PD-remainders $r(x)$. We describe how these components are designed and how they are synchronized.

We follow the same parametrization that we use in the dense case. We have n/C crates, each consisting of C/m pocket dictionaries $\text{PD}(m, f, \ell)$. Each pocket dictionary is used for explicitly storing the pointers $\text{ptr}(x)$ and has its own pocket motel for the PD-remainders $r(x)$.

PD-super-intervals. An alternative view of the structure is that the range $[n]$ is partitioned into n/m intervals such that one pocket dictionary is assigned to each interval. *PD-super-intervals* are obtained by partitioning the set of intervals into groups of $\log w$ consecutive intervals.²⁷ With each PD-super-interval, we associate one VarPD for storing adaptive remainders. See Fig. 5 for a depiction.

Storing pointers and PD remainders. The pocket dictionary of index $h^b(x)$ in crate $h^c(x)$ stores pairs of the form $(q(x), \text{ptr}(x))$. The order in which these pairs are stored in a pocket dictionary is important. The order is non-decreasing lexicographic order according to $(q(x), r(x))$.

²⁶Distinctness is always achievable by taking all of the bits of an element.

²⁷For the sake of readability, we write $\log w$ instead of $\lceil \log w \rceil$.




Figure 5: **The components in a PD-super-interval.** We denote by F_i the set of elements that correspond to PD_i . Namely, these are the elements x with $h^b(x) = i$ that are not stored in the SID. The pocket dictionary PD_i stores $(q(x), \text{ptr}(x))$ for all $x \in F_i$, where $q(x)$ is stored implicitly. The VarPD stores $(q^{si}(x), q(x), \alpha(x))$ for all $x \in \{F_i\}_{i \in \llbracket \log w \rrbracket}$, where $(q^{si}(x), q(x))$ are stored implicitly. The pocket model for PD_i stores $r(x)$ at location $\text{ptr}(x)$ in the pocket motel.

(Note the difference between the order and the stored pairs.) The value $r(x)$ is stored in the pocket motel associated with the PD of index $h^b(x)$, at the location within the pocket motel indicated by $\text{ptr}(x)$.

Storing adaptive remainders. For each PD-super-interval, we allocate a variable-length pocket dictionary $\text{VarPD}(M, F, L)$. The parameters for the VarPD are listed in Table 3. Note that the quotient of an element inside its VarPD is given by the pair $(q^{si}(x), q(x))$, where $q^{si}(x) = h^b(x) \pmod{\log w}$. The elements within a VarPD are stored in non-decreasing lexicographic order of $(q^{si}(x), q(x), r(x))$. For more details on what is stored in each component of the PD-super-interval, see Fig. 5.

Synchronization in the PD-super-interval. The fact that the pointers in the PDs and the adaptive remainders in the VarPD s are stored in the same order allows for synchronization.

Claim 27. *The position of $\text{ptr}(x)$ in the PD is determined by the position of $\alpha(x)$ in the VarPD .*

Proof. Since adaptive remainders in the VarPD are stored in the order $(q^{si}(x), q(x), r(x))$, adaptive remainders from the same PD map to a contiguous block within the body of the VarPD . Within that block of the VarPD , they are stored in the order $(q(x), r(x))$, which is the same order that $\text{ptr}(x)$ is stored in the PD. \square

symbol	value	role
M	w	the length of the super-interval
F	$(1 + o(1)) \cdot M$	cardinality of the multiset stored in a VarPD
L	$O(F)$	total length of adaptive remainders stored in a VarPD
\tilde{F}	w	cardinality of the set stored in a VarCSD
\tilde{L}	$O(\tilde{F})$	total length of adaptive remainders stored in a VarCSD
$q^{si}(x)$	$h^b(x) \pmod{\log w}$	index of the PD within the PD-super-interval

Table 3: Parametrization of VarPD and VarCSD

CSD-super-intervals. The SID mimics the structure of synchronized triples of pocket dictionaries, pocket motels, and variable-length pocket dictionaries (See Fig. 6). We group $\hat{\ell}/c$ consecutive CSDs and pocket motels into a *CSD-super-interval*. In each distributed SID, there are \tilde{f} CSDs, each storing a multiset whose support is of cardinality at most $\hat{f} = cw/\hat{\ell}$. We attach a pocket motel to each CSD.

Each CSD-super-interval is assigned a variable-length counting set $\text{VarCSD}(\tilde{F}, \tilde{L})$ for storing adaptive remainders. The VarCSD stores a set of elements since counters are already maintained in the CSD. The data structure is parametrized by the cardinality of the set and the total length of the adaptive remainders. More details on the VarCSD can be found in Appendix B.2.

Each CSD stores triples $(h^b(x), q(x), \text{ptr}(x))$, which are stored in non-decreasing lexicographic order of $(h^b(x), q(x), r(x))$. The pocket motel associated with the CSD stores $r(x)$ at location $\text{ptr}(x)$. Each VarCSD stores $\alpha(x)$ in non-decreasing lexicographic order of $(\tilde{h}(x), h^b(x), q(x), r(x))$. To achieve this, the VarCSD stores adaptive remainders from the same CSD in one contiguous block called a *frame*. We have that the CSD and the VarCSD are synchronized.

Claim 28. *One can deduce the position of $\alpha(x)$ in the VarCSD from the position of $(h^b(x), q(x), \text{ptr}(x))$ in the CSD.*

Proof. All the adaptive remainders from elements assigned to the same CSD map to one contiguous block of entries in the VarCSD (i.e. a frame). Within the same CSD, we have that the set of triples $(h^b(y), q(y), \text{ptr}(y))$ such that $(h^b(y), q(y)) = (h^b(x), q(x))$ is stored in a block of contiguous entries. This block corresponds to a similar block in the VarCSD because the adaptive remainders in the same frame of the VarCSD respect the same lexicographic order. In other words, the relative position of $\alpha(x)$ in the frame is the same as the relative position of $\text{ptr}(x)$ within the CSD. \square

6.3 Functionality

One important property of our construction is that it allows us to find the “location” of an element x (i.e. $\text{ptr}(x)$) using a constant number of memory accesses, regardless of the length of x . Consider an element $x \in \mathcal{U}$, an element $y_1 \in \mathcal{D}$ stored in the PD, and an element y_2 stored in the CSD. Note that, in the following definition, the conditions for y_i to match x depend on whether y_i is stored in a PD or in a CSD.

Definition 29. *We say that y_1 matches x if $(h^c(y_1), h^b(y_1), q(y_1)) = (h^c(x), h^b(x), q(x))$, and $\alpha(y_1) \subseteq r(x)$. We say that y_2 matches x if $(\tilde{h}(y_2), h^c(y_2), h^b(y_2), q(y_2)) = (\tilde{h}(x), h^c(x), h^b(x), q(x))$, and $\alpha(y_2) \subseteq r(x)$. We say that y fully-matches x if y matches x and $r(y) = r(x)$.*

The implementation of $\text{query}(x)$ is based on the following claim.




Figure 6: **The components in a CSD-super-interval.** In this figure we depict the organization related to the first CSD-super-interval. We denote by F_i the set of elements that correspond to CSD_i . Namely, these are the elements x with $\tilde{h}(x) = i$ that are not stored in the PDs. Each CSD_i explicitly stores $(h^b(x), q(x), ptr(x))$ alongside a multiplicity counter and doubly linked list pointers. The order is non-decreasing lexicographic order of $(h^b(x), q(x), r(x))$. The VarCSD stores $\alpha(x)$ for all $x \in \{F_i\}_{i \in [\hat{\ell}/c]}$ in non-decreasing lexicographic order of $(\tilde{h}(x), h^b(x), q(x), r(x))$. The pocket model for CSD_i stores $r(x)$ at location $ptr(x)$.

Claim 30. *For every $x \in \mathcal{U}$, within a constant number of memory accesses, one can find at most two pointers ($ptr(y_1)$ in a PD and $ptr(y_2)$ in a CSD) that point to matches with x . Moreover, $x \in \mathcal{D}$ if and only if at least one of the matches is also a full match.*

Proof. Given an element x , we look for it in the PD and potentially also in the $CSD_{\tilde{h}(x)}$. This search gives us a set of candidate elements $S = \{y \mid (h^c(x), h^b(x), q(x)) = (h^c(y), h^b(y), q(y))\}$. We then locate the corresponding block of adaptive remainders $\{\alpha(y) \mid y \in S\}$ in a constant number of memory accesses (Claim 27 and Claim 28). If none of the adaptive remainders match, then we respond that x is not in the dataset. Otherwise, we have that at most one match within the PD and one match within the $CSD_{\tilde{h}(x)}$ (Invariant 26). Both the PD, CSD and their variable length counterparts fit in a constant number of words. Hence finding a match requires only a constant number of memory accesses. A full match means x is in \mathcal{D} , otherwise x is not in \mathcal{D} . \square

We discuss separately how insertions and deletions are managed in the PD-super-intervals and in the CSD-super-intervals.

Insertions and deletions in the PD-super-interval. An $insert(x)$ first checks whether the $PD_{h^b(x)}$ in crate $h^c(x)$ is full. If it is not full, the following steps are performed: (1) Insert $r(x)$ into

the pocket motel, get $\text{ptr}(x)$ and insert $(q(x), \text{ptr}(x))$ to $\text{PD}_{h^b(x)}$. (2) Locate the block of entries in the VarPD that corresponds to $(h^b(x), q(x))$. Compute the adaptive remainder $\alpha(x)$ and insert $(\tilde{h}(x), q(x), \alpha(x))$ to $\text{VarPD}_{\lfloor h^b(x)/\log w \rfloor}$ (this may require extending an existing adaptive remainder of another element). If $\text{PD}_{h^b(x)}$ is full, then the insertion is forwarded to the SID.

A $\text{delete}(x)$ is processed by first locating x by a $\text{query}(x)$ operation. If the adaptive fingerprint of x is found in the PD, deletion is similar to the dense case with the additional steps of deleting the element's PD-remainder from the pocket motel and its adaptive remainder from the VarPD (which might require shortening an adaptive remainder of another element in the VarPD). If, in addition, the PD was full prior to deletion, then a $\text{pop}(h^b(x))$ operation must follow to maintain Invariant 16. The element returned by the pop is then inserted into $\text{PD}_{h^b(x)}$.

Insertions and deletions in the CSD-super-interval. An $\text{insert}(x)$ to the SID first checks if x is already stored in the corresponding CSD interval. If x is already stored, then it increments its counter in the CSD and returns. If x is a new element, then $r(x)$ is first inserted into the pocket motel for $\text{CSD}_{\tilde{h}(x)}$ and $(h^b(x), q(x), \text{ptr}(x))$ is inserted into the $\text{CSD}_{\tilde{h}(x)}$. The VarCSD frame corresponding to $\text{CSD}_{\tilde{h}(x)}$ is read and the adaptive remainder $\alpha(x)$ is calculated. Finally, $\alpha(x)$ is inserted in the appropriate position in the VarCSD based on the location of $\text{ptr}(x)$ in the CSD. The linked lists are maintained as in the dense case.

A $\text{delete}(x)$ operation proceeds like a $\text{query}(x)$ and updates the counters and the linked list as in the dense case. In addition, if the counter reaches zero, the element's PD-remainder must be freed from the pocket dictionary and its adaptive remainder removed from the VarCSD . This might lead to another adaptive remainder in the VarCSD requiring shortening.

A $\text{pop}(h^b(x))$ operation accesses the CSD pointed to by the head of the linked list, deletes an element that belongs to $\text{PD}_{h^b(x)}$, and inserts this element to $\text{PD}_{h^b(x)}$.

6.4 Analysis: Proof of Theorem 1 in the sparse case

We begin by proving that an overflow does not occur whp. The probability of overflow of the PDs, CSDs and their pocket motels is summarized in the following claim.

Claim 31. *An overflow of a pocket dictionary or a counting set dictionary does not occur whp.*

Proof Sketch. We employ the same load balancing arguments that we used to bound the probability of overflow for the dictionaries in the dense case in which the relative sparseness equals w . Indeed, the PDs and CSDs now store $\text{ptr}(x)$ (instead of $r(x)$), where the length of $\text{ptr}(x)$ is at most $\log w$. \square

Note that a pocket motel overflows if and only if its corresponding PD (or CSD) overflows.

Claim 32. *The variable-length dictionaries $\text{VarPD}(M, F, L)$ and $\text{VarCSD}(\tilde{F}, \tilde{L})$ do not overflow whp.*

Proof Sketch. If none of the PDs overflow, then each VarPD and stores at most $(1+o(1)) \cdot w$ adaptive remainders. Similarly, if none of the CSDs overflow, then each VarCSD stores at most w distinct adaptive remainders. Hence, with high probability, the VarPD s and VarCSD s also do not overflow due to too many elements. The average length of $\Omega(\log n)$ adaptive remainders in the VarPD s and VarCSD s is constant whp [BFG⁺17, Lemma 15]. Hence, an overflow does not occur whp, as required. \square

Combining Claim 31 with Claim 32 gives us:

Claim 33. *For every $\text{poly}(n)$ sequence of insertions, deletions and queries, the components of the Crate Dictionary for the sparse case do not overflow whp.*

We proceed by bounding the number of memory accesses per operation. Recall that the word length satisfies $w = \Omega(\log n)$.

Claim 34. *If none of the components of the Crate Dictionary for the sparse case overflow, then every query and insert operation requires at most $2 \cdot \frac{\log(|\mathcal{U}|/n)}{w} + O(1)$ memory accesses, and every delete operation requires at most $4 \cdot \frac{\log(|\mathcal{U}|/n)}{w} + O(1)$ memory accesses.*

Proof. For $\text{query}(x)$, Claim 30 states that locating $\text{ptr}(y)$ with the desired properties can be done in a constant number of memory accesses. Reading $r(y)$ requires an additional $\frac{\log(|\mathcal{U}|/n)}{w}$ memory accesses because $r(y)$ is $\log(|\mathcal{U}|/n)$ bits long. Since we may need to follow two pointers, one from the PD and the second from the CSD, the total number of memory accesses is at most $2 \cdot \frac{\log(|\mathcal{U}|/n)}{w} + O(1)$.

An insert operation $\text{insert}(x)$ attempts an insert in the PD. If the PD is not full, we consider two cases. (1) A previous copy of x is not already in the PD. In this case, we insert x and may need to extend an adaptive remainder of another element. This requires $2 \cdot \frac{\log(|\mathcal{U}|/n)}{w} + O(1)$ memory accesses. (2) Previous copies of x are already in the PD. In this case, they all have the same adaptive remainder. We need $\frac{\log(|\mathcal{U}|/n)}{w}$ memory accesses to compare the PD-remainder, and also need to insert an additional copy of the PD-remainder of x into the pocket motel. If the PD is full, then we proceed with an insertion to the CSD, which also takes at most $2 \cdot \frac{\log(|\mathcal{U}|/n)}{w} + O(1)$ memory accesses.

The worst case for a delete operation $\text{delete}(x)$ is when the PD is full and x is stored in the PD. In this case, we need to: (1) find x (as in a query in a PD) and delete it, (2) pop an element from the SID (which requires reading its PD-remainder), and (3) insert the popped element to the PD. Note that shortening the adaptive remainder of y does not require reading $r(y)$. In total, the delete operation, in this case, requires at most $4 \cdot \frac{\log(|\mathcal{U}|/n)}{w} + O(1)$ memory accesses. \square

The space requirement of the Crate Dictionary is summarized in the following claim.

Claim 35. *The Crate Dictionary for the sparse case requires $(1 + o(1)) \cdot n \log \rho$ bits whp.*

Proof. The PDs and CSDs used for storing pointers are parametrized as in the Crate Dictionary with relative sparseness equaling w . Therefore, they require $(1 + o(1)) \cdot n \log w + O(n)$ bits (Claim 24). The variable-length pocket dictionaries require $O(n)$ bits whp (Claim 32). Per element, the length of the PD remainder is $\log(|\mathcal{U}|/n)$. Hence, the total space consumed by the pocket motels is $(1 + o(1)) \cdot n \log(|\mathcal{U}|/n) + o(n \log w)$ (Claim 36). Since $|\mathcal{U}|/n = \rho$ and $w = o(\rho)$ the required bound follows. \square

This completes the proof of Theorem 1 in the sparse case.

7 Application: Static Retrieval

In the static retrieval problem, we are given a (static) set $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ and a function $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^k$ (one can think of $f(x)$ as the label of x). We would like to support queries of the form:

$$\text{query}(x) \triangleq \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{D} \\ \text{arbitrary value in } \{0, 1\}^k & \text{if } x \notin \mathcal{D}. \end{cases}$$

The retrieval problem has mainly been discussed in the static case, although fully-dynamic constructions also exist [DadHPP06, MPP05]. Several constructions rely on perfect hashing techniques [BPZ07, BPZ13, GOV16, HT01]. The data structures obtained this way require $pk + cn$ number of bits, where p is the size of the range of the perfect hash function and $(c + o(1))n$ is the number of bits the perfect function occupies. For these constructions, either p/n is a constant strictly greater than 1 (≈ 1.23) or the bounds depend on the size of the universe (which can be arbitrarily large). A different line of approach is based on representing the keys x as binary rows in a system of linear equations [DW19, CKRT04, DP08]. These constructions generally assume that k is constant. We refer to the paper of Dietzfelbinger and Walzer [DW19] for a thorough comparison of the different data structure parameters.

7.1 Sketch of the Proof of Theorem 3

The design of the retrieval data structure is very similar to that of the Crate Dictionary. We briefly describe the modifications. For every $x \in \mathcal{D}$, we compute its adaptive remainder $\alpha(x)$. This adaptive remainder will be stored alongside $f(x)$ in the following sense.

When $k = O(\log \log n)$, we use a variant of the Crate Dictionary for the sparse case in which $f(x)$ is stored instead of $\text{ptr}(x)$ in the PD or the CSD. The location of $f(x)$ in the data structure is computed in the same way in which the location of $\text{ptr}(x)$ is computed in the dictionary. We omit pocket motels since we no longer need to store $r(x)$. Since the total length of the adaptive remainders is $O(n)$ with high probability, we get that the total space occupied by this construction is $(1 + o(1))nk + O(n)$.

When $r = \omega(\log \log n)$, we use the construction for the dense case directly and store $f(x)$ in the pocket motel instead of $r(x)$. The total space occupied by this construction is $(1 + o(1))nk$.

To construct the data structure, we can insert the elements incrementally. Since each such inserts takes $O(1)$, we get that the runtime of inserting the whole set is $O(n)$. With very low probability, the data structure might overflow. In that case, we pick a new hash function and redo the process. This leads to an overall construction runtime of $O(n)$ whp.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Michael Bender, Martin Farach-Colton, and Rob Johnson for introducing this topic to us and for interesting conversations.

References

- [ANS09] Yuriy Arbitman, Moni Naor, and Gil Segev. De-amortized cuckoo hashing: Provable worst-case performance and experimental results. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 107–118. Springer, 2009.
- [ANS10] Yuriy Arbitman, Moni Naor, and Gil Segev. Backyard cuckoo hashing: Constant worst-case operations with a succinct representation. In *2010 IEEE 51st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 787–796. IEEE, 2010.
- [BFG⁺17] Michael A. Bender, Martin Farach-Colton, Mayank Goswami, Rob Johnson, Samuel McCauley, and Shikha Singh. Bloom filters, adaptivity, and the dictionary problem. *CoRR*, abs/1711.01616, 2017.

- [BFG⁺18] Michael A. Bender, Martin Farach-Colton, Mayank Goswami, Rob Johnson, Samuel McCauley, and Shikha Singh. Bloom filters, adaptivity, and the dictionary problem. In *59th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2018, Paris, France, October 7-9, 2018*, pages 182–193, 2018.
- [BFJ⁺12] Michael A. Bender, Martin Farach-Colton, Rob Johnson, Russell Kraner, Bradley C. Kuszmaul, Dzejla Medjedovic, Pablo Montes, Pradeep Shetty, Richard P. Spillane, and Erez Zadok. Don’t thrash: How to cache your hash on flash. *PVLDB*, 5(11):1627–1637, 2012.
- [Blo70] Burton H. Bloom. Space/time trade-offs in hash coding with allowable errors. *Commun. ACM*, 13(7):422–426, 1970.
- [BM99] Andrej Brodnik and J. Ian Munro. Membership in constant time and almost-minimum space. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 28(5):1627–1640, 1999.
- [BM01] Andrei Broder and Michael Mitzenmacher. Using multiple hash functions to improve ip lookups. In *Proceedings IEEE INFOCOM 2001. Conference on Computer Communications. Twentieth Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Society (Cat. No. 01CH37213)*, volume 3, pages 1454–1463. IEEE, 2001.
- [BPZ07] Fabiano C Botelho, Rasmus Pagh, and Nivio Ziviani. Simple and space-efficient minimal perfect hash functions. In *Workshop on Algorithms and Data Structures*, pages 139–150. Springer, 2007.
- [BPZ13] Fabiano C Botelho, Rasmus Pagh, and Nivio Ziviani. Practical perfect hashing in nearly optimal space. *Information Systems*, 38(1):108–131, 2013.
- [CFG⁺78] Larry Carter, Robert Floyd, John Gill, George Markowsky, and Mark Wegman. Exact and approximate membership testers. In *Proceedings of the tenth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 59–65. ACM, 1978.
- [CKRT04] Bernard Chazelle, Joe Kilian, Ronitt Rubinfeld, and Ayellet Tal. The Bloomier filter: an efficient data structure for static support lookup tables. In *Proceedings of the fifteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 30–39. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2004.
- [Cle84] J.G. Clerry. Compact hash tables using bidirectional linear probing. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, (9):828–834, 1984.
- [CRSW13] L Elisa Celis, Omer Reingold, Gil Segev, and Udi Wieder. Balls and bins: Smaller hash families and faster evaluation. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 42(3):1030–1050, 2013.
- [DadH90] Martin Dietzfelbinger and Friedhelm Meyer auf der Heide. A new universal class of hash functions and dynamic hashing in real time. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 6–19. Springer, 1990.
- [DadHPP06] Erik D Demaine, Friedhelm Meyer auf der Heide, Rasmus Pagh, and Mihai Pătraşcu. De dictionariis dynamicis paucio spatio utentibus. In *Latin American Symposium on Theoretical Informatics*, pages 349–361. Springer, 2006.

- [DDMM05] Ketan Dalal, Luc Devroye, Ebrahim Malalla, and Erin McLeish. Two-way chaining with reassignment. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 35(2):327–340, 2005.
- [DP08] Martin Dietzfelbinger and Rasmus Pagh. Succinct data structures for retrieval and approximate membership. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 385–396. Springer, 2008.
- [DR98] Devdatt Dubhashi and Desh Ranjan. Balls and bins: A study in negative dependence. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 13(2):99–124, 1998.
- [DW07] Martin Dietzfelbinger and Christoph Weidling. Balanced allocation and dictionaries with tightly packed constant size bins. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 380(1-2):47–68, 2007.
- [DW19] Martin Dietzfelbinger and Stefan Walzer. Constant-time retrieval with $o(\log m)$ extra bits. In *36th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, STACS 2019, March 13-16, 2019, Berlin, Germany*, pages 24:1–24:16, 2019.
- [FAKM14] Bin Fan, David G. Andersen, Michael Kaminsky, and Michael Mitzenmacher. Cuckoo filter: Practically better than Bloom. In *CoNEXT*, pages 75–88. ACM, 2014.
- [FKS82] Michael L Fredman, János Komlós, and Endre Szemerédi. Storing a sparse table with $o(1)$ worst case access time. In *23rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 165–169. IEEE, 1982.
- [FPSS05] Dimitris Fotakis, Rasmus Pagh, Peter Sanders, and Paul Spirakis. Space efficient hash tables with worst case constant access time. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 38(2):229–248, 2005.
- [GOV16] Marco Genuzio, Giuseppe Ottaviano, and Sebastiano Vigna. Fast scalable construction of (minimal perfect hash) functions. In *International Symposium on Experimental Algorithms*, pages 339–352. Springer, 2016.
- [HT01] Torben Hagerup and Torsten Tholey. Efficient minimal perfect hashing in nearly minimal space. In *Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, pages 317–326. Springer, 2001.
- [KM07] Adam Kirsch and Michael Mitzenmacher. Using a queue to de-amortize cuckoo hashing in hardware. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Fifth Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, volume 75, 2007.
- [KNR09] Eyal Kaplan, Moni Naor, and Omer Reingold. Derandomized constructions of k -wise (almost) independent permutations. *Algorithmica*, 55(1):113–133, 2009.
- [Knu73] Donald E Knuth. The art of computer programming, vol. 3: Searching and sorting. *Reading MA: Addison-Wisley*, 1973.
- [KR10] Jyrki Katajainen and S Srinivasa Rao. A compact data structure for representing a dynamic multiset. *Information Processing Letters*, 110(23):1061–1066, 2010.
- [LP10] Shachar Lovett and Ely Porat. A lower bound for dynamic approximate membership data structures. In *2010 IEEE 51st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 797–804. IEEE, 2010.

- [Mit02] Michael Mitzenmacher. Compressed Bloom filters. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking (TON)*, 10(5):604–612, 2002.
- [MPP05] Christian Worm Mortensen, Rasmus Pagh, and Mihai Pătraşcu. On dynamic range reporting in one dimension. In *Proceedings of the thirty-seventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 104–111. ACM, 2005.
- [MPR18] Michael Mitzenmacher, Salvatore Pontarelli, and Pedro Reviriego. Adaptive cuckoo filters. In *2018 Proceedings of the Twentieth Workshop on Algorithm Engineering and Experiments (ALENEX)*, pages 36–47. SIAM, 2018.
- [MRRR14] Raghu Meka, Omer Reingold, Guy N Rothblum, and Ron D. Rothblum. Fast pseudorandomness for independence and load balancing. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 859–870. Springer, 2014.
- [Pag01] Rasmus Pagh. Low redundancy in static dictionaries with constant query time. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 31(2):353–363, 2001.
- [Pan05] Rina Panigrahy. Efficient hashing with lookups in two memory accesses. In *Proceedings of the sixteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 830–839. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2005.
- [Păt08] Mihai Pătraşcu. Succincter. In *2008 49th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 305–313. IEEE, 2008.
- [PBJP17] Prashant Pandey, Michael A. Bender, Rob Johnson, and Robert Patro. A general-purpose counting filter: Making every bit count. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD Conference 2017, Chicago, IL, USA, May 14-19, 2017*, pages 775–787, 2017.
- [Por09] Ely Porat. An optimal Bloom filter replacement based on matrix solving. In *International Computer Science Symposium in Russia*, pages 263–273. Springer, 2009.
- [PP08] Anna Pagh and Rasmus Pagh. Uniform hashing in constant time and optimal space. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 38(1):85–96, 2008.
- [PPR05] Anna Pagh, Rasmus Pagh, and S. Srinivasa Rao. An optimal Bloom filter replacement. In *SODA*, pages 823–829. SIAM, 2005.
- [PSW13] Rasmus Pagh, Gil Segev, and Udi Wieder. How to approximate a set without knowing its size in advance. In *2013 IEEE 54th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 80–89. IEEE, 2013.
- [PT11] Mihai Pătraşcu and Mikkel Thorup. The power of simple tabulation hashing. In *Proceedings of the 43rd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2011, San Jose, CA, USA, 6-8 June 2011*, pages 1–10, 2011.
- [PT14] Mihai Pătraşcu and Mikkel Thorup. Dynamic integer sets with optimal rank, select, and predecessor search. In *2014 IEEE 55th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 166–175. IEEE, 2014.
- [Rei13] James Reinders. AVX-512 Instructions. <https://software.intel.com/en-us/articles/intel-avx-512-instructions>, 2013.

- [RR03] Rajeev Raman and Satti Srinivasa Rao. Succinct dynamic dictionaries and trees. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 357–368. Springer, 2003.
- [Wie17] Udi Wieder. Hashing, load balancing and multiple choice. *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science*, 12(3–4):275–379, 2017.

A Pocket Motels

The pocket motel is a data structure that supports insertions, deletions, and direct access via a pointer. It stores PD-remainders of fixed length. An $\text{insert}(r(x))$ operation returns a pointer $\text{ptr}(x)$ to the entry where $r(x)$ is stored. A $\text{delete}(\text{ptr}(x))$ frees the entry. The pointer $\text{ptr}(x)$ can be used to directly access the element.

The pocket motel can be implemented using an array. See Fig. 7 for a depiction. Each entry in the array stores either the PD remainder $r(x)$ (i.e. it is *occupied*) or a pointer to the next free entry in the array (i.e. it is *vacant*). A separate *head* pointer is maintained for the beginning of the linked list of vacant entries.




Figure 7: **The pocket motel.** Occupied entries are shown in grey, vacant entries are in white and form a linked list of vacant entries.

Insertion to the pocket motel is implemented by finding the first vacant entry in the list (pointed to by the *head*), updating the *head* pointer and writing the PD remainder of the element in the array at that entry. Deletion is implemented by adding the entry to the linked list of vacant entries. We get that:

Claim 36. *A pocket motel storing the PD remainders of $k \leq |U|/n$ elements requires $k \cdot (1 + \log(|U|/n)) + \log k$ bits of space.*

Proof. We need a pointer to point to the first vacant entry in the motel. Each entry is $\lceil \log(|U|/n) \rceil$ bits long. □

B SID Building Blocks

In this section, we describe auxiliary data structures (CSD and VarCSD) that we use in the design of the SID. The CSD has a role that is similar to that of a PD, and the VarCSD has a role that is similar to that of a VarPD. The design of CSDs and VarCSDs need not be space-efficient because the SID stores a sublinear number of elements.

B.1 Counting Set Dictionaries (CSDs)

The counting set dictionary (CSD) is a dictionary for small general multisets. The parameters of a CSD are: \hat{f} - an upper bound on the cardinality of the support of the stored multiset, \hat{c} - an upper bound on the maximum multiplicity of elements in the multiset, $\hat{\ell}$ - the length of the elements in bits. Counting set dictionaries are used in the implementation of the SID of each crate in the Crate Dictionary.

We denote the data structure storing such a multiset by $\text{CSD}(\hat{f}, \hat{\ell}, \hat{c})$. We use a brute force implementation in which elements with their multiplicity (using $\lceil \log \hat{c} \rceil$ bits) are packed contiguously. Elements are stored in non-decreasing lexicographic order.

Claim 37. *The number of bits that $\text{CSD}(\hat{f}, \hat{\ell}, \hat{c})$ requires is at most $\hat{f}(\hat{\ell} + \log \hat{c} + 1)$. If $\max\{\hat{\ell}, \log \hat{c}\} < w$, and $\hat{f} = O\left(w / \max\{\hat{\ell}, \log \hat{c}\}\right)$, then $\text{CSD}(\hat{f}, \hat{\ell}, \hat{c})$ fits in a constant number of words.*

We say that a $\text{CSD}(\hat{f}, \hat{\ell}, \hat{c})$ overflows whenever the cardinality of the support of the stored multiset exceeds \hat{f} or the maximum multiplicity exceeds \hat{c} .

B.2 Variable-Length Counting Set Dictionaries (VarCSDs)

The variable-length counting set dictionary (VarCSD) is a dictionary that stores sets of adaptive remainders of elements from a CSD-super-interval. The parameters of a VarCSD are: \tilde{F} - an upper bound on the cardinality of the stored set and \tilde{L} - an upper bound on the total length of the elements of the set. We note this data structure by $\text{VarCSD}(\tilde{F}, \tilde{L})$.

The VarCSD is maintained synchronized with the CSDs in the same CSD-super-interval. Specifically, all the adaptive remainders of elements stored in the same CSD are stored in one contiguous block of entries in the corresponding VarCSD. We call such a block a *frame*. Within a frame, the VarCSD stores $\alpha(x)$ in non-decreasing lexicographic order of $(h^b(x), q(x), r(x))$. To enforce this, at insertion time, $\alpha(x)$ is stored in the same relative position within a frame as $(h^b(x), q(x), \text{ptr}(x))$ is stored in the CSD.

The VarCSD uses an alphabet of four symbols that includes two types of separators: one separator distinguishes between successive frames and the other separator distinguishes between the adaptive remainders in the same frame. Since every CSD-super-interval contains $\hat{\ell}/c$ CSDs, there are $\hat{\ell}/c$ frame separators in each VarCSD (i.e. we also record empty frames).

Claim 38. *The number of bits that $\text{VarCSD}(\tilde{F}, \tilde{L})$ requires is at most $2(\tilde{F} + \tilde{L} + \hat{\ell}/c)$. If $\max\{\tilde{F}, \tilde{L}\} < w$, then $\text{VarCSD}(\tilde{F}, \tilde{L})$ fits in a constant number of words.*

Proof. We require $2\tilde{F}$ bits for the separators between the adaptive remainders. The adaptive remainders themselves take at most $2\tilde{L}$ bits. Finally, the frame separators require $2\hat{\ell}/c$ bits, since there are $\hat{\ell}/c$ frames in a VarCSD. Since $\hat{\ell} = O(\log w)$, the claim follows. \square

We say that a $\text{VarCSD}(\tilde{F}, \tilde{L})$ overflows whenever the cardinality of the stored set exceeds \tilde{F} or the total length of the adaptive remainders exceeds \tilde{L} .

C Computation of Adaptive Remainders

In this section, we describe a greedy process for computing the adaptive remainders that satisfy Invariant 26. We are given as input f pairs of the form (q_i, r_i) , where $q_i \in \{0, 1\}^{\log w}$ and $r_i \in \{0, 1\}^*$. The output is a set of adaptive remainders $\{\alpha_i\}_{i \in [f]}$ such that: (1) α_i is a prefix of r_i , (2) the set $\{(q_i, \alpha_i)\}_{i \in [f]}$ is prefix-free, and (3) the sum of lengths $\sum_{i \in [f]} |\alpha_i|$ is minimal.

The pairs are processed sequentially. Suppose we are processing (q_i, r_i) for some $i \in [f]$. We can view the pairs $\{(q_j, \alpha_j)\}_{j < i}$ as if they were stored in a trie. Interior nodes of the trie have at most two children, and every leaf corresponds to a distinct pair (q_j, α_j) . The adaptive remainder α_i is then computed in a greedy fashion. We begin with $\alpha_i = \Lambda$ (i.e. the empty string) and extend α_i (by “copying” bits of r_i) in the following way:

1. If q_i corresponds to an interior trie node, then we extend α_i until we create a new leaf in the trie or reach an old leaf.
2. If (q_i, α_i) reaches an old leaf (q_j, α_j) for some $j < i$, then we extend both α_i and α_j until $\alpha_i \neq \alpha_j$.
3. Once (q_i, α_i) reaches a new leaf in the trie, no further extension is required.

We note that, if the pairs $\{(q_i, \alpha_i)\}_{i \in [f]}$ fit in a constant number of words, then computing each α_i can be done in a constant number of operations. See [BFG⁺17] for details.