

Concurrent Expandable AMQs on the Basis of Quotient Filters

Tobias Maier, Peter Sanders, Robert Williger

Karlsruhe Institute of Technology
 {t.maier, sanders}@kit.edu

Abstract

A quotient filter is a cache efficient Approximate Membership Query (AMQ) data structure. Depending on the fill degree of the filter most insertions and queries only need to access one or two consecutive cache lines. This makes quotient filters very fast compared to the more commonly used Bloom filters that incur multiple cache misses depending on the false positive rate. However, concurrent Bloom filters are easy to implement and can be implemented lock-free while concurrent quotient filters are not as simple. Usually concurrent quotient filters work by using an external array of locks – each protecting a region of the table. Accessing this array incurs one additional cache miss per operation. We propose a new locking scheme that has no memory overhead. Using this new locking scheme we achieve 1.8 times higher speedups than with the common external locking scheme.

Another advantage of quotient filters over Bloom filters is that a quotient filter can change its size when it is becoming full. We implement this growing technique for our concurrent quotient filters and adapt it in a way that allows unbounded growing while keeping a bounded false positive rate. We call the resulting data structure a fully expandable quotient filter. Its design is similar to scalable Bloom filters, but we exploit some concepts inherent to quotient filters to improve the space efficiency and the query speed.

Additionally, we propose several quotient filter variants that are aimed to reduce the number of status bits (2-status-bit variant) or to simplify concurrent implementations (linear probing quotient filter). The linear probing quotient filter even leads to a lock-free concurrent filter implementation. This is especially interesting, since we show that any lock-free implementation of another common quotient filter variant would incur significant overheads in the form of additional data fields or multiple passes over the accessed data.

1 Introduction

Approximate Membership Query (AMQ) data structures offer a simple interface to represent sets. Elements can be inserted, queried, and depending on the use case elements can also be removed. A

query returns true if the element was previously inserted. Querying an element might return true even if an element was not inserted. We call this a false positive. The probability that a non-inserted element leads to a false positive is called the false positive rate of the filter. It can usually be chosen at the time of constructing the data structure. AMQ data structures have two main advantages over other set representations they are fast and space efficient. Similar to hash tables most AMQ data structures have to be initialized knowing a bound to their final size. This can be a problem for their space efficiency if no accurate bound is known.

AMQ data structures have become an integral part of many complex data structures or data base applications. Their small size and fast accesses can be used to sketch large, slow data sets. The AMQ filter is used before accessing the data base to check whether a slow lookup is actually necessary. Some recent uses of AMQs include network analysis [1] and bio informatics [16]. These are two of the areas with the largest data sets available today, but given the current big data revolution we expect more and more research areas will have a need for the space efficiency and speedup potential of AMQs. The most common AMQ data structure in practice is still a Bloom filter even though a quotient filter would usually be significantly faster. One reason for this might be that concurrent Bloom filters are easy to implement – even lock-free and well scaling implementations. This is important because well scaling implementations have become critical in today’s multi-processor scenarios since single core performance stagnates and efficient multi-core computation has become a necessity to handle growing data sets.

We present a technique for concurrent quotient filters that uses local locking inside the table – without an external array of locks. Instead of traditional locks we use the per-slot status bits that are inherent in quotient filters to lock local ranges of slots. As long as there is no contention on a single area of the table there is very little overhead to this locking technique because the locks are placed in slots that would have been accessed anyways. An interesting advantage of quotient filters over Bloom filters is that the capacity of a quotient filter can be increased without access to the original elements. However, because the false positive rate grows linearly with the number of inserted elements, this is

only useful for a limited total growing factor. We implement this growing technique for our concurrent quotient filters and extend it to allow large growing factors at a strictly bounded false positive rate. These *fully expandable quotient filters* combine growing quotient filters with the multi level approach of scalable Bloom filters [2].

1.1 Related Work

Since quotient filters were first described in 2012 [3] there has been a steady stream of improvements. For example Pandey et al. [17] have shown how to reduce the memory overhead of quotient filters by using rank-select data structures. This also improves the performance when the table becomes full. Additionally, they show an idea that saves memory when insertions are skewed (some elements are inserted many times). They also mention the possibility for concurrent access using an external array of locks (see Section 5 for results). Recently, there was also a GPU-based implementation of quotient filters [9]. This is another indicator that there is a lot of interest in concurrent AMQs even in these highly parallel scenarios.

Quotient filters are not the only AMQ data structures that have received attention recently. Cuckoo filters [8, 13] and very recently Morton filters [4] (based on cuckoo filters) are two other examples of AMQ data structures. A cuckoo filter can be filled more densely than a quotient filter, thus, it can be more space efficient. Similar to cuckoo hash tables each access to a cuckoo filter needs to access multiple buckets – leading to a worse performance when the table is not densely filled (a quotient filter only needs one access). It is also difficult to implement concurrent cuckoo filters (similar to concurrent cuckoo hash tables [11, 14]); in particular, when additional memory overhead is unwanted, e.g., per-bucket locks.

A scalable Bloom filter [2] allows unbounded growing. This works by adding additional levels of Bloom filters once one level becomes full. Each new filter is initialized with a higher capacity and a lower false positive rate than the last. The query time is dependent on the number of times the filter has grown (usually logarithmic in the number of insertions). Additionally, later filters need more and more hash functions to achieve their false positive rate making them progressively slower. In Section 4, we show a similar technique for fully expandable quotient filters that mitigates some of these problems.

1.2 Overview

In Section 2 we introduce the terminology and explain basic quotient filters as well as our variations

in a sequential setting. Section 3 then describes our approach to concurrent quotient filters including the two variants: the lock-free linear probing quotient filter and the locally locked quotient filter. The dynamically growing quotient filter variant is described in Section 4. All presented data structures are evaluated in Section 5. Afterwards, we draw our conclusions in Section 6.

2 Sequential Quotient Filter

In this section we describe the basic sequential quotient filter as well as some variants to the main data structure. Throughout this paper, we use m for the number of slots in our data structure and n for the number of inserted elements. The fill degree of any given table is denoted by $\delta = n/m$. Additionally, we use p^+ to denote the probability of a false positive query.

2.1 Basic Quotient Filter

Quotient filters are approximate membership query data structures that were first described by Bender et al. [3] and build on an idea for space efficient hashing originally described by Cleary [6]. Quotient filters replace possibly large elements by *fingerprints*. The fingerprint $f(x)$ of an element x is a number in a predefined range $f : x \mapsto \{0, \dots, 2^k - 1\}$ (binary representation with exactly k digits). We commonly get a fingerprint of x by taking the k bottommost bits of a hash function value $h(x)$ (using a common hash function like xxHash [7]).

A quotient filter stores the fingerprints of all inserted elements. When executing a query for an element x , the filter returns **true** if the fingerprint $f(x)$ was previously inserted and **false** otherwise. Thus, a query looking for an element that was inserted always returns **true**. A false positive occurs when x was not inserted, but its fingerprint $f(x)$ matches that of a previously inserted element. Given a fully random fingerprint function, the probability of two fingerprints being the same is 2^{-k} . Therefore, the probability of a false positive is bounded by $n \cdot 2^{-k}$ where n is the number of stored fingerprints.

To achieve expected constant query times as well as to save memory, fingerprints are stored in a special data structure that is similar to a hash table with open addressing (specifically it is similar to robinhood hashing [5]). During this process, the fingerprint of an element x is split into two parts: the topmost q bits called the quotient $quot(x)$ and the bottommost r bits called the remainder $rem(x)$ ($q + r = k$). The quotient is used to address a table that consisting of $m = 2^q$ memory slots of $r + 3$ bits (it can store one remainder and three additional status bits). The quotient of each element

is only stored implicitly by the position of the element in the table. The remainder is stored explicitly within one slot of the table. Similar to many hashing techniques, we try to store each element in one designated slot which we call its canonical slot (index $quot(x)$). With the help of the status bits we can reconstruct the quotient of each element even if it is not stored in its canonical slot.

The main idea for resolving collisions is to find the next free slot – similar to linear probing hash tables – but to reorder the elements such that they are sorted by their fingerprints (see Figure 1). Elements with the same quotient (the same canonical slot) are stored in consecutive slots, we call them a run. The canonical run of an element is the run associated with its canonical slot. The canonical run of an element does not necessarily start in its canonical slot. It can be shifted by other runs. If a run starts in its canonical slot we say that it starts a cluster that contains all shifted runs after it. Multiple clusters that have no free slots between them form a supercluster. We use the 3 status bits that are part of each slot to distinguish between runs, clusters, and empty slots. For this we store the following information about the contents of the slot (further described in Table 1): Were elements hashed to this slot (is its run non-empty)? Does the element in this slot belong to the same run as the previous entry (used as a run-delimiter signaling where a new run starts)? Does the element in this slot belong to the same cluster as the previous entry (is it shifted)?

During the query for an element x , all remainders stored in x 's canonical run have to be compared to $rem(x)$. First we look at the first status bit of the canonical slot. If this status bit is unset there is no run for this slot and we can return false. If there is a canonical run, we use the status bits to find it by iterating to the left until the start of a cluster (third status bit = 0). From there, we move to the right counting the number of non-empty runs to the left of the canonical run (slots with first status bit = 1 left of $quot(x)$) and the number of run starts (slots with second status bit = 0). This way, we can easily find the correct run and compare the appropriate remainders.

An insert operation for element x proceeds similar to a query, until it either finds a free slot or a slot that contains a fingerprint that is $\geq f(x)$. The current slot is replaced with $rem(x)$ shifting the following slots to the right (updating the status bits appropriately).

When the table fills up, operations become slow because the average cluster length increases. When the table is full, no more insertions are possible. Instead, quotient filters can be migrated into a larger table – increasing the overall capacity. To do this a new table is allocated with twice the size of the orig-

inal table and one less bit per remainder. Addressing the new table demands an additional quotient bit, since it is twice the size. This issue is solved by moving the uppermost bit from the remainder into the quotient ($q' = q + 1$ and $r' = r - 1$). The capacity exchange itself does not impact the false positive rate of the filter (fingerprint size and number of elements remain the same). But the false positive rate still increases linearly with the number of insertions ($p^+ = n \cdot 2^{-k}$). Therefore, the false positive rate doubles when the table is filled again. We call this migration technique *bounded growing*, because to guarantee reasonable false positive rates this method of growing should only be used a bounded number of times.

2.2 Variants

We give a short explanation of counting quotient filters using rank-and-select data structures [17]. Additionally, we introduce two previously unpublished quotient filter variants: the 2-status-bit quotient filter and the linear probing quotient filter.

(Counting) Quotient Filter Using Rank-and-Select. This quotient filter variant proposed by Pandey et al. [17] introduces two new features: the number of necessary status bits per slot is reduced to 2.125 by using a bitvector that supports rank-and-select queries and the memory footprint of multisets is reduced by allowing counters to be stored in the table – together with remainders.

This quotient filter variant uses two status bits per slot the *occupied-bit* (first status bit in the description above) and the *run-end-bit* (similar to the second bit). These are stored in two bitvectors that are split into 64 bit blocks (using 8 additional bits per block). To find a run, the rank of its occupied-bit is computed and the slot with the matching run-end-bit is selected.

To reduce memory impact of repeated elements Pandey et al. use the fact that remainders are stored in increasing order. Whenever an element is inserted for a second time instead of doubling its remainder they propose to store a counter in the slot after its remainder this counter can be recognized as a counter because it does not fit into the increasing order (the counter starts at zero). As long as it remains smaller than the remainder this counter can count the number of occurrences of this remainder. Once the counter becomes too large another counter is inserted.

Two-Status-Bit Quotient Filter. Pandey et al. [17] already proposed a 2 status bit variant of their counting filter. Their implementation however has average query and insertion times in $\Theta(n)$. The goal of our 2-status bit variant is to achieve running

1**	this slot has a run
000	empty slot
100	cluster start
*01	run start
*11	continuation of a run
*10	– (not used see 3.2)




Table 1: Meaning of different status bit combinations.

Figure 1: Section of the table with highlighted runs, clusters, and superclusters. Runs point to their canonical slot.

times close to $O(\text{supercluster length})$. To achieve this, we change the definition of the fingerprint (only for this variant) such that no remainder can be zero $f' : x \mapsto \{0, \dots, 2^q - 1\} \times \{1, \dots, 2^r - 1\}$. Obtaining a non-zero remainder can easily be achieved by rehashing an element with different hash functions until the remainder is non-zero. This change to the fingerprint only has a minor impact on the false positive rate of the quotient filter ($n/m \cdot (2^r - 1)$ instead of $n/m \cdot 2^r$).

Given this change to the fingerprint we can easily distinguish empty slots from filled ones. Each slot uses two status bits the *occupied-bit* (first status bit in the description above) and the *new-run-bit* (run-delimiter). Using these status bits we can find a particular run by going to the left until we find a free slot and then counting the number of occupied- and new-run-bits while moving right from there (*Note*: a cluster start within a larger supercluster cannot be recognized when moving left).

Linear Probing Quotient Filter. This quotient filter is a hybrid between a linear probing hash table and a quotient filter. It uses no reordering of stored remainders and no status bits. To offset the removal of status bits we add three additional bits to the remainder (leading to a longer fingerprint). Similar to the two-status-bit quotient filter above we ensure no element x has $rem(x) = 0$ (by adapting the fingerprint function).

During the insertion of an element x the remainder $rem(x)$ is stored in the first empty slot after its canonical slot. Without status bits and reordering it is impossible to reconstruct the fingerprint of each inserted element. Therefore, a query looking for an element x compares its remainder $rem(x)$ with every remainder stored between x 's canonical slot and the next empty slot. There are potentially more remainders that are compared than during the same operation on a normal quotient filter. The increased remainder length however reduces the chance of a single comparison to lead to a false positive by a factor of 8. Therefore, as long as the average number of compared remainders is less than 8 times more than before, the false positive remains the same or improves. In our tests, we found this to be true for fill degrees up to $\approx 70\%$.

The number of compared remainders corresponds to the number of slots probed by a linear probing hash table, this gives the bound below.

Corollary 1 (p^+ linear probing q.f.). *The false positive rate of a linear probing quotient filter with $\delta = n/m$ (bound due to Knuth [10] chapter 6.4) is*

$$p^+ = \frac{E[\# \text{comparisons}]}{2^{r+3} - 1} = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{(1 - \delta)^2} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{2^{r+3} - 1}$$

It should be noted that linear probing quotient filters cannot support deletions and the bounded growing technique.

3 Concurrent Quotient Filter

From a theoretical point of view using an external array of locks should lead to a good concurrent quotient filter. As long as the number of locks is large enough to reduce contention ($> p^2$) and the number of slots per lock is large enough to ensure that clusters don't span multiple locking regions. But there are multiple issues that complicate the implementation in practice. In this section we describe the difficulties of implementing an efficient concurrent quotient filter, attributes of a successful concurrent quotient filter, and the concurrent variants we implemented.

Problems with Concurrent Quotient Filters.

The first consideration with every concurrent data structure should be correctness. The biggest problem with implementing a concurrent quotient filter is that multiple data entries have to be read in a consistent state for a query to succeed. All commonly known variants (except the linear probing quotient filter) use at least two status bits per slot, i.e., the *occupied-bit* and some kind of *run-delimiter-bit* (the run-delimiter might take different forms). The remainders and the run-delimiter-bit that belong to one slot cannot reliably be stored close to their slot and its occupied-bit. Therefore, the occupied-bit and the run-delimiter-bit cannot be updated with one atomic operation.

For this reason, implementing a lock-free quotient filter that uses status bits would cause significant overheads (i.e. additional memory or multiple

passes over the accessed data). The problem is that reading parts of multiple different but individually consistent states of the quotient filter leads to an inconsistent perceived state. To show this we assume that insertions happen atomically and transfer the table from one consistent state directly into the new final consistent state. During a query we have to find the canonical run and scan the remainders within this run. To find the canonical run we have to compute its rank among non-empty runs using the occupied-bits (either locally by iterating over slots or globally using a rank-select-data structure) and then find the run with the same rank using the run-delimiter-bits. There is no way to guarantee that the overall state has not changed between finding the rank of the occupied-bit bit and finding the appropriate run-delimiter. Specifically we might find a new run that was created by an insertion that shifted the actual canonical run. Similar things can happen when accessing the remainders especially when remainders are not stored interleaved with their corresponding status bits. Some of these issues can be fixed using multiple passes over the data but ABA problems might arise in particular when deletions are possible.

To avoid these problems while maintaining performance we have two options: either comparing all following remainders and removing the status bits all-together (i.e. the linear probing quotient filter) or by using locks that protect the relevant range of the table.

Goals for Concurrent Quotient Filters. Besides the correctness there are two main goals for any concurrent data structure: scalability and overall performance. One major performance advantage of quotient filters over other AMQ data structures is their cache efficiency. Any successful concurrent quotient filter variant should attempt to preserve this advantage. Especially insertions into short or even empty clusters and (unsuccessful) queries with an empty canonical run lead to operations with only one or two accessed cache lines and at most one write operation. Any variant using external locks has an immediate disadvantage here.

Concurrent Slot Storage. Whenever data is accessed by multiple threads concurrently, we have to think about the atomicity of operations. To be able to store all data connected to one slot together we alternate between status bits and remainders. The slots of a quotient filter can have arbitrary sizes that do not conform to the size of a standard atomic data type. Therefore, we have to take into account the memory that is wasted by using these basic data types inefficiently. It would be common to just use the smallest data type that can hold both the remainder and status bits and waste any

excess memory. But quotient filters are designed to be space efficient. Therefore, we need a different method.

We use the largest common atomic data type (64 bit) and pack as many slots as possible into one data element – we call this packed construct a group (of slots). This way, the waste of multiple slots accumulates to encompass additional elements. Furthermore, using this technique we can atomically read or write multiple slots at once – allowing us to update in bulk and even avoid some locking.

An alternative would have been not to waste any memory and store slots consecutively. However, this leads to slots that are split over the borders of the aligned common data types and might even cross the border between cache lines. While non-aligned atomic operations are possible on modern hardware, we decided against this method after a few preliminary experiments showed how inefficient they performed in practice.

3.1 Concurrent Linear Probing Quotient Filter

Operations on a linear probing quotient filter (as described in Section 2.2) can be executed concurrently similar to operations of a linear probing hash table [12]. The table is constructed out of merged atomic slots as described above. Each insertion changes the table atomically using a single compare and swap instruction. This implementation is even lock free, because at least one competing write operation on any given cell is successful. Queries find all remainders that were inserted into their canonical slot, because they are stored between their canonical slot and the next empty slot and the contents of a slot never change once something is stored within it.

3.2 Concurrent Quotient Filter with Local Locking

In this section we introduce an easy way to implement concurrent quotient filters without any memory overhead and without increasing the number of cache lines that are accessed during operations. This concurrent implementation is based on the basic (3-status-bit) quotient filter. The same ideas can also be implemented with the 2-status-bit variant, but there are some problems discussed later in this section.

Using status bits for local locking. To implement our locking scheme we use two combinations of status bits that are impossible to naturally appear in the table (see Table 1) – 010 and 110. We use 110 to implement a write lock. In the beginning

Algorithm 1 Concurrent Insertion

```
(quot, rem) ← f(key)
// Block A: try a trivial insertion
table_section ← atomically load data around slot quot
if insertion into table_section is trivial then
  finish that insertion with a CAS and return
// Block B: write lock the supercluster
scan right from it ← quot
  if it is write locked then
    wait until released and continue
  if it is empty then
    lock it with write lock and break
    if CAS unsuccessful re-examine it
// Block C: read lock the cluster
scan left from it ← quot
  if it is read locked then
    wait until released and retry this slot
  if it is cluster start then
    lock it with read lock and break
    if CAS unsuccessful re-examine it
// Block D: find the correct run
occ = 0; run = 0
scan right from it
  if it is occupied and it < canonical slot then occ++
  if it is run start then run++
  if occ = run and it ≥ canonical slot then break
// Block E: insert into the run and shift
scan right from it
  if it is read locked then
    wait until released
  store rem in correct slot
  shift content of following slots
  (keep groups consistent)
  break after overwriting the write lock
unlock the read lock
```

of each write operation, 110 is stored in the first free slot after the supercluster, see Block B Algorithm 1 (using a compare and swap operation). Insertions wait when encountering a write lock. This ensures that only one insert operation can be active per supercluster.

The combination 010 is used as a read lock. All operations (both insertions Block C Algorithm 1 and queries Block G Algorithm 2) replace the status bits of the first element of their canonical cluster with 010. Additionally, inserting threads wait for each encountered read lock while moving elements in the table, see Block E Algorithm 1. When moving elements during the insertion each encountered cluster start is shifted and becomes part of the canonical cluster that is protected by the insertion's original read lock. This ensures, that no operation can change the contents of a cluster while it is protected with a read lock.

Avoiding locks. Many instances of locking can be avoided, e.g., when the canonical slot for an insertion is empty (write the elements with a single compare and swap operation), when the canonical slot of a query either has no run (first status bit), or stores the wanted fingerprint. In addition to these trivial instances of lock elision, where the whole

Algorithm 2 Concurrent Query

```
(quot, rem) ← f(key)
// Block F: try trivial query
table_section ← atomically load data around slot quot
if answer can be determined from table_section then
  return this answer
// Block G: read lock the cluster
scan left from it ← quot
  if it is read locked then
    wait until released and retry this slot
  if it is cluster start then
    lock it with read lock and break
    if CAS unsuccessful re-examine it
// Block H: find the correct run
occ = 0; run = 0
scan right from it
  if it is occupied and it < canonical slot then occ++
  if it is run start then run++
  if occ = run and it ≥ canonical slot then break
// Block I: search remainder within the run
scan right from it
  if it = rem
    unlock the read lock
    return contained
  if it is not continuation of this run
    unlock the read lock
    return not contained
```

operation happens in one slot, we can also profit from our compressed atomic storage scheme (see Section 3). Since we store multiple slots together in one atomic data member, multiple slots can be changed at once. Each operation can act without acquiring a lock, if the whole operation can be completed without loading another data element. The correctness of the algorithm is still guaranteed, because the slots within one data element are always in a consistent state.

Additionally, since the table is the same as it would be for the basic non-concurrent quotient filter, queries can be executed without locking if there can be no concurrent write operations (e.g. during an algorithm that first constructs the table and then queries it repeatedly). This fact is actually used for the fully expandable variant introduced in Section 4.

Deletions. Given our locking scheme deletions could be implemented in the following way (we did not do this since it has some impact on insertions). A thread executing a deletion first has to acquire a write lock on the supercluster then it has to scan to the left (to the canonical slot) to guarantee that there was no element removed while finding the cluster end. Then the read lock is acquired and the deletion is executed similar to the sequential case. During the deletion it is possible that new cluster starts are created due to elements shifting to the left into their canonical slot. Whenever this happens, the cluster is created with read locked status bits (010). After the deletion all locks are unlocked.

This implementation would impact some of the

other operations. During a query, after acquiring the read lock when moving to the right, it would be possible to hit a new cluster start or an empty cell before reaching the canonical slot. In this case the previous read lock is unlocked and the operation is restarted. During an insertion after acquiring the write lock it is necessary to scan to the left to check that no element was removed after the canonical slot.

2-Status-Bit Concurrent Quotient Filter. In the 2-status-bit variant of the quotient filter there are no unused status bit combinations that can be used as read or write locks. But zero can never be a remainder when using this variant, therefore, a slot with an empty remainder but non-zero status bits cannot occur. We can use such a cell to represent a lock. Using this method, cluster starts within a larger supercluster cannot be recognized when scanning to the left ,i.e., in Blocks C and G (of Algorithms 1 and 2). Instead we can only recognize supercluster starts (a non-empty cell to the right of an empty cell).

To write lock a supercluster, we store 01 in the status bits of an otherwise empty slot after the supercluster. To read lock a supercluster we remove the remainder from the table and store it locally until the lock is released (status bits 11). However, this concurrent variant is not practical because we have to ensure that the read-locked slot is still a supercluster start (the slot to its left remains empty). To do this we can atomically compare and swap both slots. However this is a problem since both slots might be stored in different atomic data types or even cache lines. The variant is still interesting from a theoretical perspective where a compare and swap operation changing two neighboring slots is completely reasonable (usually below 64 bits). However, we have implemented this variant when we did some preliminary testing with non-aligned compare and swap operations and it is non-competitive with the other implementations.

Growing concurrently. The bounded growing technique (described in Section 2.1) can be used to increase the capacity of a concurrent quotient filter similar to that of a sequential quotient filter. In the concurrent setting we have to consider two things: distributing the work of the migration between threads and ensuring that no new elements are inserted into parts of the old table that were already migrated (otherwise they might be lost).

To distribute the work of migrating elements, we use methods similar to those in Maier et al. [12]. After the migration is triggered, every thread that starts an operation first helps with the migration before executing the operation on the new table. Reducing interactions between threads during the

migration is important for performance. Therefore, we migrate the table in blocks. Every thread acquires a block by incrementing a shared atomic variable. Each block has a constant size of 4096 slots. The migration of each block happens one supercluster at a time. Each thread migrates all superclusters that begin in its block. This means that a thread does not migrate the first supercluster in its block, if it starts in the previous block. It also means that the thread migrates elements from the next block, if its last supercluster crosses the border to that block. The order of elements does not change during the migration, because they remain ordered by their fingerprint. In general this means that most elements within one block of the original table are moved into one of two blocks in the target table (block i is moved to $2i$ and $2i + 1$). By assigning clusters depending on the starting slot of their supercluster, we enforce that there are no two threads accessing the same slot of the target table. Hence, no atomic operations or locks are necessary in the target table.

As described before, we have to ensure that ongoing insert operations either finish correctly or help with the migration before inserting into the new table. Ongoing queries also have to finish to prevent deadlocks. To prevent other threads from inserting elements during the migration, we write lock each empty slot and each supercluster before it is migrated. These *migration-write-locks* are never released. To differentiate migration-write-locks from the ones used in a normal insertions, we write lock a slot and store a non-zero remainder (write locks are usually only stored in empty slots). This way, an ongoing insertion recognizes that the encountered write lock belongs to a migration. The inserting thread first helps with the migration before restarting the insertion after the table is fully migrated. Queries can happen concurrently with the migration, because the migration does not need read locks.

4 Fully Expandable QFs

The goal of this fully expandable quotient filter is to offer a resizable quotient filter variant with a bounded false positive rate that works well even if there is no known bound to the number of elements inserted. Adding new fingerprint bits to existing entries is impossible without access to the inserted elements. We adapt a technique that was originally introduced for scalable Bloom filters [2]. Once a quotient filter is filled, we allocate a new *additional* quotient filter. Each subsequent quotient filter increases the fingerprint size. Overall, this ensures a bounded false positive rate.

We show that even though this is an old idea, it offers some interesting possibilities when applied to

quotient filters, i.e., avoiding locks on lower levels, growing each level using the bounded growing technique, higher fill degree through cascading inserts, and early rejection of queries also through cascading inserts.

4.1 Architecture

This new data structure starts out with one quotient filter, but over time, it may contain a set of quotient filters we call levels. At any point in time, only the newest (highest) level is active. Insertions operate on the active level. The data structure is initialized with two user-defined parameters the *expected capacity* c and the *upper bound for the false positive rate* $\bar{p}^+$. The first level table is initialized with m_0 slots where $m_0 = 2^{q_0}$ is the first power of 2 where $\delta_{grow} \cdot m_0$ is larger than c , here δ_{grow} is the fill ratio where growing is triggered and $\bar{n}_i = \delta_{grow} \cdot m_i$ is the maximum number of elements level i can hold. The number of remainder bits r_0 is chosen such that $\bar{p}^+ > 2\delta_{grow} \cdot 2^{-r_0}$. This first table uses $k_0 = q_0 + r_0$ bits for its fingerprint.

Queries have to check each level. Within the lower levels queries do not need any locks, because the elements there are finalized. The query performance depends on the number of levels. To keep the number of levels small, we have to increase the capacity of each subsequent level. To also bound the false positive rate, we have to reduce the false positive rate of each subsequent level. To achieve both of these goals, we increase the size of the fingerprint k_i by two for each subsequent level ($k_i = 2 + k_{i-1}$). Using the longer fingerprint we can ensure that once the new table holds twice as many elements as the old one ($\bar{n}_i = \bar{n}_{i+1}/2$), it still has half the false positive rate ($\bar{p}_i^+ = \bar{n}_i \cdot 2^{-k_i} = 2\bar{p}_{i+1}^+ = 2 \cdot \bar{n}_{i+1} \cdot 2^{-k_{i+1}}$).

When one level reaches its maximum capacity $\bar{n}_i$ we allocate a new level. Instead of allocating the new level to immediately have twice the number of slots as the old level, we allocate it with one 8th of the final size, and use the bounded growing algorithm (described in Section 2.1) to grow it to its final size (three growing steps). This way, the table has a higher average fill rate (at least $2/3 \cdot \delta_{grow}$ instead of $1/3 \cdot \delta_{grow}$).

Theorem 2 (Bounded p^+ in expandable QF). *The fully expandable quotient filter holds the false positive probability $\bar{p}^+$ set by the user independently of the number of inserted elements.*

Proof. For the following analysis, we assume that fingerprints can potentially have an arbitrary length. The analysis of the overall false positive rate p^+ is very similar to that of the scalable Bloom filter. A false positive occurs if one of the ℓ levels has a false positive $p^+ = 1 - \prod_i (1 - p_i^+)$. This can be approximated with the Weierstrass inequality $p^+ \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} p_i^+$. When we insert the shrinking

false positive rates per level ($p_{i+1}^+ = p_i^+/2$) we obtain a geometric sum which is bounded by $2p_1^+$: $\sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} p_i^+ 2^{-i} \leq 2p_1^+ < \bar{p}^+$. $\square$

Using this growing scheme the number of filters is in $O(\log n/T)$, therefore, the bounds for queries are similar to those in a broad tree data structure. But due to the necessary pointers tree data structures take significantly more memory. Additionally, they are difficult to implement concurrently without creating contention on the root node.

4.2 Cascading Inserts

The idea behind cascading inserts is to insert elements on the lowest possible level. If the canonical slot in a lower level is empty, we insert the element into that level. This can be done using a simple compare and swap operation (without acquiring a write lock). Queries on lower levels can still proceed without locking, because insertions cannot move existing elements.

The main reason to grow the table before it is full is to improve the performance by shortening clusters. The trade-off for this is space utilization. For the space utilization it would be optimal to fill each table 100%. Using cascading inserts this can be achieved while still having a good performance on each level. Queries on the lower level tables have no significant slow down due to cascading inserts, because the average cluster length remains small (cascading inserts lead to one-element clusters). Additionally, if we use cascading inserts, we can abort queries that encounter an empty canonical slot in one of the lower level tables, because this slot would have been filled by an insertion.

Cascading inserts do incur some overhead. Each insertion checks every level whether its canonical slot is empty. However, in some applications checking all levels is already necessary. For example in applications like element unification all lower levels are checked to prevent repeated insertions of one element. Applications like this often use combined query and insert operations that only insert if the element was not yet in the table. Here cascading inserts do not cost any overhead.

5 Experiments

The performance evaluations described in this section consist of two parts: Some tests without growing where we compare our implementation of concurrent quotient filters to other AMQ data structures, and some tests with dynamically growing quotient filter implementations. There we compare three different variants of growing quotient filters: bounded growing, our fully expandable multi level

approach, and the multi level approach with cascading inserts.

All experiments were executed on a two socket Intel Xeon E5-2683 v4 machine with 16 cores per socket, each running at 2.1 GHz with 40MB cache size, and 512 GB main memory. The tests were compiled using gcc 7.4.0 and the operating system is Ubuntu 18.04.02. Each test was repeated 9 times using 3 different sequences of keys (same distribution) – 3 runs per sequence.

Non-Growing Competitors

- Linear probing quotient filter presented in Section 3.1
- Locally locked quotient filter presented in Section 3.2 (using status bits as locks)
- ◆ Externally locked quotient filter using an array with one lock per 4096 slots
- ✕ Counting quotient filter – implementation by Pandey et al. [15,17]
- ▲ Bloom filter. Our implementation uses the same amount of memory as the quotient filters we compared to ($m \cdot (r + 3)$ bits) and only 4 hash functions ($\Rightarrow$ better performance at a false positive rate comparable to our quotient filters).

Speedup. The first test presented in Figure 2 shows the throughput of different data structures under a varying number of operating threads. We fill the table with 24M uniformly random elements through repeated insertions by all threads into a previously empty table of $2^{25} \approx 33.6$ M slots ($\delta \approx 72\%$) using $r = 10$ remainder bits (13 for the linear probing quotient filter). Then we execute 24M queries with uniformly random keys (none of which were previously inserted) this way we measure the performance of unsuccessful queries and the rate of false positives (not shown since it is independent of p). At last, we execute one query for each inserted element. In each of these three phases we measure the throughput dependent on the number of processors. The base line for the speedups was measured using a sequential quotient filter, executing the same test.

We can see that all data structures scale close to linearly with the number of processors. There is only a small bend when the number of cores exceeds the first socket and once it reaches the number of physical cores. But, the data structures even seem to scale relatively well when using hyperthreading. The absolute performance is quite different between the data structures. In this test the linear probing quotient filter has by far the best throughput (excluding the unsuccessful query performance of the

Bloom filter). Compared to the locally locking variant it performs 1.5 times better on inserts and 2.4 times better on successful queries (speedups of 30.6 vs. 20.5 on inserts and 51.3 vs 21.0 on successful queries at $p = 32$). Both the externally locking variant performs far worse (speedups below 12 for insertions). Inserting into the counting quotient filter does not scale with the number of processors at all, instead, it starts out at about 2M inserts per second and gets worse from there. Both variants also perform worse on queries with a speedup of below 15 ($p = 32$). This is due to the fact that each operation incurs multiple cache faults – one for locking and one for the table access. In the case of the counting quotient filter there is also the additional work necessary for updating the rank-select bitvectors. The concurrent Bloom filter has very different throughputs depending on the operation type. It has by far the best throughput on unsuccessful queries (speedup of 46.8 at $p = 32$). The reason for this is that the described configuration with only 4 hash functions and more memory than a usual bloom filters (same memory as quotient filters) leads to a sparse filter, therefore, it most unsuccessful queries can be aborted after one or two cache misses.

Fill ratio. In this test we fill a table with $2^{25} \approx 33.6$ M slots and $r = 10$. Every 10% of the fill ratio, we execute a performance test. During this test each table operation is executed 100k times. The results can be seen in Figure 3. The throughput of all quotient filter variants decreases steadily with the increasing fill ratio, but the relative differences remain close to the same. Only the counting quotient filter and the Bloom filter have running times that are somewhat independent of the fill degree. On lower fill degrees the linear probing quotient filter and the locally locked quotient filter display their strengths. With about 236% and 157% higher insertion throughputs than the external locking quotient filter, and 358% and 210% higher successful query throughputs than the Bloom filter at 50% fill degree.

Growing Benchmark In the benchmark shown in Figure 4, we insert 50M elements into each of our dynamically sized quotient filters bounded growing, fully expandable without cascading inserts (no ci), and fully expandable with cascading inserts (ci) (all based on the quotient filter using local locking). The filter was initialized with a capacity of only $2^{19} \approx 520$ k slots and a target false positive rate of $\bar{p}^+ = 2^{-10}$. The inserted elements are split into 50 segments of 1M elements each. We measure the running time of inserting each segment as well as the query performance after each segment (using 1M successful and unsuccessful queries).




Figure 2: Throughput over the number of threads. Strong scaling measurement inserting 24M elements into a table with $2^{25} \approx 33.6\text{M}$ slots (72% fill degree). The speedup is measured compared to a sequential basic quotient filter. *Note:* the x-axis does not scale linearly past 32 threads.




Figure 3: Throughput over fill degree. Using $p = 32$ threads and $2^{25} \approx 33.6\text{M}$ slots. Each point of the measurement was tested using 100k operations.

As expected, the false positive rate grows linearly when we only use bounded growing, but each query still consists of only one table lookup – resulting in a query performance similar to that of the non-growing benchmark. Both fully expandable variants have a bounded false positive rate. But their query performance suffers due to the lower level look ups and the additional cache lines that have to be accessed with each additional table. Cascading inserts can improve query times by 13% for successful queries and 12% for unsuccessful queries (averaged over all segments), however, slowing down insertions significantly.

6 Conclusion

Future Work. We already mentioned a way to implement deletions in our concurrent table Sec-

tion 3.2. Additionally, one would probably want to add the same counting method used by Pandey et al. [17] this should be fairly straight forward, since the remainders in our implementation are also stored in increasing order.

One large opportunity for improvement could be to use the local locking methods presented here as a backoff mechanism for a solution that uses hardware transactional memory. Transactional memory could also improve the memory usage by removing the overheads introduced by the grouped storage method we proposed. Such an implementation might use unaligned compare and swap operations, but only if a previous transaction failed (this would hopefully be very rare).

The fully expandable quotient filter could be adapted to specific use cases, e.g., one could use the normal insertion algorithm to fill a fully expandable quotient filter. Then one could scan all




Figure 4: Throughput of the growing tables (all variants based on the local locking quotient filter). Using $p = 32$ threads 50 segments of 1M elements are inserted into a table initialized with $2^{19} \approx 520k$ slots.

tables (in parallel) to move elements from later levels into earlier levels, if their slots are free. The resulting data structure could then be queried as if it was built with cascading inserts.

Discussion. In this publication, we have shown a new technique for concurrent quotient filters that uses the status bits inherent to quotient filters for localized locking. Using this technique, no additional cache lines are accessed (compared to a sequential quotient filter). We were able to achieve a 1.8 times increase in insert performance over the external locking scheme (1.4 on queries; both at $p = 32$). Additionally, we proposed a simple linear probing based filter that does not use any status bits and is lock-free. Using the same amount of memory, this filter achieves even better false positive rates up to a fill degree of 70% and also 1.5 times higher insertion speedups (than the local locking variant).

We also propose to use the bounded growing technique available in quotient filters to refine the growing technique used in scalable Bloom filters. Using this combination of techniques guarantees that the overall data structure is always at least $2/3 \cdot \delta_{grow}$ filled (where δ_{grow} is the fill degree where growing is triggered). Using cascading inserts, this can even be improved by filling lower level tables even further, while also improving query times by over 12%.

Our tests show that there is no optimal AMQ data structure. Which data structure performs best depends on the use case and the expected workload. The linear probing quotient filter is very good, if the table is not densely filled. The locally locked

quotient filter is also efficient on tables below a fill degree of 70%. But, it is also more flexible for example when the table starts out empty and is filled to above 70% (i.e., constructing the filter). Our growing implementations work well if the number of inserted elements is not known prior to the table’s construction. The counting quotient filter performs well on query heavy workloads that operate on densely filled tables.

References

- [1] Mohammad Al-hisnawi and Mahmood Ahmadi. Deep Packet Inspection using Quotient Filter. *IEEE Communications Letters*, 20(11):2217–2220, Nov 2016.
- [2] Paulo Sérgio Almeida, Carlos Baquero, Nuno Preguiça, and David Hutchison. Scalable Bloom Filters. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 101(6):255–261, March 2007.
- [3] 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. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 5(11):1627–1637, July 2012.
- [4] Alex D. Breslow and Nuwan S. Jayasena. Morton filters: fast, compressed sparse cuckoo filters. *The VLDB Journal*, Aug 2019.
- [5] Pedro Celis, Per-Ake Larson, and J Ian Munro. Robin Hood Hashing. In *26th Annual Sym-*

- posium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 281–288. IEEE, 1985.
- [6] J. G. Cleary. Compact hash tables using bidirectional linear probing. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, C-33(9):828–834, 1984.
 - [7] Yan Collet. xxHash. <https://github.com/Cyan4973/xxHash>. Accessed March 21, 2019.
 - [8] Bin Fan, Dave G. Andersen, Michael Kaminsky, and Michael D. Mitzenmacher. Cuckoo Filter: Practically better than Bloom. In *10th ACM International on Conference on Emerging Networking Experiments and Technologies*, pages 75–88, 2014.
 - [9] Afton Geil, Martin Farach-Colton, and John D. Owens. Quotient Filters: Approximate membership queries on the GPU. In *2018 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS)*, pages 451–462, May 2018.
 - [10] Donald Ervin Knuth. *The art of computer programming: sorting and searching*, volume 3. Pearson Education, 1997.
 - [11] Xiaozhou Li, David G. Andersen, Michael Kaminsky, and Michael J. Freedman. Algorithmic Improvements for Fast Concurrent Cuckoo Hashing. In *Proceedings of the 9th European Conference on Computer Systems, EuroSys ’14*, pages 27:1–27:14, New York, NY, USA, 2014. ACM.
 - [12] Tobias Maier, Peter Sanders, and Roman Dementiev. Concurrent Hash Tables: Fast and general(?)! *ACM Trans. Parallel Comput.*, 5(4):16:1–16:32, February 2019.
 - [13] 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.
 - [14] Nhan Nguyen and Philippas Tsigas. Lock-free cuckoo hashing. In *34th IEEE International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (ICDCS)*, pages 627–636, June 2014.
 - [15] Prashant Pandey. Counting quotient filter. <https://github.com/splatlab/cqf>. Accessed August 07, 2019.
 - [16] Prashant Pandey, Fatemeh Almodaresi, Michael A. Bender, Michael Ferdman, Rob Johnson, and Rob Patro. Mantis: A fast, small, and exact large-scale sequence-search index. *Cell Systems*, 7(2):201 – 207.e4, 2018.
 - [17] Prashant Pandey, Michael A. Bender, Rob Johnson, and Rob Patro. A General-Purpose Counting Filter: Making every bit count. In *ACM Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD)*, pages 775–787, 2017.