

## NTIN066 - solutions 8

David Mareček

April 05, 2023

1. Show that the family of all constant functions from  $\mathcal{U}$  to  $[m]$  is 1-independent.

2. Prove that the family of linear functions is not 3-independent.

$m = p$

keys:  $x, y, z$

buckets:  $i, j, k$

$(ax + b) \bmod p = r$

$(ay + b) \bmod p = s$

$(a,b)$  maps to  $(r,s)$  (bijection)

$(az + b) \bmod p = t$

for  $(r,s)$  we can compute  $a,b,t$

$\Pr(h(x) = i) = \Pr(r = i) = 1/m$

$\Pr(h(y) = j) = \Pr(s = j) = 1/m$

$\Pr(h(z) = k) = \Pr(t = k) = 1 \text{ or } 0$

For  $i,j,k$  satisfying the equations, the probability is  $1/m^2$ .

For  $i,j,k$  not satisfying the equations, the probability is 0.

3. Prove that tabulation hashing is 3-independent but not 4-independent.

*If tabulation uses only one table, it is perfectly random, so it is  $k$ -independent for each  $k$  not exceeding the size of the universe.*

*Otherwise, we have  $t \geq 2$  tables, each indexed by bits. Now consider  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  and  $a_1, a_2, a_3$  from the definition of 3-independence. At the same time, we imagine  $x_i$  as ordered  $k$ -tuples of  $b$ -bit values (parts indexing individual tables).*

*(a) If there is a position  $i$  in which all  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  differ, then regardless of the values in the other positions, we can always fill in the table corresponding to this position so that the XORs come out  $a_1, a_2, a_3$ . Since  $T_i$  is perfectly random, the probability of generating  $a_1, a_2, a_3$  is  $1/m^3$ .*

(b) Or there exists (WLOG) a position  $i$ , position  $j$ , and some values  $A, B, C, D$ , for which:

$$\begin{aligned} T_i[A] \oplus T_j[C] \oplus v_1 &= a_1 \\ T_i[B] \oplus T_j[C] \oplus v_2 &= a_2 \\ T_i[A] \oplus T_j[D] \oplus v_3 &= a_3, \end{aligned}$$

where  $v_1, v_2$ , and  $v_3$  are XORed values from all the other tables. For each  $T_j[C]$  and each  $v_1, v_2, v_3$ , this set of equations has just one solution. So the probability that filling of the tables leads to a solution is exactly  $1/m^3$ , as we need for 3-independence.

Counter-example for 4-independence: Imagine four different values  $A, B, C, D$  and four following keys  $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4$ :

$$x_1 = AB, x_2 = AC, x_3 = DB, x_4 = DC.$$

Then for each  $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4$ , we get the following four equations:

$$\begin{aligned} T_1[A] \oplus T_2[B] &= a_1 \\ T_1[A] \oplus T_2[C] &= a_2 \\ T_1[D] \oplus T_2[B] &= a_3 \\ T_1[D] \oplus T_2[C] &= a_4 \end{aligned}$$

If we sum the equations, we get  $a_1 \oplus a_2 \oplus a_3 \oplus a_4 = 0$ . Thus, given the hash values of any of three of the keys, we can uniquely determine the fourth hash value. So when  $a_4 = a_1 \oplus a_2 \oplus a_3$ , then, if e.g.  $T_1[A]$  is given, there is just one option how to fill  $T_2[B], T_2[C]$ , and  $T_1[D]$ . These were filled independently, so  $P = 1/m^3$ , which is always higher than  $c/m^4$  for  $m > c$ .