An optimal cardinality estimation algorithm based on order statistics and its full analysis

Jérémie Lumbroso

Projet ALGORITHMS, INRIA Rocquencourt & Laboratoire d'Informatique de Paris 6 (UPMC).



1. PROBLEM STATEMENT



For instance,

$$S = run, sally, run, see, sally, run$$
 $|S| = 6$ $||S|| = 3.$

1. PROBLEM STATEMENT



For instance,

$$S = run, sally, run, see, sally, run$$
 $|S| = 6$ $||S|| = 3.$

Problem: Estimate cardinality of S so large that it cannot be stored.

Constraints

- very little processing memory
- on the fly (single pass + simple main loop)
- no statistical hypothesis
- accuracy within a few percentiles

MOTIVATION

Network security:

detect attacks (denial of service), or the spreading of worms/spam,...



- **Data mining**: document classification, ...
- Databases: query optimization
- Distributed: censor networks

Bibliographic context

- 1. Algorithms based on pattern observation
 - Flajolet and Martin, 1985, Probabilistic Counting
 - Durand and Fl., 2003, Loglog ; Fl. and al., 2007, Hyperloglog
- 2. Algorithms based on order statistics
 - Giroire, 2003-2006, thèse P6
- 3. Complexity results
 - Alon, Matias, Szegedy, 1996, Frequency moments
 - Chassaing and Gerin, 2006, Theoretical optimality of using the minimum

2. THE MODEL

Definition: a hash function h is defined as $h: \mathcal{A}^* \to [0, 1].$

Main idea. With "good enough" hash functions, our data is uniformized.





Definition: an observable = function of the underlying hash set (i.e.: a function not sensitive to repetitions)

Example: minimum

• min $\{1, 2, 3\}$ = min $\{1, \dots, 1, 2, \dots, 2, 3, \dots, 3\}$ = 1

With:

- hash functions that uniformize the data
- observables : functions of underlying hash set

process data \rightarrow study | n i.i.d. random variables in [0,1] |

3. ORDER STATISTIC of rank 1

M := minimum of *n* random variables

$$\mathbb{P}_n[M \in [x, x + \mathrm{d}x]] = n(1-x)^{n-1}\mathrm{d}x \tag{1}$$

hence

$$\mathbb{E}_{n}[M] = \int_{0}^{1} x \cdot n(1-x)^{n-1} \mathrm{d}x = \boxed{\frac{1}{n+1}}.$$
 (2)

Advantages:

- computable in one pass
 computable with a single way
- computable with a single register
- ► $\mathbb{E}_n[M] = \frac{1}{n+1}$.

Disadvantages:

• minimum oscillates a lot, indeed $\sigma_n[M] = \frac{1}{n+1}$

• function
$$x \mapsto \frac{1}{x}$$
 diverges at 0.

$$\mathbb{P}_n\left[M\leqslant \frac{t}{n}\right]\sim 1-\exp(-t)$$



STOCHASTIC AVERAGING

How to cheaply repeat the estimation (to average)?

Idea. Make m copies of the [0, 1] interval, and distribute the hashed values on these m intervals.

An extra condition: a **given element** must always be attributed to the **same interval**.

Core Algorithm

Parameter: *m* control parameter Input: a stream $S = (s_1, \ldots, s_N)$

initialize *m* registers M_1 through M_m to 1

$$\begin{array}{ll} \mbox{for all } x \in S \ \mbox{do} \\ A := h(x) & \{ \mbox{hash } x, \ \mbox{with } h(x) \in (0,1) \} \\ j := \lfloor mA \rfloor + 1 & \{ \mbox{index of the substream assigned to } x \} \\ M_j := \min \left(M_j, mA - \lfloor mA \rfloor \right) & \{ \mbox{update minimum of } j \mbox{-th substream} \} \\ \mbox{return } \mathcal{Z}^* = m \cdot \frac{(m-1)}{M_1 + \ldots + M_m} \end{array}$$

4. ANALYSIS of the CORE algorithm

$$\mathcal{Z}^* = m \cdot rac{(m-1)}{M_1 + \ldots + M_m}$$

Configuration ${\mathcal C}$ defined by:

- ▶ allocation of *n* RVs in *m* bins (stochastic averaging)
- minimum of each bin

$$\mathbb{P}_n[\mathcal{C}] = \frac{1}{m^n} \binom{n}{n_1, \dots, n_m} \prod_{j=1}^m n_j (1-x_j)^{n_j-1} \mathrm{d} x_j.$$
(3)

[Interm.] Lemma. The *r*-th moment of random variable \mathcal{Z}^* is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_{n}[(\mathcal{Z}^{\star})^{r}] = \bullet \int_{\left[0,\frac{n}{m}\right]^{m}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m} t_{j}\right)^{n-m} \frac{\mathrm{d}t_{1} \cdots \mathrm{d}t_{m}}{\left(t_{1} + \ldots + t_{m}\right)^{r}} \qquad (4)$$

Proof.

- 1. sum (3) over all configurations
- 2. integrate over all possible minima: $x_j \in [0, 1]$
- 3. rescaling $(x_j = m/n \cdot t_j)$ and algebraic manipulations.

Calculating the multi-dimensional parametered integral

$$\mathbb{E}_{n}[(\mathcal{Z}^{\star})^{r}] = \bullet \int_{\left[0,\frac{n}{m}\right]^{m}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{m} t_{j}\right)^{n-m} \frac{\mathrm{d}t_{1}\cdots\mathrm{d}t_{m}}{\left(t_{1} + \ldots + t_{m}\right)^{r}}$$

Laplace method:

1. split integral into

$$I_C = \left[0, \frac{\delta(n)}{m}\right]^m$$
 and $I_T = \left[0, \frac{n}{m}\right]^m \setminus I_C$

- 2. on I_C , use $(1 \frac{1}{n} \sum) \sim \exp(-\sum)$
- 3. show I_T is negligible

+ use integral representation of Gamma function on integers

$$\int_0^\infty \mathrm{e}^{-ay} a^{r-1} \mathrm{d}a = \frac{(r-1)!}{y^r}.$$

A) UNBIASED and ACCURATE

Theorem 1: Z^* is asymptotically unbiased, in the sense that $\mathbb{E}_n[Z^*] = n(1 + o(1)).$ (5)

Theorem 2: The precision of estimator \mathcal{Z}^* , expressed in terms of standard error, satisfies

$$\frac{\sigma_n[\mathcal{Z}^\star]}{n} \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{m-2}}.$$
(6)

B) LIMIT DISTRIBUTION

Let $S := M_1 + \ldots + M_m$, where the M_j are interdependent, the Laplace transform,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{e}^{-wS}\right] \sim \left(\int_0^\infty \mathrm{e}^{-t} \mathrm{e}^{-w\frac{m}{n}t} \mathrm{d}t\right)^m = \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{e}^{-wY\frac{m}{n}}\right]\right)^m \tag{7}$$

and $Y \in Exp(1)$. So sum S behaves like the sum of m indep. Exp(n/m).

Thus, the rescaled/inverted $\frac{1}{n/m \cdot S}$ has induced density:

$$\overline{w}_m(u) = e^{-1/u} \frac{u^{-m-1}}{(m-1)!}.$$
(8)

Theorem 3: For a fixed m > 1, as *n* tends to infinity, the estimator \mathcal{Z}^* satisfies

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}_n\left[\frac{\mathcal{Z}^{\star}}{n}\leqslant y\right]=\int_0^{y/(m-1)}\mathrm{e}^{-1/u}\frac{u^{-m-1}}{(m-1)!}\mathrm{d} u.$$

LIMIT DISTRIBUTION versus GAUSSIAN for m = 4..1024



OBSERVED estimations for m = 50



5. NON-ASYMPTOTICAL corrections



A) POISSON model (SOME urns are empty)

Pre-asymptotic calculations: *n* relatively small compared to *m*

Empty urns bias the average \longrightarrow keep track + ignore empty urns.

Poisson approx. of urn allocation (i.e.: $N_j \in Poi(\lambda)$).

$$\mathbb{P}[M_j \in [x, x + \mathrm{d}x]] = \lambda \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda x} \mathrm{d}x + \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda} \mathbf{1}_{\{x=1\}}$$
(9)

Let $k = #\{\text{non-empty urns}\}$:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{M_1+\ldots+M_m}\right] = \sum_{k=0}^m \int_0^\infty \binom{n}{k} \left(\lambda \cdot \frac{1-\mathrm{e}^{-a-\lambda}}{a+\lambda}\right)^k \left(\mathrm{e}^{-a-\lambda}\right)^{m-k} \mathrm{d}a$$

after calculations + Laplace, yields

Theorem 4: let $n/m = \lambda$ be such that $0 < \lambda < C < \infty$, then $\mathbb{E}_n[\mathcal{Z}^*] \sim \frac{n}{1 - e^{-\lambda}}.$ (10)

B) "Linear counting"¹ (TOO MANY urns are empty)

Non-asymptotic: shift in point-of-view

n balls are thrown into *m* urns.

Classical result: Let $W_k := \#\{\text{urns containing } k \text{ balls}\}$

$$\mathbb{E}[W_k] \sim \mathbf{m} \cdot \left[\frac{\lambda^k}{k!} \exp(-\lambda)\right]$$

where $\lambda := n/m$ is constant, with $n \to \infty$ and $m \to \infty$.

Since $\mathbb{E}[W_0] \sim m \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{n}{m}\right)$ then, with \widehat{w}_0 observed empty urns,

$$n \approx -\frac{m}{\log\left(\frac{\widehat{w}_0}{m}\right)}$$
(11)

¹after Whang et al, "*A Linear-Time Probabilistic Counting Algorithm for Database Applications*," ACM Trans. on Database Systems, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 208-229, June 1990.

C) JOINING all regimes



linear counting

core algorithm $_{19/20}$

5. CONCLUSION

- a **complete** algorithm (large range of cardinalities)
- optimal within its class
- the full analysis with precise knowledge of the output

5. CONCLUSION

- a **complete** algorithm (large range of cardinalities)
- optimal within its class
- the full analysis with precise knowledge of the output

Future (immediate):

- rate of convergence
- attempt transposing the analysis to Hyperloglog
- plug-in the limit distribution analysis in simple algorithms which use cardinality estimation as a black box.