

MementoHash: A Stateful, Minimal Memory, Best Performing Consistent Hash Algorithm

Massimo Coluzzi, Amos Brocco, Alessandro Antonucci, Tiziano Leidi

Department of Innovative Technologies,

University of Applied Sciences and Arts of Southern Switzerland, Lugano, Switzerland

Email: {massimo.coluzzi,amos.brocco,alessandro.antonucci,tiziano.leidi}@supsi.ch

Abstract—Consistent hashing is used in distributed systems and networking applications to spread data evenly and efficiently across a cluster of nodes. In this paper, we present *MementoHash*, a novel consistent hashing algorithm that eliminates known limitations of state-of-the-art algorithms while keeping optimal performance and minimal memory usage. We describe the algorithm in detail, provide a pseudo-code implementation, and formally establish its solid theoretical guarantees. To measure the efficacy of *MementoHash*, we compare its performance, in terms of memory usage and lookup time, to that of state-of-the-art algorithms, namely, *AnchorHash*, *DxHash*, and *JumpHash*. Unlike *JumpHash*, *MementoHash* can handle random failures. Moreover, *MementoHash* does not require fixing the overall capacity of the cluster (as *AnchorHash* and *DxHash* do), allowing it to scale indefinitely. The number of removed nodes affects the performance of all the considered algorithms. Therefore, we conduct experiments considering three different scenarios: stable (no removed nodes), one-shot removals (90% of the nodes removed at once), and incremental removals. We report experimental results that averaged a varying number of nodes from ten to one million. Results indicate that our algorithm shows optimal lookup performance and minimal memory usage in its best-case scenario. It behaves better than *AnchorHash* and *DxHash* in its average-case scenario and at least as well as those two algorithms in its worst-case scenario. However, the worst-case scenario for *MementoHash* occurs when more than 70% of the nodes fail, which describes a unlikely scenario. Therefore, *MementoHash* shows the best performance during the regular life cycle of a cluster.

Index Terms—Consistent hashing, load balancing, scalability.

I. INTRODUCTION

A distributed system consists of multiple nodes that manage different kind of data, such as files for distributed storage, records for distributed databases, or requests for load balancers. An even distribution of these data units, also referred to as *resources*, among the nodes is necessary to prevent specific nodes from being overloaded. Consistent hashing is widely known for its ability to evenly allocate the load across the system and minimize the number of resources that need to be remapped during cluster scaling [1]. After the introduction of cloud infrastructures, *elasticity*, namely the ability to scale quickly and efficiently, has become a concept of paramount importance. Elasticity demands efficient and high-performing consistent hashing algorithms because resources must be redistributed to maintain balance as nodes are added or removed. Each resource is uniquely identified by a key, and each node is mapped to a sequential integer called a *bucket*. In the considered scenario, each node in a cluster of size n is

mapped to a unique value in the range $[0, n-1]$. The lookup operation maps each key to a bucket in a deterministic way, therefore invoking the lookup operation on the same key must return the same bucket as long as such a bucket is available. The challenge is to efficiently map keys to buckets, knowing that each key represents a resource and each bucket represents a node in a distributed system. The scientific literature proposes several algorithms that strive to obtain the best balance between desirable properties, algorithmic complexity, and real-world performance. Our contribution, named *MementoHash*, represents a novel consistent hashing algorithm that eliminates known limitations of state-of-the-art algorithms while keeping optimal performance and minimal memory usage.

II. RELATED WORK

Consistent hashing algorithms are not a novel concept: the first example in the literature can be dated back to 1996, when Thaler and Ravishankar proposed *Rendezvous* [2][3], while the term was first used by Karger and co-authors in 1997 [4]. Other consistent hashing algorithms for non peer-to-peer environments followed. Overall, the most prominent ones, published between 1996 and 2021, are:

- *Rendezvous*: published by Thaler and Ravishankar in 1996 [2][3].
- *Consistent Hashing Ring*: published by Karger et al. in 1997 [4][5].
- *JumpHash*: published by Lamping and Veach in 2014 [6].
- *Multi-probe*: published by Appleton and O'Reilly in 2015 [7].
- *Maglev*: published by Eisenbud in 2016 [8].
- *AnchorHash*: published by Mendelson et al. in 2020 [9].
- *DxHash*: published by Dong and Wang in 2021 [10].

For the sake of conciseness, in the following we omit the *hash* suffix from the names of the aforementioned algorithms (e.g., *Memento* instead of *MementoHash*).

In a previous work [11][12], we implemented all the above algorithms in Java together with a benchmark tool specifically designed for consistent hashing algorithms [13]. We compared them against the following metrics:

- **memory usage**: the amount of memory used to store the internal data structure.
- **initialization time**: the time needed to initialize the internal data structure.

- **lookup time**: the time needed to map a given key to its related bucket.
- **resize time**: the time to change the internal data structure when adding or removing buckets.
- **balance**: the ability to spread the keys evenly among the buckets.
- **resize balance**: the ability to spread the keys evenly among the buckets after resizing the cluster.
- **monotonicity**: the ability to move only the keys involved in the resizing.

We found that *Anchor*, *Dx*, and *Jump* outmatch the other algorithms in all the considered metrics. In particular, *Jump* was shown to be the best-performing algorithm since it does not use any internal data structure. It uses minimal memory and is the fastest in any time metric because it does not access memory and runs at CPU speed. However, not using any internal data structure makes *Jump* a stateless algorithm unable to keep track of the state of the cluster. *Jump* allows only the last inserted bucket to be removed, meaning that it is not able to handle the failure of a random node in the cluster. Therefore, despite its excellent performance, it is an impractical solution for production environments.

Anchor and *Dx* address this limitation by using an internal data structure to keep track of all the cluster nodes (both working and not working) which causes them to use much more memory than *Jump* and to be slower in all the time metrics. Moreover, those two algorithms require the overall capacity of the cluster to be defined during initialization. The capacity cannot change during execution, forcing an upper bound to the scalability of the cluster. We argue that it is unnecessary to maintain a record of all potential nodes, even those that are not operational. While conducting our comparative analysis, we pondered whether it would be feasible to harness the outstanding capabilities of *Jump* by incorporating a minimal data structure that only remembers the nodes that have failed. This line of thinking led us to the creation of *MementoHash*, which overcomes the limitations of *Jump* while maintaining nearly identical performance.

III. PRELIMINARIES

As previously mentioned, we consider the problem of allocating resources, which are uniquely identified by keys, to buckets. In this context we commonly turn our attention to hashing algorithms, which are deterministic functions that take an arbitrary amount of data as input and produce a fixed length output called *hash value* or *digest*. The digest, usually a number, can be mapped to a value in the interval $[0, n-1]$ using modular algebra. Hashing algorithms serve the purpose of evenly distributing keys among buckets, ensuring a balanced load distribution across all buckets. Additionally, they facilitate efficient determination of the mapping between keys and buckets. However, when the number of buckets is altered, a simple approach based on hash functions and modular algebra will result in a significant remapping of keys to different buckets. Consequently, a distributed system experiences the relocation of nearly all its resources across nodes each time a node joins or departs from the cluster. To address this problem,

consistent hashing solutions have been devised. It is a class of distributed hashing algorithms that provide the following properties:

balance: keys are evenly distributed among buckets. Given k keys and n buckets, ideally, $\frac{k}{n}$ keys are mapped to each bucket.

minimal disruption: the same key is always mapped to the same bucket as long as such a bucket is available. When a bucket leaves the cluster, only the keys mapped to such a bucket will move to other buckets, while keys previously mapped to the other buckets will not move.

monotonicity: when a new bucket is added, keys only move from an existing bucket to the new one, but not from an existing one to another. Given k keys and n buckets, ideally, only $\frac{k}{n+1}$ keys should move to the new bucket.

Since many consistent hashing algorithms rely on non-consistent hashing functions we deem important to introduce the following assumption.

Note. III.1. (Uniform hash functions) We assume the hash functions used inside the consistent hashing algorithms to produce a uniform distribution of the keys.

A. Notation

As stated in previous sections, we can map each node of a distributed system to an integer in the range $[0, n-1]$ called a *bucket*. Therefore, we can represent a cluster as an array of buckets.

Def. III.2 (b-array). With the term *b-array* we refer to the array of buckets representing a cluster of nodes in a distributed system. A *b-array* \mathcal{N} of size n is an array of integers where every position contains a value in the range $[0, n-1]$

Def. III.3 (working bucket). With the term *working bucket* we identify a bucket related to a working node.

Moving forward, this paper will adhere to the following notation:

Def. III.4 (notation). We will use \subset to denote a strict inclusion and \subseteq to denote a non-strict inclusion.

Given a *b-array*:

- $\mathcal{N} := [0, \dots, n-1]$ is the content of the *b-array* and $n := |\mathcal{N}|$ is its size.
- $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ is the set of working buckets.
- $\mathcal{W}_b := \mathcal{W} \setminus \{b\}$ is the set of working buckets after removing bucket b .
- $\langle b \rightarrow c, p \rangle$ represents the replacement of the failing bucket b with the bucket c (more details in Sec. V).
- $\mathcal{R} := \{\langle b \rightarrow c, p \rangle | b, c \in \mathcal{N}, p \leq n\}$ is the set of replacements and $r := |\mathcal{R}|$ is the number of replacements.

IV. STATE OF THE ART

In this section, we will briefly introduce the *Jump*, *Anchor*, and *Dx* algorithms. We will discuss their strengths and weaknesses to allow a better understanding of the improvements introduced by *Memento*.

A. The Jump algorithm

By representing a cluster as a b-array, *Jump* [6] assumes every bucket to be working and the b-array to be sorted.

0	1	2	3	...	$n-2$	$n-1$
---	---	---	---	-----	-------	-------

Fig. 1. *Jump*'s representation of a cluster

Jump assumes buckets are sorted from 0 to $n-1$ and cannot change their position. Therefore, it only needs to store the size of the b-array (see, e.g., Fig. 1). When the cluster scales up, *Jump* increases the buckets count, assuming new buckets to be added to the tail of the b-array with values $n, n+1, \dots$ (see, e.g., Fig. 2).

0	1	2	3	...	$n-2$	$n-1$	n	$n+1$
---	---	---	---	-----	-------	-------	-----	-------

Fig. 2. Jump Hash: Adding two buckets

When the cluster scales down, *Jump* reduces the buckets count, assuming buckets to be removed from the tail, first $n-1$, then $n-2, \dots$ (see, e.g., Fig. 3)

0	1	2	3	...	$n-2$	$n-1$
---	---	---	---	-----	-------	-------

Fig. 3. Jump Hash: Removing two buckets

The algorithm takes a key and the size of the b-array as input parameters and returns the bucket such a key belongs (e.g., $\text{jump}(\text{key}, n) \rightarrow b \in \mathcal{N}$). It is stateless and its output depends only on the provided parameters. *Jump* holds the properties of *balance*, *monotonicity*, and *minimal disruption*. As an example, let us assume $\text{jump}(\text{key}, 10) \rightarrow 5$, then also $\text{jump}(\text{key}, 9) \rightarrow 5$, $\text{jump}(\text{key}, 8) \rightarrow 5, \dots, \text{jump}(\text{key}, 6) \rightarrow 5$. The bucket returned by *Jump* will change only when 5 is no more a working bucket (e.g., $\text{jump}(\text{key}, 5) \rightarrow 2$). Each key is always mapped to the same bucket until such a bucket is removed. This behavior describes the property of *minimal disruption*. *Jump* operates without an internal state and does not perform any memory access, allowing it to run at CPU speed. In spite of its slower theoretical growth rate, this characteristic makes *Jump* the fastest algorithm in practical terms [11][12]. In an ideal scenario where failures are absent, it would be possible to scale our cluster by adding and removing buckets in a *Last-In-First-Out* (LIFO) order. In such a case, *Jump* would be the most effective consistent-hashing algorithm available. However, in real-world environments, any node can fail at any time. Furthermore, we could need to shut down for maintenance the node mapped to the bucket 0. *Jump* does not allow you to do that unless you shut down the entire cluster. This limitation makes *Jump* impractical for real-world environments.

B. The Anchor algorithm

To address the limitations of *Jump*, *Anchor* [9] represents all the possible buckets up to the maximum size reachable by the cluster. This choice allows *Anchor* to mark which buckets are working and which are not, allowing it to handle random failures (see, e.g., Fig. 4). Let us call \mathcal{W}_b , the set of working buckets remaining after removing b . When a bucket fails, the algorithm maps \mathcal{W}_b to b . Every removed bucket b is mapped to the set of buckets that were working after the removal of b . The basic idea behind *Anchor* is to use a hash function to map a key to one of the buckets b in the cluster. If b is working, the algorithm is done. Otherwise, the key is mapped to a bucket c in the subset of buckets \mathcal{W}_b that were working when b was removed. The algorithm iterates the same logic on c . If c is working, the algorithm is done. Otherwise, the key is mapped to a bucket d in the subset of buckets \mathcal{W}_c that worked when c was removed. Since $c \in \mathcal{W}_b$, c worked when b was removed. Therefore, calling \mathcal{W} the set of working buckets, we have that $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{W}_c \subset \mathcal{W}_b$. Every iteration will work on a smaller set, and a working bucket will eventually be found.

0	1	2	3	4	5	...	$n-2$	$n-1$	n	$n+1$...	$a-2$	$a-1$
---	---	---	---	---	---	-----	-------	-------	-----	-------	-----	-------	-------

Fig. 4. Cluster representation for Anchor

The described solution takes $O(\ln(\frac{a}{w}))$ iterations to look up a key, where a is the overall capacity of the cluster (working and nonworking buckets). Still, it uses a considerable amount of memory. To overcome this issue, the authors of *Anchor* suggest an in-place solution that leverages four arrays of integers to store the required information. The in-place solution uses less memory but takes $O([\ln(\frac{a}{w})]^2)$ steps to perform a lookup. Both versions rely on the assumption of keeping track of all the available nodes in the cluster. The size of the internal data structure cannot change to ensure *monotonicity* and *minimal disruption*. Therefore, from start the arrays must be big enough to contain any possible buckets. Foreseeing from the early beginning the maximum size reachable by the cluster is not a trivial task. Capacity can be ensured by instantiating large arrays, but overestimating will consume resources and slow down performance.

C. The Dx algorithm

Dx [10] reduces the memory consumption by using a bit-array to mark the availability of the buckets. It is a remarkable improvement compared to the four integer arrays used by *Anchor*. Still, it uses an amount of memory proportional to the overall capacity of the cluster. In order to compute a position in the range $[0, a-1]$, *Dx* uses a pseudo-random function R initialized with the key as the seed. Accordingly, a sequence of buckets in the form $R(k), R(R(k)), R(R(R(k))) \dots$ can be generated, and the first working bucket is chosen (see, e.g., Fig. 5). *Dx* trades the improvement in memory consumption in terms of lookup time. It takes $O(\frac{a}{w})$ steps to perform a lookup while suffering from the same limitations of *Anchor* (i.e., upper bound in the overall capacity of the cluster).




Fig. 5. Lookup process of Dx

V. MEMENTOHASH

The basic idea behind the *Memento* algorithm is to use memory just to remember the removed buckets. It starts with an empty data structure and relies on *Jump* as its core engine. When all the buckets are working, or when buckets are removed in *LIFO* order, *Memento* works exactly like *Jump*. If a random bucket is removed (i.e., the related node fails) *Memento* stores this information in its internal data structure and redistributes the keys among the remaining buckets.

A. Dense b-arrays

When we initially set up a new cluster, we associate each node to a sequential bucket. We can represent the cluster as a b-array where each bucket represents a working node and is positioned at the corresponding index. *Jump* assumes the b-array always to be in this configuration (see, e.g., Fig. 6).

Index	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Bucket	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Fig. 6. Initial state of a b-array of size 10

Def. V.1 (dense b-array). Given a b-array \mathcal{N} of size n and a value $w \leq n$. We define the b-array as dense up to w , $D_w(\mathcal{N})$ if every index between 0 and $w-1$ contains a working bucket.

The b-array representing the initial configuration of a cluster of size $n = w = |\mathcal{N}|$ is dense (i.e., $D_n(\mathcal{N})$ holds), and the buckets are sorted from 0 to $n-1$. If we remove the last bucket, $w = |\mathcal{N}| - 1$, hence $D_{n-1}(\mathcal{N})$ holds. It is the working condition for *Jump*. On the other hand, if we remove a random bucket other than the last (i.e., the related node fails), we create a gap, and neither $D_n(\mathcal{N})$ nor $D_{n-1}(\mathcal{N})$ hold.

B. Maintaining a dense b-array

In the general sense, random node removals prevent us from using *Jump*. In the following we thus present the basic idea that enables us to keep the b-array dense. Let us assume to have a b-array \mathcal{N}_0 of size 10 (Fig. 7), $D_{10}(\mathcal{N}_0)$ holds. If we remove bucket 9, the condition $D_9(\mathcal{N}_1)$ holds. Subsequently, if we remove bucket 5, we create a gap, and neither $D_9(\mathcal{N}_1)$ nor $D_8(\mathcal{N}_1)$ would hold. Accordingly, to fill the gap, we can copy bucket 8 in position 5 to obtain \mathcal{N}_2 , where $D_8(\mathcal{N}_2)$ and $D_9(\mathcal{N}_2)$ hold again.




Fig. 7. Removing a bucket: the last (9) or any other than the last (5)

Since we removed bucket 5, the new size of our cluster is $w = 8$. So, we will consider only the buckets in the positions from 0 to 7. After removing bucket 5 the working buckets are $[0, 8] \setminus \{5\}$, which are precisely the buckets available from position 0 to 7. If we remove another bucket, for example, bucket 1, we fill the gap by copying bucket 7 in position 1 to obtain \mathcal{N}_3 (Fig. 8). The working buckets are now $[0, 8] \setminus \{1, 5\}$, and the size of the cluster becomes 7.

Prop. V.2. The new size of the cluster always corresponds to the index of the bucket we use to fill the gap.





Fig. 8. Filling the gap after removal of bucket 1

If we compare the b-array versions \mathcal{N}_1 , \mathcal{N}_2 , and \mathcal{N}_3 we can notice that they are identical except for the positions of the removed buckets. Therefore, instead of representing the whole b-array, we can represent only the differences between the initial and the current state of the b-array (Fig. 9).

Fig. 9. Comparing versions \mathcal{N}_1 , \mathcal{N}_2 , and \mathcal{N}_3

Each bucket corresponds to its position in the initial state \mathcal{N}_0 , so we do not need to represent it; we just need the size of the b-array. Removing the last bucket just reduces the size of the b-array. Also in this case, we just need to update its size ($n \leftarrow n-1$). For every removed bucket b , other than the last one, we remember its replacement in the form $b \rightarrow c$ where c is the replacing bucket. As we will discuss later, when we restore the buckets, we should do it in reverse order, from the last removed bucket backward. This approach preserves the properties of *balance* and *minimal disruption* of the algorithm. Therefore, when a bucket b is removed, we store

the replacement $b \rightarrow c$ together with the previously removed bucket p .

Def. V.3 (replacement). A replacement is defined by a tuple $\langle b \rightarrow c, p \rangle$ where b is the removed bucket, c is the replacing one, and p is the previously removed bucket.

Given a cluster with n initial nodes, all the buckets are working and are in the range $[0, n-1]$. When the first bucket b is removed, we set $p = n$ in the replacement. This way, when the first removed bucket get restored, the next node added to the cluster will be mapped to the bucket n as expected.

Prop. V.4. The number of working buckets $w = n - r$ is given by the difference between the size of the b-array $n = |\mathcal{N}|$ and the number of replacements $r = |\mathcal{R}|$ (i.e., the number of removed buckets).

Let l , with $0 \leq l \leq n$, be the last removed bucket. Accordingly, the aforementioned removals lead to the following updates:

Initialization: $n = 10, R_{\mathcal{N}_0} = \{\}, l = 10$
 Removing bucket 9: $n = 9, R_{\mathcal{N}_1} = \{\}, l = 9$
 Removing bucket 5: $n = 9, R_{\mathcal{N}_2} = \{\langle 5 \rightarrow 8, 9 \rangle\}, l = 5$
 Removing bucket 1: $n = 9, R_{\mathcal{N}_3} = \{\langle 5 \rightarrow 8, 9 \rangle, \langle 1 \rightarrow 7, 5 \rangle\}, l = 1$

This replacement strategy works well in all situations. However, in the following sections, we will discuss two edge cases we can get while removing buckets.

C. Removing a replacing bucket

In the previous example, we removed bucket 5, replacing it with 8, and then we removed bucket 1, replacing it with 7. We will now show what happens if we remove bucket 8 from \mathcal{N}_3 . Following the same logic, we will copy bucket 6 in position 8. The remaining working buckets are 6 namely: $\mathcal{N}_4 = \{0, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7\}$ (Fig. 10). At this point, to find the actual replacement of bucket 5, we need to apply the substitution two times $5 \rightarrow 8 \rightarrow 6$. In Fig. 10, we can see how substitutions can be chained to obtain a proper replacement.




Fig. 10. Removing a replacing bucket

The proper bucket positions (containing the working buckets) are in the range $[0, 5]$. Therefore, positions 6, 7, or 8 cannot be directly reached. The only way to hit one of the related buckets is through redirection.

The same concept holds in the opposite situation where the replacing bucket was removed in a previous iteration. In this case we fill the gap with an already replaced bucket. Therefore, to find the working bucket we need to follow the chain of replacements.

D. Replacing a bucket with itself

Suppose to remove bucket 5 from the b-array \mathcal{N}_4 . Applying the same logic, bucket 5 must be copied in position 5 to obtain \mathcal{N}_5 (Fig. 11). Bucket 5 is replaced by itself. However, this is not an issue since, after removing bucket 5, the size of the cluster becomes 5. Therefore, the proper bucket positions are in the range $[0, 4]$, representing the set of working buckets $\{0, 2, 3, 4, 7\}$. Position 5 cannot be hit directly, and bucket 5 cannot be reached via redirection.




Fig. 11. Replacing a bucket with itself

VI. EXPLANATION OF THE ALGORITHM

As described in the previous sections, *Memento* relies entirely on *Jump* as its core engine. The latter ensures *balance*, *monotonicity* when adding new buckets, and *minimal disruption* when removing buckets from the tail. However, since *Memento* allows for removing arbitrary buckets, additional state information needs to be stored.

Def. VI.1 (state). The algorithm state information S , which comprises all relevant information required by *Memento*, is defined as $S := \langle n, \mathcal{R}, l \rangle$ where:

- n is the size of the b-array
- \mathcal{R} is the set of replacements
- l , with $0 \leq l \leq n$, is the last removed bucket.

In the following, the underlying details of the algorithm will be discussed.

A. Initialization

When we set up a new cluster of size n , all the initial buckets are working ($\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{N}$ and $\mathcal{R} = \emptyset$). *Memento* initializes its state by storing the initial number of buckets and creating an empty set of replacements (Alg. 1). The last removed bucket l get initialized to the value of n , since the b-array would grow starting from this index.

Algorithm 1 Init Memento

Require: $initial_node_count > 0$

function INIT($initial_node_count$)

$n \leftarrow initial_node_count$

$l \leftarrow n$

$\triangleright l = \text{last removed bucket}$

$\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \emptyset$

end function

B. Removing a bucket

If all the buckets work and we remove a bucket from the tail, it reduces the b-array's size. Otherwise, if there are already removed buckets or when removing a bucket b other than the last, *Memento* creates a new replacement $\langle b \rightarrow w-1, l \rangle$ and puts it into \mathcal{R} . The bucket b becomes the new last removed $l \leftarrow b$. The removal procedure is described in Alg. 2.

Algorithm 2 Remove a bucket

Require: $0 \leq b < n$

function REM(b)

if $b = n - 1$ **and** $\mathcal{R} = \emptyset$ **then**

$n \leftarrow n - 1$ ▷ Size is reduced by 1

else

$w = n - |\mathcal{R}|$

$\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R} \cup \langle b \rightarrow w - 1, l \rangle$

end if

$l \leftarrow b$ ▷ The last removed bucket

end function

C. Adding a bucket

If all the buckets are working, a new bucket will be added to the tail of the array, increasing the number of buckets by one. Otherwise, we will restore the last removed bucket (Alg. 3).

Algorithm 3 Add a bucket

Ensure: $0 \leq b \leq n$

function ADD()

if $\mathcal{R} = \emptyset$ **then** ▷ Adds a bucket to the tail

$b \leftarrow n$

$l \leftarrow n \leftarrow n + 1$

else

$b \leftarrow l$ ▷ Get the last removed bucket

$\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \mathcal{R} \setminus \langle b \rightarrow c, p \rangle$ ▷ Remove the replacement

$l \leftarrow p$ ▷ Updates the last removed bucket

end if

return b

end function

As described in Sec. V-C, there are edge cases where removing buckets may create chains of replacements. By always restoring the last removed bucket, we guarantee to properly untie the chains of replacements.

D. Lookup

The explanation of the lookup function is the following. We start hitting a position in the b -array. If the related bucket b works, we are done. Otherwise, we hit a new position in the portion of b -array \mathcal{W}_b containing the working buckets when b was removed. We hit a new bucket, $c \in \mathcal{W}_b$. If it works, we are done. Otherwise, we search in the portion of b -array \mathcal{W}_c containing the working buckets when c was removed. This second portion is smaller than \mathcal{W}_b (i.e., $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{W}_c \subset \mathcal{W}_b$). Therefore, eventually, we will reach the portion of the b -array \mathcal{W} containing only working buckets.

More specifically, when performing a lookup, *Memento* starts by invoking *Jump* to get a bucket b in the range $[0, n-1]$ (Alg. 4 line 2). If the bucket is working, the lookup is done. Otherwise, there must be a replacement in the form $\langle b \rightarrow c, p \rangle \in \mathcal{R}$ for some $c, p \in \mathcal{N}$.

When we start a new cluster, all the buckets are working. *Jump* is balanced and evenly maps the keys among the buckets. When we remove a bucket b other than the last, all the keys originally mapped to b need to be evenly distributed among the remaining buckets.

As stated in Prop. V.2, the value c corresponds also to the remaining number of working buckets after the removal of b (Alg. 4 line 4). Therefore, the working buckets can be found only in range $[0, c-1]$.

We hash the key again to get a new mapping in the range $[0, c-1]$ (Alg. 4 lines 5 and 6). This time we do not need the hashing algorithm to be consistent. So, we can reduce complexity by using an uniform hash function as described in Note III.1 that works in $O(1)$ (assuming keys to be of fixed size).

Algorithm 4 Lookup

Ensure: $0 \leq b < n$

1: **function** LOOKUP(key)

2: $b \leftarrow \text{jump}(key, n)$

3: **while** $\exists \langle b \rightarrow c, p \rangle \in \mathcal{R}$ **do**

4: $w_b \leftarrow c$ ▷ Working buckets after b was removed

5: $h \leftarrow \text{hash}(key, b)$ ▷ Traditional hash function

6: $d \leftarrow h \bmod w_b$ ▷ New bucket in $[0, w_b - 1]$

7: **while** $\exists \langle d \rightarrow u, q \rangle \in \mathcal{R}$ and $u \geq w_b$ **do**

8: $d \leftarrow u$ ▷ Follow substitutions

9: **end while**

10: $b \leftarrow d$

11: **end while**

12: **return** b

13: **end function**

At this step, if we hit a working bucket, the algorithm is done. Otherwise, we follow the replacements chain until either we find a working bucket, or we find a bucket d removed after b (Alg. 4 lines 7 and 8). It is worth noting that the inner loop is crucial to guarantee the balance, since following the chain until reaching a working bucket would result in an unbalanced distribution. Suppose, for instance, to have a b -array of size 6 and remove buckets 0, 3, and 5 in order (Fig. 12, steps *I*, *II*, and *III* denote the removal order and the corresponding replacement). The replacement set is $\mathcal{R} = \{\langle 0 \rightarrow 5, 6 \rangle, \langle 3 \rightarrow 4, 0 \rangle, \langle 5 \rightarrow 3, 3 \rangle\}$.




Fig. 12. Removing bucket 0, 3, and 5

The first operation of the lookup $\text{jump}(key, 6)$ returns 3. Bucket 3 was removed (i.e., $\langle 3 \rightarrow 4, 0 \rangle \in \mathcal{R}$), so we rehash the key to get an index in the range $[0, 4-1]$. We assume to use a uniform hash function, so every index has the same probability of being selected. Buckets 0 and 3 are removed, and both redirect to bucket 4 ($3 \rightarrow 4$ and $0 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 4$). Therefore, buckets 1 and 2 have 25% probability of being selected, while the probability of selecting bucket 4 is 50%. Thanks to the condition of the internal loop, this balance issue is avoided. If the first rehash returns 1 or 2, we find a working bucket, and

the loop exits. If it returns 3, we follow the redirect hitting bucket 4 that is also working, and the loop exits. Finally, if it returns 0, we follow the first redirect $\langle 0 \rightarrow 5, 3 \rangle \in \mathcal{R}$, hitting 5. Bucket 5 was removed after bucket 3 (i.e., $\langle 5 \rightarrow 3, 0 \rangle \in \mathcal{R}$ but $3 \not\leq w_b = 4$). Therefore, the internal loop stops, and we rehash the key again to get an index in the interval $[0, 3-1]$. Again every index has the same probability of being selected. This time, the internal loop keeps following the substitution chain until hitting bucket 4. This allows keys to be distributed evenly among the working buckets. Keys returning the indexes 1, 2, or 3 end the external loop in one iteration, while keys returning the index 0 do an additional iteration that distributes the keys evenly among the working buckets.

Prop. VI.2. *The lookup function always ends.*

Proof. By construction, all the working buckets can be reached by hitting a position in the range $[0, w-1]$ and following the substitutions. The algorithm starts with the range $[0, n-1] \geq [0, w-1]$. At each iteration, either it finds a working bucket and ends, or it reduces the range by a delta $\delta > 0$. Eventually, the range becomes $[0, w-1]$, where every position leads to a working bucket. \square

Prop. VI.3. *Minimal disruption holds for Memento.*

Proof. When we remove a bucket b , only the keys previously mapped to b should move to a new location. We will prove this property by induction on r (the number of removed buckets).

- **$r = 1$:** If we remove the bucket from the tail, minimal disruption is guaranteed by *Jump*. Otherwise, let us assume to remove a bucket b other than the last. First, we invoke *Jump*. If it returns an index other than b the algorithm ends. The position of the keys previously mapped to a bucket other than b does not change. If *Jump* returns b the key is rehashed and mapped to an index in the range $[0, n-2]$. If it hits b again, it will be redirected to $c \neq b$. Only keys previously mapped to b will move to another bucket.
- **r :** we assume the property to hold for $r \geq 1$.
- **$r+1$:** by hypothesis all the keys were consistently moved to the $n - r$ working buckets. After we remove a new bucket b , the lookup algorithm stops if a key hits a working bucket. Keys on working buckets do not move. Keys hitting a previously removed bucket will not move by hypothesis. Finally, if a key hits b (the last removed bucket), it will be rehashed and mapped to an index in the range $[0, n-r-2]$ that contains only working buckets. Therefore, only keys mapped to b will move to a working bucket. \square

Prop. VI.4. *Balance holds for Memento*

Proof. We prove the balance by induction on the number of removed buckets r .

- **$r = 0$:** balance is guaranteed by *Jump*.
- **$r = 1$:** first we invoke *Jump*, evenly distributing keys among all the buckets. Every bucket gets $\frac{k}{n}$ keys. The keys mapped on the only removed bucket b are rehashed

and mapped to an index in the range $[0, n-2]$. The hash function is assumed to be uniform, so every index gets $\frac{\frac{k}{n}}{n-1}$ keys. The keys that hit b again are remapped to c . Therefore, all the buckets except b will end up having $\frac{k}{n} + \frac{\frac{k}{n}}{n-1} = \frac{k}{n} + \frac{k}{n(n-1)} = \frac{k(n-1)+k}{n(n-1)} = \frac{kn}{n(n-1)} = \frac{k}{n-1}$ keys.

- **r :** we assume the property to hold for $r \geq 0$.
- **$r+1$:** we assume the keys to be evenly distributed after removing r buckets. Every working bucket has $\frac{k}{n-r}$ keys. When we remove a new bucket b , all the keys previously mapped to other buckets will not be affected (minimal disruption). The keys previously mapped to b will be rehashed and mapped to an index in the range $[0, n-r-2]$. Since we use a uniform hash function, every index in $[0, n-r-2]$ gets $\frac{1}{n-r-1}$ of the rehashed keys. After the removal of b every working bucket will have $\frac{k}{n-r} + \frac{\frac{k}{n-r}}{n-r-1} = \frac{k}{n-r} + \frac{k}{(n-r-1)(n-r)} = \frac{k(n-r)}{(n-r)(n-r-1)} = \frac{k}{n-r-1}$ keys. \square

Prop. VI.5. *Monotonicity holds for Memento.*

Proof. When a new bucket is added, keys only move from an existing bucket to the new one, but not between existing ones. We will prove this property by induction on the number of removed buckets r .

- **$r = 0$:** there are no removed buckets. The new bucket is added to the tail and monotonicity is guaranteed by *Jump*.
- **$r = 1$:** we have only one removed bucket b . Keys that are sent to b by *Jump* in the first place are evenly remapped to the remaining buckets. As proven in VI.4, every bucket other than b gets $\frac{1}{n-1}$ of the keys previously mapped to b . When we add a new node to the cluster, *Memento* will assign to such a node the bucket b . Keys previously mapped to b will move to b again, so from every node other than b , $\frac{k}{n(n-1)}$ keys will move to b . A total of $\frac{k}{n}$ keys will move to b . Keys mapped by *Jump* to buckets other than b are not affected by this operation and, therefore, will not move.
- **r :** we assume the property to hold for $r \geq 1$.
- **$r+1$:** by hypothesis monotonicity holds when up to r buckets are removed. We assume to have $r+1$ removed buckets and add a new node to the cluster. *Memento* restores the last removed bucket. As discussed in VI.3, keys were remapped to the working buckets when the last bucket b was removed. Each working bucket got $\frac{1}{n-r-1}$ of the keys previously mapped to b . When b gets restored, keys are not remapped anymore. Therefore, any working bucket other than b will send $\frac{k}{(n-r)(n-r-1)}$ keys back to b . A total of $\frac{k}{n-r}$ keys will move to b , and no keys will move to any other node. \square

VII. COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXITY

In this section, we explore the computational complexity of the functions described earlier. The complexity related to

initializing the data structure, adding and removing buckets is considered negligible, thus requiring only a brief explanation. For the lookup function we provide instead a formal characterisation to elaborate on its intricate nature.

A. Initialization

During the initialization phase, we assume all nodes to be working and each bucket to match its own position. The set of replacements is initialized as an empty set (or hash table) and the size of the b-array is stored in the algorithm state. The initialization takes therefore $O(1)$ and uses minimal memory.

B. Removing a bucket

If $b = n-1$ and $\mathcal{R} = \emptyset$ the algorithm just updates the size of the b-array which takes $O(1)$. Otherwise, a new replacement is created and added to the replacement set. The replacement is a tuple and can be created in constant time. The replacement can be added in constant time by using a hash table to represent \mathcal{R} . So, the overall complexity of removing a bucket is $O(1)$.

C. Adding a bucket

If $\mathcal{R} = \emptyset$ (no previously removed buckets), we assume the bucket to be added to the tail of the b-array. In this case, the algorithm stores such information by increasing the size of the b-array, which takes $O(1)$. Otherwise, the algorithm restores the last removed bucket. A replacement can be removed in constant time by using a hash table to represent \mathcal{R} . So, the overall complexity of adding a bucket is $O(1)$.

D. Lookup

In this section, we derive an upper bound to the average number of operations needed to lookup a key. The algorithm starts invoking $b \leftarrow \text{jump}(\text{key}, n)$ which takes $O(\ln(n))$ [6]. If the first step hits a working bucket the algorithm is done. Otherwise there are two nested loops. We will start by giving an upper bound to the number of iterations of the external loop (Alg. 4 lines 3-11).

Prop. VII.1 (External loop computational complexity). *Let τ denote the number of iterations of the external loop in Alg. 4 given a b-array of size n with $w \leq n$ working buckets and a given key. Due to the stochastic nature of the underlying process, τ is a random variable and we have that:*

- (i) *the expectation of τ is upper-bounded by $\ln(\frac{n}{w})$; and*
- (ii) *the standard deviation of τ is upper-bounded by $\sqrt{\ln(\frac{n}{w})}$.*

Proof. We prove the proposition by deriving a closed-form expression for the *moment generating function* (MGF, [14]) of τ , that is defined as:

$$\phi_\tau(s) := \mathbb{E}[e^{s\tau}], \quad (1)$$

with \mathbb{E} denoting the expectation of its argument computed w.r.t. the distribution $\mathbb{P}(\tau)$. It is a straightforward exercise to check that the expectation and the variance of τ can be

expressed by means of the first two derivatives of the MGF computed for $s = 0$:

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau] = \phi'_\tau(0), \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbb{V}(\tau) = \phi''_\tau(0) - (\phi'_\tau(0))^2. \quad (3)$$

Remember that \mathcal{W}_b denotes the set of working buckets after b was removed. When the first step (i.e., $\text{jump}(\text{key}, n)$) hits a removed bucket b , there must exist a replacement tuple $\langle b \rightarrow c, p \rangle \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $c \in \mathcal{W}_b$ represents both the replacing bucket (see Prop. V.2) and the number of working buckets after b was removed (i.e., $c = |\mathcal{W}_b|$). The existence of such a tuple is the entering condition for the external loop. The key is consequently rehashed to an index in the interval $[0, c-1]$ with uniform probability, and b is replaced by either a working bucket or a bucket removed after b . The interval $[0, c-1]$ becomes smaller after each iteration, and the loop terminates when we reach the interval containing only working buckets.

Consider a fixed sequence of removed buckets $r_{n-w-1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow r_0$ where r_{n-w-1} is the first removed bucket and r_0 the last one. Denote as \mathcal{W}_{r_i} the set of working buckets after the removal of r_i (hence, $\mathcal{W}_{r_0} = \mathcal{W}$). We might regard the working buckets as buckets that have not been already removed, and extend the sequence by adding working buckets with negative indexes to the tail, i.e., $r_{n-w-1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow r_0 \rightarrow r_{-1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow r_{-w}$. In this way, every bucket b is equal to r_i for some i , being working iff $i < 0$. In particular, if $b = \text{jump}(\text{key}, n)$ is the bucket returned by the first instruction of the algorithm (line 2) there is a i such that $b = r_i$. If $b \in \mathcal{W}$ (i.e., $i < 0$) the loop exits and $\tau = 1$. If this is not the case, we call τ_i the number of iterations of the loop when $i \geq 0$.

When the algorithm enters the loop, a new bucket $d \in \mathcal{W}_b$ is picked with uniform probability. Let us consider a discrete random variable j defined as the index (smaller than i by construction) such that $d = r_j$. If $j < 0$, we have that d is working, the loop ends and $\tau_i = 1$. Otherwise, if $0 \leq j < i$, by the uniform hashing assumption (see Note III.1), $\tau_i = 1 + \tau_j$. Finally, notice that, since $\mathcal{W}_{r_0} = \mathcal{W}$, $\tau_0 = 1$.

Consider the MGF of τ_i , which, with a small abuse of notation, is denoted as:

$$\phi_i(s) := \mathbb{E}[e^{s\tau_i}]. \quad (4)$$

This allows us to apply the law of total expectation to $\phi_i(s)$ by conditioning w.r.t. j , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_i(s) &= \mathbb{P}(j < 0) \cdot \mathbb{E}[e^{s\tau_i} | j < 0] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \mathbb{P}(j = k) \cdot \mathbb{E}[e^{s\tau_i} | j = k]. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Distribution $\mathbb{P}(j)$ is uniform over its $w + i$ integer values. We can therefore rewrite Eq. (5) as:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_i(s) &= \frac{w}{w+i} \cdot \mathbb{E}[e^{s\tau_i} | j < 0] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{w+i} \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \mathbb{E}[e^{s\tau_i} | j = k]. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

For $j < 0$ (i.e., $d \in \mathcal{W}$), as the loop ends after one iteration and a single hash calculation is done, we have $\tau_i = 1$ and hence:

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{s\tau_i} | j < 0] = e^s. \quad (7)$$

For each $j = k$ with $0 \leq k < i$, we already proved that $\tau_i = 1 + \tau_k$ and hence:

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{s\tau_i} | j = k] = \mathbb{E}[e^{s(1+\tau_k)}] = e^s \mathbb{E}[e^{s\tau_k}]. \quad (8)$$

Overall, by Eqs. (7) and (8) and the definition in Eq. (4), we can rewrite Eq. (6) as follows:

$$\phi_i(s) = \frac{we^s}{w+i} + \frac{e^s}{w+i} \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \phi_k(s), \quad (9)$$

and hence, by simple algebra:

$$\frac{w+i}{e^s} \phi_i(s) = w + \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \phi_k(s), \quad (10)$$

and finally, by putting in evidence $\phi_{i-1}(s)$:

$$\frac{w+i}{e^s} \phi_i(s) = w + \sum_{k=0}^{i-2} \phi_k(s) + \phi_{i-1}(s). \quad (11)$$

If we rewrite Eq. (10) with $i-1$ instead of i , we obtain on the r.h.s. the first two terms of the r.h.s. of Eq. (11). The latter equation might therefore rewrite as:

$$\frac{w+i}{e^s} \phi_i(s) = \frac{w+i-1}{e^s} \phi_{i-1}(s) + \phi_{i-1}(s), \quad (12)$$

and hence, by simple algebra, as the following recursion:

$$\phi_i(s) = \frac{w+i-1+e^s}{w+i} \phi_{i-1}(s). \quad (13)$$

As $\phi_0(s) = e^s$, for each $i > 0$ we obtain the following closed-form expression for Eq. (13):

$$\phi_i(s) = e^s \prod_{k=1}^i \frac{w+k-1+e^s}{w+k}, \quad (14)$$

and hence, by taking the logarithm on both sides:

$$\ln(\phi_i(s)) = s + \sum_{j=1}^i \ln \left(\frac{w+j-1+e^s}{w+j} \right), \quad (15)$$

and finally, by taking the derivative on both sides:

$$\frac{\phi'_i(s)}{\phi_i(s)} = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^i \frac{e^s}{w+k-1+e^s}. \quad (16)$$

By the MGF definition, we trivially have $\phi_i(0) = 1$. Thus, from Eqs. (2) and (16):

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau_i] = \phi'_i(0) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^i \frac{1}{w+k}. \quad (17)$$

Note that the number τ of iterations for the external loop is stochastically larger when $b = r_{n-w}$ is the first removed bucket. Therefore, we can upper-bound the expectation of τ and, by Eq. (17), write:

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau] \leq \mathbb{E}[\tau_{n-w}] = \phi'_{n-w}(0) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n-w} \frac{1}{w+k}. \quad (18)$$

The proof of (i) finally follows from the fact that the sum in the r.h.s. of Eq. (17) is equal to the difference between the n -th and the w -th *harmonic numbers* being therefore dominated by the difference of the corresponding natural logarithms, i.e.,¹

$$1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n-w} \frac{1}{w+k} \leq 1 + \ln \left(\frac{n}{w} \right). \quad (19)$$

We similarly upper-bound the variance (and then the standard deviation), by first taking the derivative of Eq. (16):

$$\frac{\phi''_i(s)\phi_i(s) - (\phi'_i(s))^2}{(\phi_i(s))^2} = \sum_{k=1}^i \frac{e^s(w+k-1+e^s) - e^{2s}}{(w+k-1+e^s)^2}. \quad (20)$$

Evaluating Eq. (20) for $s = 0$ and noting that $\phi_i(0) = 1$ we obtain on the l.h.s. the variance of τ_i as in Eq. (3) and hence:

$$\mathbb{V}(\tau_i) = \sum_{k=1}^i \frac{w+k-1}{(w+k)^2}. \quad (21)$$

As for the expected value the variance of τ is stochastically dominated by the worst-case value in $b = r_{n-w}$, thus:

$$\mathbb{V}(\tau) \leq \mathbb{V}(\tau_{n-w}) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-w} \frac{w+k-1}{(w+k)^2}, \quad (22)$$

and hence:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-w} \frac{w+k-1}{(w+k)^2} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{n-w} \frac{w+k}{(w+k)^2} \leq \ln \left(\frac{n}{w} \right), \quad (23)$$

where the first inequality follows by simple algebra and the second is because of Eq. (19). As the standard deviation is the square root of the variance, it is upper-bounded by $\sqrt{\ln(\frac{n}{w})}$. Note that the bounds do not depend on the removal sequence. \square

Let us similarly characterise the worst-case complexity of the internal loop of the algorithm by the following result.

Prop. VII.2 (Internal loop computational complexity). *Let σ denote the number of iterations of the internal loop in Alg. 4 given a b -array of size n with $w \leq n$ working buckets and a given key. Due to the stochastic nature of the underlying process, σ is a random variable and we have that:*

- the expectation of σ is upper-bounded by $\ln(\frac{n}{w})$; and
- the standard deviation of σ is upper-bounded by $\sqrt{\ln(\frac{n}{w})}$.

Proof. The proof is very similar to that of Prop. VII.1. As in the other proof, let us extend the sequence of removals by adding the working buckets to the tail with negative indexes: $r_{n-w-1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow r_0 \rightarrow r_{-1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow r_{-w}$.

The first step of the algorithm returns a random bucket $b \leftarrow \text{jump}(\text{key}, n)$ with uniform probability. But, if we enter the external loop, then b is a removed bucket. Let us consider a discrete random variable x defined as the index such that $b = r_x$. As b is a removed bucket, we have $x \geq 0$. In this case, the algorithm generates a new bucket $d = r_i$ for some i . The

¹If H_k is the k -th harmonic number, then $H_k = \ln k + \gamma_k$, where γ_k is a monotonic function of k [15].

condition to enter also the internal loop is $\exists \langle d \rightarrow u, q \rangle \in \mathcal{R}$ and $u \geq w_b$ can be translated as follows:

*The loop ends if d is a working bucket or if d was removed after b , i.e., if $b = r_x$, $d = r_i$, and $i < x$.
The loop executes instead a new iteration if $i \geq x$.*

Let σ_i denote the number of iterations of the internal loop when $d = r_i$. If d is working or was removed after b (i.e., $i < x$), the loop ends immediately and $\sigma_i = 1$. Otherwise, d is replaced by u (Alg. 4 line 8) with $u = r_j$ for some $j < i$. Since the sequence of removed buckets can be any, also the substitutions $d \rightarrow u$ are randomly defined. Therefore, when $i > x$ the distribution of σ_i follows the same distribution as $1 + \sigma_j$. We can therefore proceed as in Eq. (5) and write the MGF of σ_i as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{t\sigma_i}] &= \mathbb{P}(j < x) \cdot \mathbb{E}[e^{t\sigma_i} | j < x] \\ &+ \sum_{k=x}^{i-1} \mathbb{P}(j = k) \cdot \mathbb{E}[e^{t\sigma_i} | j = k]. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

The number of iterations of the internal loop is stochastically larger when $b = r_0$ is the last removed bucket (i.e., $x = 0$). In this case, all the other buckets were removed before b . Thus, replacing x with 0 in Eq. (24) holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{t\sigma_i}] &\leq \mathbb{P}(j < 0) \cdot \mathbb{E}[e^{t\sigma_i} | j < 0] \\ &+ \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \mathbb{P}(j = k) \cdot \mathbb{E}[e^{t\sigma_i} | j = k], \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

and finally:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{t\sigma_i}] &\leq \frac{w}{w+i} \cdot \mathbb{E}[e^{t\sigma_i} | j < 0] \\ &+ \frac{1}{w+i} \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \mathbb{E}[e^{t\sigma_i} | j = k]. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Since the r.h.s. of Eq. (26) is the same as in Eq. (6) and the same conditions hold, we can apply the same steps as for the external loop to obtain the proof of the proposition. \square

Finally, we can provide an upper bound to the overall complexity of the two nested loops.

Prop. VII.3 (Nested loops computational complexity). *Let ω denote the overall number of iterations executed by the nested loops in Alg. 4. Due to the stochastic nature of the underlying process, ω is a random variable and we have that:*

- (i) *the expectation of ω is upper-bounded by $[\ln(\frac{n}{w})]^2$; and*
- (ii) *the standard deviation of ω is upper-bounded by $[\ln(\frac{n}{w})]^{\frac{3}{2}}$.*

Proof. Since the two loops are nested, the total number of iterations is given by the product of the iterations of the individual loops. Hence, $\omega = \tau \cdot \sigma$. As those two random variables are independent the expected values factorise, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau \cdot \sigma] = \mathbb{E}[\tau] \cdot \mathbb{E}[\sigma], \quad (27)$$

and (i) easily follow from the results about the expectations in the two previous propositions.

Finally, to characterise the standard deviation, we first consider a classical characterisation of the variance of the product of two independent variables such as τ and σ :

$$\mathbb{V}(\tau \cdot \sigma) = \mathbb{V}(\tau) \cdot \mathbb{V}(\sigma) + \mathbb{V}(\tau) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\sigma]^2 + \mathbb{E}[\tau]^2 \cdot \mathbb{V}(\sigma), \quad (28)$$

and hence, by considerations analogous to those provided for the expectations:

$$\mathbb{V}(\tau \cdot \sigma) \leq \left[\ln\left(\frac{n}{w}\right) \right]^3, \quad (29)$$

and thence the upper bound in (ii) for the standard deviation. \square

The overall complexity of the *lookup* function is given by summing the complexity of *Jump*, invoked as the first instruction, and the complexity of the nested loops, resulting in $O(\ln(n) + [\ln(\frac{n}{w})]^2)$. The following table summarizes the asymptotic complexity in time and space of *Memento* and the other algorithms considered in the paper.

TABLE I
ASYMPTOTIC COMPLEXITY

	Memento	Jump
Memory usage	$\Theta(r)$	$\Theta(1)$
Lookup time	$O(\ln(n) + [\ln(\frac{n}{w})]^2)$	$O(\ln(w))$
Init time	$\Theta(1)$	$\Theta(1)$
Resize time	$\Theta(1)$	$\Theta(1)$
	Anchor	Dx
Memory usage	$\Theta(a)$	$\Theta(a)$
Lookup time	$O([\ln(\frac{a}{w})]^2)$	$O(\frac{a}{w})$
Init time	$\Theta(a)$	$\Theta(a)$
Resize time	$\Theta(1)$	$\Theta(1)$

w = number of working buckets
 r = number of removed buckets
 a = overall capacity of the cluster
 n = size of the b-array

Memento shows to be asymptotically slower than the other considered algorithms. However, as shown in the next section, it is faster in practice. The asymptotic complexity is given by two parts:

- 1) $O(\ln(n))$ which is given by the initial execution of *Jump* (Alg. 4 line 2), and
- 2) $O([\ln(\frac{n}{w})]^2)$ which is given by the two nested loops (Alg. 4 lines 3 to 11).

As discussed in Sec. IV-A, *Jump* achieves high speed by avoiding memory accesses and operating at CPU speed. This is evident from the comparison shown in Figs. 19 and 20, where *Jump* consistently outperforms all other algorithms. The *Memento* algorithm incorporates *Jump* as its initial instruction and enters the nested loops only if the bucket returned by *Jump* is not working. When all buckets are working, *Memento* performs similarly to *Jump*. However, as buckets are removed, the latter part of the complexity becomes increasingly significant. Nonetheless, *Memento* exhibits better performance than *Anchor* and *Dx* until approximately 70% of the buckets are removed. In real-world production environments, significant efforts are made to prevent failures, resulting in a low probability of concurrent failures. Additionally, if more than 20% of the nodes fail simultaneously, the performance or memory consumption of the consistent hashing algorithm becomes

a secondary concern. The recommended usage pattern for *Memento* involves scaling the cluster by adding and removing buckets in a *Last-In-First-Out* order, utilizing replacements exclusively for failures. This approach ensures that the internal structure remains empty, resulting in optimal performance and minimal memory usage.

VIII. BENCHMARKS

We conducted a benchmark comparing the performance of *Memento* with *Jump*, *Dx*, and the in-place version of *Anchor* in terms of lookup time and memory usage. The implementations of these algorithms, together with the benchmarking tool, can be found on GitHub [13]. Our findings indicate that *Memento* performs similarly to *Jump* in the best-case scenario and better than *Anchor* and *Dx* in the worst-case scenario (up to 70% of removed nodes). As mentioned in Sec. III, *Anchor* and *Dx* require setting an upper bound for the cluster's overall capacity (referred to as the value a in Tab. I). This value impacts both time and memory complexity. Determining the appropriate overall capacity is not a straightforward task. Setting the overall capacity at double the initial cluster size is unrealistic because real-world scenarios often involve scaling clusters up to tens or hundreds of times the initial size, such as in distributed storage systems. However, using a significantly larger overall capacity would negatively impact the performance of these algorithms. Therefore, we decided to set the overall capacity to be ten times the initial capacity for each benchmark. This choice represents a reasonable compromise that reflects a real-world setup without excessively penalizing performance.

A. Evaluation scenarios

We propose a comprehensive set of empiric evaluation scenarios to determine the behavior of our algorithm. The considered metrics are *lookup time* (i.e., the time required for resolving the bucket which stores a particular key), and *memory usage*. We experimented with three main scenarios:

- *Stable*: in this scenarios the nodes (buckets) of the network are stable and no additions or removals are performed;
- *One-shot removals*: given an initial size (number of nodes), we remove 90% of the initial nodes;
- *Incremental removals*: starting from an initial size of one million nodes, a growing number of nodes (buckets) is removed from the network. The amount of nodes removed will be expressed as a percentage of the initial size.

When the network is constructed we assume that nodes are inserted, one at a time, into a corresponding data structure in a known order. This ordering influences the performance of the algorithms, therefore concerning removals, we evaluated two different strategies: for the *best case*, removals follow a *Last-In-First-Out* (LIFO) order (i.e. the first node to be removed is the last node added to the network), whereas for the *worst case* we follow a *First-In-First-Out* order (FIFO) (i.e. the first node to be removed is the first node added to the network). Since *Jump* only supports removals in *LIFO* order, the *worst case* results for that algorithm will also refer to a *LIFO* removal order.




Fig. 13. Stable scenario - Lookup time




Fig. 14. Stable scenario - Memory usage

B. Stable scenario

In the first evaluation scenario we consider stable networks of different sizes (from ten to one million nodes). Concerning the lookup time, as shown in Fig. 13, *Memento* performs similarly to *Jump*, and noticeably better than both *Anchor* and *Dx*. Regarding memory usage, *Jump* does clearly benefit from being a *stateless* algorithm, and exhibits the lowest requirements (as shown in Fig. 14 and 16). With a constant memory usage, *Memento* is on par with *Jump*, whereas *Anchor* (which has to keep track of the working buckets) and *Dx* (which optimizes memory usage by using a bit-array to mark available buckets) are the worst performers.

C. One-shot removals

When nodes are removed, all algorithms apart from *Jump* need to store additional information into their data structure. This behavior is reflected in an increased memory usage. As shown in Fig. 15, in the best case (namely when nodes are removed in a *LIFO* order), both *Memento* and *Jump* use very little memory and exhibit constant requirements regardless of the size of the network. On the contrary, *Dx*




Fig. 15. One-shot removals - Memory usage (best case)




Fig. 17. One-shot Removals - Lookup time (best case)




Fig. 16. One-shot removals - Memory usage (worst case)




Fig. 18. One-shot Removals - Lookup time (worst case)

and *Anchor* actively keep track of removed nodes, therefore increasing their memory usage. In the worst-case scenario (nodes removed in *FIFO* order), *Memento* also needs to update its state and consumed memory increases (Fig. 16). To notice that, even in its worst case scenario, *Memento* needs less memory than *Anchor* and *Dx*.

Concerning lookup-time, both *Memento* and *Jump* perform significantly better than *Dx* and display better results also compared to *Anchor* in the best-case scenario (Fig. 17). The advantage of *Memento* over *Anchor* disappears in the worst-case scenario, where the latter algorithm performs slightly better on average (Fig. 18). While *Dx* remains the slowest of the pack. As mentioned before, *Jump* does not support *FIFO* (or random) removals. Therefore the reported measurement still concerns the *LIFO* ordering.

D. Incremental removals

In the last scenario, we simulate the incremental removal up to 90% of the nodes. Fig. 19 and Fig. 20 report the lookup time in the best case and in the worst case, respectively. In the best case, and in contrast to the previous scenario, *Dx* is

by far the worst performer: this result can be explained by the fact that several additional resolution steps are introduced by that algorithm when replacing nodes. *Memento* and *Jump* perform similarly, as the logic for both of them is similar. In the worst case, *Anchor* is the worst performer, up until the removal of 70% of the nodes. After that threshold, *Memento* and *Dx* become the slowest ones. Losing more than 70% of nodes is not a common situation. During the regular life cycle of a cluster, the number of failing nodes is likely never to exceed the threshold of 20%, which is the optimal performance range for *Memento*.

Regarding memory usage, *LIFO* removals do not affect neither *Jump* nor *Memento*, as no additional information is required to keep track of removed nodes (Fig. 21). In the worst case, similarly to the *One-shot removals* scenario, *Memento* exhibits similar results as *Dx*, whereas *Anchor* has the highest memory consumption.

IX. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we presented a novel consistent hashing algorithm named *MementoHash*, which improves upon state-of-the-art algorithms such as *JumpHash*, *AnchorHash*, and




Fig. 19. Incremental removals - Lookup time (best case)




Fig. 22. Incremental removals - Memory usage (worst case)




Fig. 20. Incremental removals - Lookup time (worst case)




Fig. 21. Incremental removals - Memory usage (best case)

DxHash. We provided implementation details and theoretical guarantees. *MementoHash* is an advancement of *JumpHash*, capable of handling random failures while maintaining minimal memory usage and optimal time performance. Unlike

AnchorHash and *DxHash*, it does not require fixing the overall capacity of the cluster, thus allowing for indefinite scalability. The recommended usage pattern for *Memento* involves scaling the cluster by adding and removing buckets in a Last-In-First-Out order, utilizing replacements exclusively for failures. This approach ensures that the internal structure remains empty, resulting in optimal performance and minimal memory usage. By means of an experimental evaluation, we measured and compared the behavior of those algorithms concerning lookup time and memory usage. Results show that the lookup time of *MementoHash* is on par with *JumpHash* and considerably better than both *AnchorHash* and *DxHash*. In terms of memory usage, *MementoHash* ranks second only to *JumpHash*, which has the advantage of being a stateless algorithm. However, *JumpHash* does not allow random removals. Only the last added node can be removed. To address this limitation, *AnchorHash* and *DxHash* keep track of all the nodes of the cluster (working and not working). To ensure balance and minimal disruption, those algorithms force an upper bound to the overall capacity of the cluster, leading to reduced scalability. *MementoHash* overcomes the limitations of *JumpHash* without limiting the overall capacity of the cluster. Compared to *AnchorHash* and *DxHash*, our approach exhibits similar memory usage in the worst-case scenario and performs significantly better in the best-case scenario. However, the worst-case scenario for *MementoHash* occurs when the number of failing nodes exceeds 70%, which is not a common situation. During the regular life cycle of a cluster, the number of failing nodes probably never exceeds the threshold of 20%, which is the optimal performance range for *MementoHash*.

X. FUTURE WORK

In order to further expand the scope of application of *MementoHash* and facilitate its implementation in existing or novel distributed solutions, several avenues of future work can be explored. First and foremost, it is worth investigating the feasibility of extending *MementoHash* to maintain full consistency when nodes may not unanimously agree on the removal

order. Furthermore, we aim at investigating the applicability of our solution to a scenario with bounded loads [16].

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Priyamvada, "Analysis of various hash function," *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, vol. 3, 2018.
- [2] D. Thaler and C. V. Ravishankar, "A name-based mapping scheme for rendezvous," in *Technical Report CSE-TR-316-96*, University of Michigan. University of Michigan, 1996.
- [3] D. G. Thaler and C. V. Ravishankar, "Using name-based mappings to increase hit rates," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on networking*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1–14, 1998.
- [4] D. Karger, E. Lehman, T. Leighton, R. Panigrahy, M. Levine, and D. Lewin, "Consistent hashing and random trees: Distributed caching protocols for relieving hot spots on the world wide web," in *Proceedings of the twenty-ninth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, 1997, pp. 654–663.
- [5] D. Karger, A. Sherman, A. Berkheimer, B. Bogstad, R. Dhanidina, K. Iwamoto, B. Kim, L. Matkins, and Y. Yerushalmi, "Web caching with consistent hashing," *Comput. Netw.*, vol. 31, no. 11–16, p. 1203–1213, may 1999.
- [6] J. Lamping and E. Veach, "A fast, minimal memory, consistent hash algorithm," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.2294*, 2014.
- [7] B. Appleton and M. O'Reilly, "Multi-probe consistent hashing," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.00062*, 2015.
- [8] D. E. Eisenbud, C. Yi, C. Contavalli, C. Smith, R. Kononov, E. Mann-Hielscher, A. Cilingeroglu, B. Cheyney, W. Shang, and J. D. Hosein, "Maglev: A fast and reliable software network load balancer," in *13th {USENIX} Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation ({NSDI} 16)*, 2016, pp. 523–535.
- [9] G. Mendelson, S. Vargaftik, K. Barabash, D. H. Lorenz, I. Keslassy, and A. Orda, "Anchorhash: A scalable consistent hash," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 517–528, 2020.
- [10] C. Dong and F. Wang, "Dxhash: A scalable consistent hash based on the pseudo-random sequence," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.07930*, 2021.
- [11] M. Coluzzi, A. Brocco, P. Contu, and T. Leidi, "A survey and comparison of consistent hashing algorithms," in *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Performance Analysis of Systems and Software*, April 2023.
- [12] M. Coluzzi, A. Brocco, and T. Leidi, "Consistently faster: A survey and fair comparison of consistent hashing algorithms," in *Proceedings of SEBD 2023: 31st Symposium on Advanced Database System, July 02–05, 2023, Galzignano Terme, Padua, Italy*, ser. CEUR Workshop Proceedings, 2023.
- [13] I. of Information Systems and N. at SUPSI, java-consistent-hashing-algorithms. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/SUPSI-DTI-ISIN/java-consistent-hashing-algorithms>
- [14] N. Cressie and M. Borkent, "The moment generating function has its moments," *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, vol. 13, pp. 337–344, 1986.
- [15] Z.-W. Sun, "Arithmetic theory of harmonic numbers," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 140, no. 2, pp. 415–428, 2012.
- [16] V. Mirrokni, M. Thorup, and M. Zadimoghaddam, "Consistent hashing with bounded loads," 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1608.01350>