

# Sampling Space-Saving Set Sketches

Homin K. Lee  
Datadog  
New York City, USA  
homin@datadog.com

Charles Masson  
Datadog  
New York City, USA  
charles@datadog.com

## ABSTRACT

Large, distributed data streams are now ubiquitous. High-accuracy *sketches* with low memory overhead have become the de facto method for analyzing this data. For instance, if we wish to group data by some label and report the largest counts using fixed memory, we need to turn to mergeable heavy hitter sketches that can provide highly accurate approximate counts. Similarly, if we wish to keep track of the number of distinct items in a *single* set spread across several streams using fixed memory, we can turn to mergeable count distinct sketches that can provide highly accurate set cardinalities.

If we were to try to keep track of the cardinality of *multiple* sets and report only on the largest ones, maintaining individual count distinct sketches for each set can grow unwieldy, especially if the number of sets is not known in advance. We consider the natural combination of the heavy hitters problem with the count distinct problem, the *heavy distinct hitters* problem: given a stream of  $(\ell, x)$  pairs, find all the labels  $\ell$  that are paired with a large number of distinct items  $x$  using only constant memory.

No previous work on heavy distinct hitters has managed to be of practical use in the large, distributed data stream setting. We propose a new algorithm, the Sampling Space-Saving Set Sketch, which combines sketching and sampling techniques and has all the desired properties for size, speed, accuracy, mergeability, and invertibility. We compare our algorithm to several existing solutions to the heavy distinct hitters problem, and provide experimental results across several data sets showing the superiority of the new sketch.

### Artifact Availability:


The source code, data, and/or other artifacts have been made available at <https://github.com/datadog/ssss-paper-code>.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

When analyzing distributed data, it is crucial to be able to report accurate summary statistics [3]. Some statistics, such as the average, are trivial to compute in a distributed system. Others, such as quantiles [34], require more sophisticated sketches of the data.

We consider a particularly difficult case, the *heavy distinct hitters* problem: given a stream of  $(\ell, x)$  pairs, find all the labels  $\ell$  that are paired with a large number of distinct items  $x$  (which we call *heavy sets*) using only constant memory. The set of labels are not known in advance. The definition of “large” can either be formulated as any set whose cardinality is over some absolute threshold, or we

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International License. Visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> to view a copy of this license. For any use beyond those covered by this license, obtain permission by emailing the authors. Copyright is held by the owner/author(s).



**Figure 1: A distributed web application, with each pod sending metrics to the monitoring system.**

can define it to be the top  $k$  sets by cardinality, e.g., queries of the form:

```
SELECT L, COUNT(DISTINCT X) AS C
GROUP BY L
ORDER BY C DESC
LIMIT K
```

(1)

This problem has also been referred to as the *distinct heavy hitter* problem [18] as well as the *superspreader* problem [45] in the context of network security. The network security use cases include detecting source IP addresses that make an unusually high number of distinct connections within a short time, and detecting random subdomain distributed denial of service (DDoS) attacks on the Domain Name System (DNS) infrastructure [47] (where the label is the domain name and the items are the sub-domains). Other use cases include web applications that want to track the number of distinct users that have clicked on a recommendation, or advertisers that want to track the ad campaigns seen by the largest number of distinct users [37].

The use case that motivates this work comes from agent-based infrastructure monitoring. As computing has moved to a distributed, containerized, micro-service model, many organizations use container orchestration to run thousands of pods (tightly coupled collections of containers) [14]. Effectively being able to administer and operationalize such a large fleet of machines requires the ability to monitor, in near real-time, data streams coming from multiple transitory sources [3]. A common solution is to use agents to collect the necessary observability metrics, and it is in this setting where no previous work on heavy distinct hitters has managed to be of practical use.

Figure 1 shows a typical example of a web application backed by a distributed system. Every machine in the distributed system

runs a small agent that reports statistics to the monitoring system. When agents run on machines it is crucial that the agents consume a predictably small amount of compute, memory, and network usage so that the machines can reliably run their primary workloads as production services. The necessary properties for a sketch for the *heavy distinct hitter* problem to be practical in this setting are:

- **Single Pass.** The sketch gets one look at each element over any data stream.
- **Accuracy.** We want our sketch approximations to return values that are close to the actual set cardinalities. We will consider the normalized absolute error, defined in Section 5.1.
- **Constant Memory Size.** The memory footprint of the sketch should be independent of the amount of data processed by the sketch. For a sketch to be viable in the agent monitoring model, the memory size should be on the order of megabytes.
- **Insertion Speed.** We want our sketches to be able to process high-throughput data streams without falling behind.
- **Mergeability.** When aggregating over distributed data streams, we want to be able to sketch each data stream separately and then merge the sketches to provide answers over the entire data set [1] without losing too much accuracy.
- **Invertibility.** The sketch itself needs to be able to return the labels of all the heavy distinct hitters [43]. Non-invertible sketches are able to return the approximate cardinality for any label provided at query time, but do not store any labels themselves.
- **Query Speed.** The sketch should have fast query response times. An increasingly common pattern is to sketch data streams every few seconds, and report statistics as time series [35].

These properties are also necessary when a distributed database [15, 23] responds to queries such as (1). Gathering all the relevant data in a centralized node to give an exact answer is often infeasible for large data. An accurate constant-size sketch allows for each leaf node to return partial aggregates, which are then merged by the query engine. The constant-size is important as databases need to be able to respond to many queries at once using a finite amount of resources. Note that non-invertible sketches by definition can not provide responses to queries such as (1).

We present the Sampling Space-Saving Set Sketch, the first sketch with all of the above properties. In Section 2 we formally define the heavy hitter, count distinct, and heavy distinct hitter problems. In Section 3 we define an initial version of the algorithm and prove bounds on its accuracy. We present the final version of the algorithm in Section 4. Finally, in Section 5 we present our experimental results showing that Sampling Space-Saving Set Sketches provide superior accuracy, memory usage, and throughput than existing sketches.

The source code of our prototype along with the code for running our experiments is freely available online.

## 2 RELATED WORK

Given a data stream  $x_1, \dots, x_m$  of elements coming from a universe of size  $n$ , let  $f_i = |\{k : x_k = i\}|$  be the frequency of element  $i$  so that  $\sum_i f_i = m$ .

### 2.1 Count Distinct

The *count distinct* problem, also known as the *set cardinality*, or *distinct elements*, or  $F_0$  problem is to output  $d = |\{i : f_i > 0\}|$ , the number of distinct elements seen in the stream.

There are a variety of sketch algorithms that return approximate answers while minimizing the amount data stored, including Probabilistic Counting [21], HyperLogLog [20], Adaptive Sampling [19],  $K$ 'th Minimum Value [2], Alpha [13], and Compressed Probabilistic Counting [29]. Each sketch algorithm has an INSERT method for adding elements, and a DISTINCT method for estimating the cardinality of the set of elements added so far.

Count distinct sketch algorithms are required to output an estimate of the cardinality of the set with relative error  $\epsilon$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta_c$ . *I.e.*, if the exact number of distinct elements is  $d$ , return  $\tilde{d}$  such that  $(1 - \epsilon)d \leq \tilde{d} \leq (1 + \epsilon)d$ .

For many practical applications, the standard one-shot guarantee is too weak, as the sketch can be queried several times while it processes a stream. A count distinct algorithm is said to have a *strong-tracking* guarantee [4, 25] if it reports an accurate estimate after each INSERT:

$$\Pr[\forall k, (1 - \epsilon)d^{(k)} \leq \tilde{d}^{(k)} \leq (1 + \epsilon)d^{(k)}] \geq 1 - \delta_c,$$

where  $d^{(k)}$  is the number of distinct elements seen at time step  $k$ .

The size of the sketches are functions of  $\epsilon$ ,  $\delta_c$ , and  $n$ , where the optimal bound is  $\Theta(\epsilon^{-2} \log(1/\delta_c) + \log n)$  for the one-shot version [28], and  $\Theta(\epsilon^{-2}(\log \log n + \log(1/\delta_c)) + \log n)$  for the strong-tracking version [4]. In addition to the size, the time complexity of INSERT is very important as it gets called on each item in the stream.

Finally, we will only be considering *monotonic* count distinct sketches. That is we only consider sketches whose estimate of the set cardinality can only increase as more elements are added to the sketch. While the error guarantee allows for a count distinct sketch to be non-monotonic, most count distinct sketches in the literature are monotonic, as non-monotonic behavior would be very counter-intuitive.

### 2.2 Heavy Hitters

The heavy hitter problem, with parameter  $s$ , is to output all elements with frequency  $f_i > m/s$ , where  $m$  is the number of elements in the stream. An  $s$ -counter heavy hitter algorithm keeps at most  $s$  counters and is guaranteed to return for every item an estimate  $\tilde{f}_i$  such that  $|\tilde{f}_i - f_i| \leq m/s$

There are a variety of sketch algorithms for this problem, including Misra-Gries [38], Space-Saving [36], Count [7], and Count-Min [11]. The size of the sketches are functions of  $s$ ,  $m$ , and  $n$  (as well as a failure probability parameter  $\delta$  if the sketch is randomized).

For insertion-only streams, the Space-Saving sketch has been found to have clear benefits over the other sketches [10]. A Space-Saving sketch of size  $s$  stores  $s$  ( $\ell$ , *count*) pairs. It is initialized with the first  $s$  distinct labels seen along with their exact counts. If a

subsequent item is already in the sketch, the count is updated. Otherwise, the pair with the smallest count will have its label replaced with the new label, and then the count will be incremented. The insertion time is dominated by the time to find the minimum count label, where various strategies are possible (including that of maintaining a min-heap).

## 2.3 Heavy Distinct Hitters

The *heavy distinct hitters* problem combines the *count distinct* problem with the *heavy hitters* problem. Given a data stream of elements each with a label,  $(\ell_1, x_1), \dots, (\ell_m, x_m)$ , let  $f_{\ell, x} = |\{k : \ell_k = \ell, x_k = x\}|$  be the frequency of item  $x$  with label  $\ell$ , and let  $d_\ell = |\{x : f_{\ell, x} > 0\}|$  be the number of distinct items with label  $\ell$ . The heavy distinct hitters problem, with parameter  $s$ , is to output all labels with  $d_\ell > m/s$ , and for every label, return an estimate  $\tilde{d}_\ell$  such that  $|\tilde{d}_\ell - d_\ell| \leq m(1/s + \epsilon)$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ . The labels can be arbitrary, and the set of labels are not known in advance.

Initial papers tackled the heavy distinct hitter problem by just keeping a set for every label [39, 40], which was then improved to keeping a count distinct sketch for every label [17]. The first paper to consider the heavy distinct hitter problem holistically (and which introduced the terminology) was by Venkataraman et al. [45] whose sampling-based solution was improved in subsequent work [6, 27, 33]. The sampling based approaches require a predefined sampling rate, which is impractical in the distributed stream setting, and it requires knowing the total length of the stream in advance to match the required bounds.

A related problem is the *many distinct count* problem, which requires that the sketch accurately answer the count distinct problem for multiple labels, whether or not their corresponding sets are heavy. A key difference with the heavy distinct hitter problem is that the sketch itself is not required to hold any labels, and thus is not *invertible*. Note that a sketch for the heavy distinct hitter problem can be trivially modified to be a many distinct count sketch by outputting either the minimum cardinality or zero for any label not in the sketch.

The state-of-the-art sketch for the many distinct count problem is Count-HLL [44], which uses a Count-Min sketch whose columns are replaced with the registers of HLL sketches. Previous work includes the CMFM sketch [9], a Count-Min sketch whose counters are replaced with Probabilistic Counting sketches [21], and vHLL [48], which is similar to Count-HLL, but has a different hashing scheme and final cardinality estimator.

Many other non-invertible sketches exist [30, 49, 53], and the general method for turning them into invertible sketches is to separately keep a set of all the labels in the stream, and to then iterate through the *entire* set of labels when finding the heavy hitters. Some approaches work to reduce the search space [31, 46].

Invertible sketches for the heavy distinct hitter problem include Distinct-Count Sketch [22], Count-Min-Heap [12], OpenSketch [50], FastSketch combined with count distinct sketches [32], and SpreadSketch [43], which was shown by the authors to be superior to the previous four sketches in memory, insertion time and query time. Much like several of the solutions for the count distinct problem, SpreadSketch uses a Count-Min sketch, and replaces the

counters in the array with a count distinct sketch. To make the sketch invertible, they add a candidate heavy distinct hitter label along with a rough estimate of that label’s cardinality in each array entry.

Finally, we note the invertible algorithm idwsHH [18] by Feibish et al. They start by generalizing the sampling algorithms for the heavy distinct hitters problem, and importantly, they add two twists that ends up giving them something very similar to the Space-Saving sketch for heavy hitters. First, they fix the number of count distinct sketches they keep. Second, when there is a label that is not in the sketch, they drop the count distinct sketch with the highest random hash of label and item only if the new hash value  $h(\ell_i, x_i)$  passes a sampling threshold. This threshold gets dynamically updated every time it is passed by a new  $(\ell_i, x_i)$  pair, and thus the threshold does not need to be set manually. The downsides of their sketch are that it is not mergeable, and that it has poor accuracy. The poor accuracy partially stems from their use of a count distinct sketch that is not particularly robust. More significantly, the poor accuracy comes from many heavy labels being missing entirely, as each label has an independent failure probability.

## 3 SPACE-SAVING SET SKETCHES

Algorithm 1 is a natural extension of the Space-Saving algorithm for the heavy hitters problem to the heavy distinct hitters problem (we call it the Space-Saving Sets algorithm). It keeps up to  $s$  count distinct sketches along with corresponding offset values. We call each (count distinct sketch, offset value) pair, a *counter* to emphasize the similarity to the Space-Saving algorithm.

For the first  $s$  distinct labels, the sketch just adds items to their corresponding count distinct sketches. When a new label arrives, the sketch creates a new counter for the label, finds the minimum existing counter and records its value into the offset for the new counter, and then removes the minimum existing counter.

We will first show a couple properties of the minimum value count distinct sketch in the algorithm.

LEMMA 3.1. *After  $m$  insertions, let  $d_\ell$  be the number of distinct elements  $x_i$  with label  $\ell$ . Let  $\alpha := \min_{j \in S} S[j].DISTINCT()$ , and let  $|\{\ell : d_\ell > 0\}| > s$ . Then, for Algorithm 1:*

- (1)  $\alpha$  never decreases as entries are inserted;
- (2)  $\alpha \leq (m/s)(1 + \epsilon)$ ;
- (3)  $QUERY(\ell) \leq d_\ell(1 + \epsilon) + \alpha$ ; and
- (4) if  $\ell \notin S$ , then  $d_\ell \leq \alpha/(1 - \epsilon)$ .

where the last three properties hold with probability at least  $1 - \delta_c$  by the strong-tracking property of the count distinct sketch, and  $\epsilon$  is its accuracy guarantee.

PROOF. The first property comes from the use of *monotonic* count distinct sketches, and the recording of the value of a counter into an offset before deleting it.

For the second property, note that every one of the  $m$  items is inserted into a count distinct sketch exactly once. Thus, the total sum of all the counters is at most  $m(1 + \epsilon)$  by the strong-tracking sketch guarantee, and the smallest value can be at most  $(m/s)(1 + \epsilon)$ .

For the third property, we upper-bound each component of the counter separately. The count distinct sketch itself has at most  $d_\ell$  items inserted into it, and it has at most  $\epsilon$  relative-error by the

**Algorithm 1:** SPACE-SAVING-SETS( $s$ )

---

```

Initialize ( $s$ ):
   $S \leftarrow$  empty associative array of strong-tracking,
  monotonic count distinct sketches with NEWSKETCH,
  INSERT, DISTINCT methods, accuracy parameter  $\epsilon$  and
  failure parameter  $\delta_c$ ;
   $O \leftarrow$  empty associative array of offset values;

Function QUERY( $\ell$ ):
  if  $\ell \in S$  then
    return  $S[\ell].\text{DISTINCT}() + O[\ell]$ ;
  else
    return  $\min_{j \in S} S[j].\text{DISTINCT}()$ ;

Function REMOVE( $\ell$ ):
   $S.\text{REMOVE}(\ell)$ ;
   $O.\text{REMOVE}(\ell)$ ;

Function INSERT( $\ell, x$ ):
  if  $\ell \notin S$ ; then
    if  $|S| < s$ ; then
       $S.\text{ADD}(\ell, \text{NEWSKETCH}());$ 
    else
      /* save the smallest counter value to
      the new label offset */
       $y \leftarrow \arg \min_{j \in S} \text{QUERY}(j)$ ;
       $O[\ell] \leftarrow \text{QUERY}(y)$ ;
      REMOVE( $y$ );
       $S.\text{ADD}(\ell, \text{NEWSKETCH}());$ 
   $S[\ell].\text{INSERT}(x)$ ;

```

---

sketch guarantee. The offset for any counter is always assigned the value of the minimum counter when that counter is created. By the first property, the minimum value only ever increases until it reaches  $\alpha$ .

For the final property, consider the final time the counter for  $\ell$  gets removed from  $S$ . At the time of removal, its value (let us call it  $\alpha'$ ) is the minimum among all the counters. Then we can bound  $\alpha'$  by:

$$\alpha \geq \alpha' \geq d_\ell(1 - \epsilon).$$

Where the upper-bound comes from the first property, and the lower-bound comes from the sketch guarantee.  $\square$

Now we are ready to prove the main theorem.

**THEOREM 3.2.** *For any label  $\ell$ , let  $d_\ell$  be the number of distinct elements  $x_i$  with label  $\ell$  in the stream. After  $m$  insertions to Algorithm 1 with parameter  $s > 4$ , and  $\epsilon < 1/2$ ,  $|\text{QUERY}(\ell) - d_\ell| \leq m(1/s + (1 + 1/s)\epsilon)$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta_c$ .*

**PROOF.** If  $\ell \notin S$ , by properties 2 and 4 from Lemma 3.1, we have that the error is at most:

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha - d_\ell| &\leq \max(\alpha, d_\ell) \leq \frac{\alpha}{1 - \epsilon} \leq \left(\frac{m}{s}\right) \left(\frac{1 + \epsilon}{1 - \epsilon}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{m}{s}\right) \left(1 + \frac{2\epsilon}{1 - \epsilon}\right) \leq \left(\frac{m}{s}\right) + m\epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds as  $s > 2/(1 - \epsilon)$ .

If  $\ell \in S$ , by properties 2 and 3 from Lemma 3.1, we have that the error is at most

$$d_\ell\epsilon + \alpha \leq d_\ell\epsilon + \left(\frac{m}{s}\right)(1 + \epsilon) \leq \left(\frac{m}{s}\right) + \left(1 + \frac{1}{s}\right)m\epsilon,$$

where the last inequality comes from bounding  $d_\ell \leq m$ .  $\square$

Let us consider some examples for which Theorem 3.2 is tight. If the stream of elements  $(\ell, x_i)$  only ever includes one label, then only one counter is created. If each  $x_i$  is unique, then all the error comes from the count distinct sketch, and so we have an upper-bound of  $m\epsilon$  on the error.

If the stream of elements  $(\ell, x_i)$  only has a single element  $x$ , but the  $\ell_i$ 's cycle through the same  $s + 1$  labels repeatedly, then every insert after the first  $s$  will delete an existing counter. If the deletions happen sequentially, then after  $m$  inserts, every counter will have offsets of  $m/s$ . So instead of reporting the correct count  $d_j = 1$ , the sketch can return values as large as  $(m/s)(1 + \epsilon)$ .

Much like the Space-Saving algorithm, the insertion time is dominated by the time to find the minimum cardinality label, where various strategies are possible (including that of maintaining a min-heap).

## 4 SAMPLING SPACE-SAVING SET SKETCHES

We will make a series of modifications to Algorithm 1 so that the worst-case bound of Theorem 3.2 continues to hold, while improving the practical performance of the sketch.

### 4.1 Recycling the Count Distinct Sketches

In the *recycling* variant of SSS (Algorithm 2), instead of recording the value of the minimum counter into an offset, we simply reuse the counter. (We only specify the modified INSERT method. The other methods are modified to remove the unused offset values.)

**Algorithm 2:** RECYCLING SPACE-SAVING-SETS( $s$ )

---

```

Function INSERT( $\ell, x$ ):
  if  $\ell \notin S$ ; then
    if  $|S| < s$ ; then
       $S.\text{ADD}(\ell, \text{NEWSKETCH}());$ 
    else
      /* use the smallest counter as the
      counter for the new label */
       $y \leftarrow \arg \min_{j \in S} S[j].\text{DISTINCT}();$ 
       $S.\text{ADD}(\ell, S[y]);$ 
       $S.\text{REMOVE}(y);$ 
   $S[\ell].\text{INSERT}(x)$ ;

```

---

In practice, the recycling variant does slightly better when labels share a lot of items as it is less likely to over-count in this case. Both variants do poorly on sets whose ranks are close to the size parameter  $s$  of the sketch. Thus on particularly challenging data sets, for  $s = 1000$ , only the top 100 might have accurate estimates, while lower ranked sets have error closer to  $m/s$ . The poor estimates

are caused by the large amount of churn for the smaller sets in the sketch (as we always replace the minimum counter), and the estimates can quickly become over-inflated.

## 4.2 Sampling the Input

The sampling-based solutions for the heavy distinct hitter problem mentioned in Section 2.3 avoid over-estimating the cardinality of small sets as the probability of sampling them is low. The idea of combining sketching with sampling has appeared in other domains recently [8], [41], and the aforementioned idwsHH [18] by Feibish et al. recently introduced the idea for heavy distinct hitters.

We modify Algorithm 2 to sample the input. Let  $h$  be a hash function that uniformly maps to the open unit interval  $U(0, 1)$ . For an input  $(\ell, x)$  we use  $1/h(x)$  as an estimate for  $d_\ell$  (the number of distinct items with label  $\ell$ ). Note that if we hash  $d_\ell$  different items the expected maximum value of  $1/h(x)$  is  $d_\ell + 1$ , as the minimum of  $n$  uniform  $(0, 1)$  variables is Beta $(1, n)$  distributed with expectation  $1/(n + 1)$ .

For any item  $x$  and  $\alpha > 1$ ,  $\Pr[1/h(x) < \alpha] = 1 - 1/\alpha$ . Thus for labels corresponding to small sets the chances of getting into the sketch shrink as the size of the minimum count distinct sketch starts to grow.

---

### Algorithm 3: SAMPLING SPACE-SAVING-SETS( $s$ )

---

**Function**  $INSERT(\ell, x)$ :

```

if  $\ell \in S$ ; then
   $S[\ell].INSERT(x)$ ;
else
  if  $|S| < s$ ; then
     $S.ADD(\ell, NEWSKETCH())$ ;
     $S[\ell].INSERT(x)$ ;
  else
     $y \leftarrow \arg \min_{j \in S} S[j].DISTINCT()$ ;
     $s_y \leftarrow S[y].DISTINCT()$ ;
    if  $1/h(x) > s_y$ ; then
       $S.ADD(\ell, S[y])$ ;
       $S.REMOVE(y)$ ;
       $S[\ell].INSERT(x)$ ;

```

---

We show an analogous lemma to Lemma 3.1 for Algorithm 3.

**LEMMA 4.1.** *After  $m$  insertions, let  $d_\ell$  be the number of distinct elements  $x_i$  with label  $\ell$ . Let  $\alpha := \min_{j \in S} S[j].DISTINCT()$ , and let  $|\{\ell : d_\ell > 0\}| > s$ . Then for Algorithm 3:*

- (1)  $\alpha$  never decreases as entries are inserted;
- (2)  $\alpha \leq (m/s)(1 + \epsilon)$ ;
- (3)  $QUERY(\ell) \leq d_\ell(1 + \epsilon) + \alpha$ ; and
- (4) If  $\ell \notin S$ , then  $d_\ell \leq \alpha \ln(1/\delta_r)$ .

The second and third properties hold with probability at least  $1 - \delta_c$  by the strong-tracking property of the count distinct sketch with accuracy guarantee  $\epsilon$ , while the fourth holds with probability at least  $1 - \delta_c - \delta_r$ , for  $\delta_r > 0$ ,

**PROOF.** The proofs of the first three properties remain unchanged from the proofs for Lemma 3.1.

For the last property, consider the final time the counter for  $\ell$  gets removed from  $S$ . At the time of removal, its value is the minimum among all the counters, and it can be upper-bounded by  $\alpha$ . Our main concern is with the number of items for  $\ell$  that are sampled away after the sketch stops updating. If there are  $r$  such remaining items, then the probability that they never enter the sketch is at most  $(1 - 1/\alpha)^r < e^{-r/\alpha} = \delta_r$  for  $r = \alpha \ln(1/\delta_r)$ .  $\square$

**THEOREM 4.2.** *For any label  $\ell$ , let  $d_\ell$  be the number of distinct elements  $x_i$  with label  $\ell$  in the stream. After  $m$  insertions, to Algorithm 3 with parameter  $s$ ,*

$$|QUERY(\ell) - d_\ell| \leq \left(\frac{m}{s}\right)(1 + \epsilon) + m \max\left(\frac{(\ln(1/\delta_r) - 1)(1 + \epsilon)}{s}, \epsilon\right),$$

with probability at least  $1 - \delta_c - \delta_r$  for  $\delta_c, \delta_r > 0$ .

**PROOF.** If  $\ell \notin S$ , by properties 2 and 4 from Lemma 4.1, we have that the error is at most:

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha - d_\ell| &\leq \max(\alpha, d_\ell) \leq \alpha \ln(1/\delta_r) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{m}{s}\right)(1 + \epsilon) \ln(1/\delta_r) \\ &= \left(\frac{m}{s}\right)(1 + \epsilon) + m \left(\frac{(\ln(1/\delta_r) - 1)(1 + \epsilon)}{s}\right). \end{aligned}$$

If  $\ell \in S$ , by properties 2 and 3 from Lemma 4.1, we have that the error is at most

$$d_\ell \epsilon + \alpha \leq d_\ell \epsilon + \left(\frac{m}{s}\right)(1 + \epsilon) \leq m \epsilon + \left(\frac{m}{s}\right)(1 + \epsilon),$$

where the last inequality comes from bounding  $d_\ell \leq m$ .  $\square$

## 4.3 Practical Implementation

Our final variant, the Practical Sampling Space-Saving Set sketch is the implementation of Algorithm 3 that we provide in our open-source code and used in our experiments. Instead of calculating the minimum size counter at every step, we only calculate the value when an item is sampled. In our implementation we use HyperLogLog, a monotonic count distinct sketch commonly used in practice with many highly optimized library implementations [24], as the count distinct sketch.

Algorithm 4 caches the size of the minimum counter into  $\theta$ , so that we do not have to recalculate the size of the minimum counter on every insert. Importantly, note that the caching does not affect the construction of the sketch at all, and thus the outputs of Algorithms 3 and 4 are equivalent.

## 4.4 Mergeability

Given two data streams, their corresponding Sampling Space-Saving Set sketches can trivially be merged by merging corresponding count distinct sketches, then only keeping the top  $s$ . We show the merge method for Algorithm 4 in Algorithm 5. The merge method for Algorithms 1, 2, and 3, are all similar.

Merging is useful for both distributed stream processing, as well as aggregating statistics over time—sketches for several consecutive time spans can be merged to generate a sketch for the longer aggregate window.

**Algorithm 4:** PRACTICAL SAMPLING SPACE-SAVING-SETS( $s$ )

---

```

Initialize ( $s$ ):
   $S \leftarrow$  empty associative array of strong-tracking,
    monotonic count distinct sketches with NEWSKETCH,
    INSERT, DISTINCT methods;
   $\theta \leftarrow 0.0$ ;

Function QUERY( $\ell$ ):
  if  $\ell \in S$  then
     $\lfloor$  return  $S[\ell].\text{DISTINCT}()$ ;
  else
     $\lfloor$  return  $\min_{j \in S} S[j].\text{DISTINCT}()$ 

Function INSERT( $\ell, x$ ):
  if  $\ell \in S$ ; then
     $\lfloor$   $S[\ell].\text{INSERT}(x)$ ;
  else
    if  $|S| < s$ ; then
       $\lfloor$   $S.\text{ADD}(\ell, \text{NEWSKETCH}())$ ;
       $\lfloor$   $S[\ell].\text{INSERT}(x)$ ;
    else
      if  $1/h(x) > \theta$ ; then
         $y \leftarrow \arg \min_{j \in S} S[j].\text{DISTINCT}()$ ;
         $s_y \leftarrow S[y].\text{DISTINCT}()$ ;
         $\theta = s_y$ ;
        if  $1/h(x) > s_y$ ; then
           $\lfloor$   $S.\text{ADD}(\ell, S[y])$ ;
           $\lfloor$   $S.\text{REMOVE}(y)$ ;
           $\lfloor$   $S[\ell].\text{INSERT}(x)$ ;

```

---

**Algorithm 5:** MERGING FOR SAMPLING SPACE-SAVING-SETS( $s$ )

---

```

Function MERGE( $other$ ):
  for  $\ell \in other.S$  do
    if  $\ell \in S$  then
       $\lfloor$   $S[\ell].\text{MERGE}(other.S[\ell])$ ;
    else
       $\lfloor$   $S.\text{ADD}(\ell, other.S[\ell])$ ;
  /* sort by cardinality and take top  $s$  */
   $\text{SORTBYVALUEDESCENDING}(S)$ ;
  while  $|S| > s$  do
     $\lfloor$   $S.\text{POP}()$ ;
   $\theta \leftarrow \min_{j \in S} S[j].\text{DISTINCT}()$ ;

```

---

## 5 EXPERIMENTS

We evaluate Sampling Space-Saving Sets (SSSS) on several real-world and synthetic data sets to demonstrate its state-of-the-art performance along several axes.

### 5.1 Metrics

Previous experimental work evaluates the accuracy of heavy distinct hitter sketches by comparing the output of a sketch to the actual set cardinalities *only* over the heavy sets, where “heavy” is determined by an arbitrary threshold. The following example shows why such metrics are inherently flawed.

Let  $d_i$  be the the number of distinct items with label  $\ell_i$ . Consider the simple example where the labels are in sorted order and,  $d_1 = 100, d_2 = 100, \dots, d_{10} = 100, d_{11} = 10, \dots, d_{20} = 10, d_{21} = 1, \dots, d_n = 1$ . A sketch that returns the true values for the first 10 labels (i.e.,  $\tilde{d}_i = d_i, i \in \{1, \dots, 10\}$ ), but also returns  $\tilde{d}_i = 1000$  for  $i \in \{11, \dots, n\}$ , will be considered to be perfectly accurate under a metric that only evaluates accuracy over the heavy sets. If the sketch is invertible, and one asks the sketch for the top 10 labels, it will respond only with labels that are in fact *outside* of the top 10.

To address this problem some papers [43] report precision and recall, viewing the identification of heavy sets as a classification problem, but these metrics are inherently flawed as well. We consider again the example above. If the thresholds are set so that the top 20 are in the heavy set, a sketch returning  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{10}, \ell_{21}, \dots, \ell_{30}$  with zero error but estimates of 0 for all other labels will have exactly the same precision and recall metrics as a sketch returning  $\ell_{11}, \dots, \ell_{30}$  with zero error but estimates of 0 for all other labels. Given the choice of the two, we would much rather have the top 10 than the second 10, and we need an error metric that can distinguish between the two cases.

To address both problems, we will report continuous error metrics not only with respect to the actual heavy sets, but also with respect to the sketch’s self-reported heavy sets.

Some previous experimental works [44] use relative error,  $(d_i - \tilde{d}_i)/d_i$ , to show that the sketch does well in approximating cardinalities across the board. If one evaluates the top 20 for the previous example for a sketch that gets the first 10 labels exactly right, but outputs 0 for all the other labels, the relative accuracy will be just as bad as a sketch that outputs 0 for the top 10 labels and outputs 10 for all the rest. In practice, one would be much happier with the output of the first sketch as the most common use cases for heavy distinct hitter sketches are in fact to better approximate the heavier sets. For this reason, we will emphasize absolute error  $|d_i - \tilde{d}_i|$  in the results, as it better captures the error over the heavy items. We can further emphasize the heavy items by looking at the squared error, though our guarantees are in terms of just the absolute error.

As we will be running over multiple data sets with very different characteristics, we will be normalizing our error metrics so that a perfect sketch has an error of 0.0 and 1.0 corresponds to reporting 0 as the estimate for every set cardinality. (Errors higher than 1.0 indicate that the sketch is doing worse than the all-zero estimator.) Similarly, as the different data sets have very different distributions, instead of specifying a “heavy” set using an arbitrary threshold relative to a characteristic of the data set itself, we will report the error over the top  $k$  for  $k = 10, 100, 1000$ . Note that considering the top  $k$  is related to a threshold of  $m/k$  (as there can be at most  $k$  sets with cardinality  $m/k$ ). In other words, if we wish to measure sets that comprise over 1% of the stream, we would want to consider the top 100.

We will compare the sketches when they have the same memory constraints. We constrain the memory used by each sketch by setting its parameters to be as large as possible while remaining under the memory limit. We will show the error metrics over the top 10, 100, 1000 sets. We will notate the actual top  $k$  sets as  $T_k$ , and the top  $k$  according to the sketch as  $S_k$ .

The precise error metrics we use will be Normalized Absolute Error throughout:

$$NAE(S) = \sum_{i \in S} |d_i - \tilde{d}_i| / \sum_{i \in S} d_i$$

(where  $S$  is either  $T_k$  or  $S_k$ ).

We include relative and squared error for completeness in our experiments, and show that SSSS is superior regardless in the full version of this paper:

- Normalized Root Squared Error:

$$NRSE(S) = \sqrt{\sum_{i \in S} (d_i - \tilde{d}_i)^2 / \sum_{i \in S} d_i^2}$$

- Relative Mean Absolute Error:

$$RMAE(S) = |S|^{-1} \sum_{i \in S} |d_i - \tilde{d}_i| / |d_i|$$

- Relative Root Mean Square Error:

$$RRMSE(S) = |S|^{-1} \sqrt{\sum_{i \in S} (d_i - \tilde{d}_i)^2 / |d_i|}$$

To combine the errors over the actual heavy sets and the sketch’s heavy sets into a single metric, we use the widely used quadratic mean ( $\sqrt{(a^2 + b^2)/2}$ ):

$$Q_k := \sqrt{(NAE(S_k)^2 + NAE(T_k)^2)/2}.$$

The quadratic mean emphasizes the larger of the two numbers, and thus we bias our metric towards the worse error. This is similar to the F1-score (the harmonic mean) used to combine precision and recall, which emphasizes the lower of the two numbers as higher values are better for precision and recall.

Returning to the first scenario we considered earlier in this section, the algorithm that returns an estimate of 1000 for everything outside of the top 10 would have  $NAE(T_{10}) = 0$ ,  $NAE(S_{10}) = 999$ , and thus  $Q_{10} = 999/\sqrt{2}$ . For the second scenario, the two sketches would have  $NAE(S_{20}) = 0$ , but the first sketch would have  $NAE(T_{20}) = 1/11$  and  $Q_{20} \approx 0.06$  while the second sketch would have  $NAE(T_{20}) = 10/11$  and  $Q_{20} \approx 0.64$ .

## 5.2 Configuration

We compare Sampling Space-Saving Sets (SSSS) with the state-of-the-art heavy distinct hitter sketch SpreadSketch [43] and the state-of-the-art many count distinct sketch Count-HLL [44]. All three are mergeable. SSSS and SpreadSketch are invertible, while Count-HLL in its original form is not. Our results in Section 5.4 will be based on the data-independent configurations described below. We do not provide a comparison with idwsHH [18] in this section even though it is the algorithm most similar to ours as it is not mergeable, and as noted in Section 2.3, its accuracy is several orders of magnitude worse than all the other algorithms.

Recall that SpreadSketch is a  $d$  by  $w$  array of count distinct sketches (Section 2.3). It has 3 parameters: the depth (which is set to 4 in their experiments), the width (which they vary to match the memory limit), and the number of registers used by the count distinct sketch (which they set to 438). Our experiments showed that SpreadSketch benefits greatly from having as large a width as possible, so we use an even lower size for the count distinct sketch of 64, and only vary the width.

Count-HLL also has depth and width parameters. In their experiments, they set  $d$  to be 512, and vary the width. We find 512 to be a reasonable setting as well. As it is not invertible, we augment that algorithm using the technique used by SpreadSketch where they keep  $d \cdot w$  labels. When a particular cell is updated, the label is updated if a rough estimate of the cardinality of that label is greater than the rough estimate previously recorded for the label corresponding to that cell. When asked for the heavy distinct hitters, the sketch estimates cardinalities for all the labels it knows about, and outputs the highest ones.

Finally, for SSSS our recommendation would be to set the count distinct sketch size at 1024. Tuning SSSS is relatively straightforward as the number of labels kept by the sketch is the same as the number of count distinct sketches in the sketch. As we shall see later in the experiments, in practice, SSSS’s accuracy quickly becomes the accuracy of the underlying count distinct sketch. SpreadSketch and Count-HLL are more difficult to tune as a large part of their memory budget is spent on holding an array of labels whose dimensions changes along with the parameters being tuned for accuracy.

## 5.3 Data

We consider the performance of the three algorithms on three real data sets and one synthetic data set. The first data set is the CAIDA UCSD Witty Worm [5] data set, where we use the first four hours of network trace data. The labels here are the source IPs and the items are the destination IPs. The task is to identify the high-cardinality sources. The next two data sets (PubMed and KASANDR) are from the UCI Machine Learning Repository [16]. The Bag of Words PubMed abstracts data set is a set of documents. The labels here are the words, the items are the documents, and the task is to find the words appearing in the most documents. The KASANDR data set [42] is an ad impression data set where the labels are ad offer ids and the items are user ids. The task is to find the offers that were shown to the most unique users. The synthetic data set is created to be a particularly difficult case for heavy distinct hitter sketches. It has labels drawn according to the *Zipf*( $N; s$ ) distribution for  $N = 10^8$  and  $s = 0.2$ , and items are randomly chosen. We choose the exponent parameter  $s$  to be much less than 1.0 so that the tail falls very gradually.

Table 1 shows the basic statistics for each data set. An *entry* is a single (possibly non-unique) label-item pair in the data stream.

We can see that the KASANDR data set is an order of magnitude smaller than the others, but it has an order of magnitude more labels than the PubMed data set, which in turn has an order of magnitude more labels than the Witty data set. All three real data sets have set size distributions that tail off sharply. To contrast with the real data sets, we set the parameters of the Zipf data set so that

	Witty	PubMed	KASANDR	Zipf
entries	123,931,016	483,450,157	15,844,717	100,000,000
entries for top 100	26%	12%	5%	0.4%
entries for top 1000	88%	45%	14%	3%
unique entries	99%	100%	52%	100%
unique labels	16,821	141,043	2,158,859	100,000
unique items	14,962,090	8,200,000	291,485	100,000,000
avg label set size	7322.6	3,427.7	3.8	1000
p50 label set size	84	191	2	922
p90 label set size	6,311	3,278	7	1271
p99 label set size	195,592	66,354	33	2010
max label set size	502,142	2,323,263	4080	11,610

**Table 1: Descriptive statistics of the four data sets.**

the tail is much fatter, and the average and median set sizes are within a factor of 11 of the maximum-size set.

Finally, we also consider synthetic data sets that test performance when there is a high amount of overlap among the sets with different labels. (These data sets come from the paper for Count-HLL [44].) The data is drawn from a universe of  $10^6$  items with  $10^5$  of those items fixed as the common items over which the sets overlap. We draw  $k = 10^5$  or  $10^6$  sets of size 1000 from the common items and 1000 sets of size  $n$  from the full universe where we vary  $n$  from 20,000 to 500,000.

## 5.4 Results

Sampling Space-Saving Sets can be seen to have superior accuracy across the board over the state-of-the-art heavy distinct hitter and many count distinct sketches in Figure 2. N.B., the accuracy graphs are log-scaled on the  $y$ -axis to be able to reasonably present the errors of the other sketches, which are much worse.

Witty, with the smallest overall number of labels and 88% of its entries coming from the top 1000 labels, is seen to be the easiest data set for all three algorithms. Though even here SSSS with a consistent 0.03 NAE is superior to CountHLL with 0.05-0.12 NAE and SpreadSketch with 0.08-0.13 NAE.

At the other extreme, KASANDR is the most difficult real data set as the number of labels is the same magnitude as the number of entries, and only 14% of the entries come from the top 1000 labels. SpreadSketch only starts doing better than the all-zero estimator (which would have an NAE of 1.0) when it has more than 1.0 MiB to work with and even then only over the top 100 or top 10. Count-HLL also does worse than the all-zero estimator over the top 1000.

While SSSS only needs to hold a single label for each count distinct sketch, Count-HLL and SpreadSketch need to hold  $w$  and  $d \cdot w$  times as many labels respectively. This leaves less memory for count distinct sketches. Recall that SpreadSketch is run with a redundancy of  $d = 4$ . Thus, the effective number of count distinct sketches is lower than that of SSSS, and the count distinct sketches used by SpreadSketch only have 64 registers as opposed to the 1024 registers of SSSS.

Overall, we see that SSSS quickly reaches the error inherent in its count distinct sketch, which is low due to the relatively high number of registers. Count-HLL performs remarkably well at lower memory sizes where it effectively has fewer than 1000 count distinct sketches yet still manages to have fairly low NAE for the Witty and PubMed data sets. For data sets with a lot more labels than its capacity, Count-HLL starts to degrade. For data sets where SpreadSketch

reaches the error inherent in its count distinct sketch, it suffers from the low number of registers in its count distinct sketch. For data sets with more labels than its capacity, SpreadSketch quickly becomes noisy.

In the Zipf data set, the set sizes get gradually smaller so that there is not a clear difference between “signal” sets and “noise” sets. We see that the other sketches can not handle such a setting, and their accuracies are always worse than the all-zero estimator. SSSS has no such problem.

To see how much of SSSS’s superior performance is coming from only holding as many labels as counters and thus having more space for both more and larger counters, we look at the performance of the different sketches when they are all set to have the same size (or “width”) and the same count distinct sketch size. Table 2 shows the performance for the three sketches on the KASANDR data set for  $s = w = 2000$  and count distinct sketches of size 1024. Even here we see that SSSS has far superior accuracy while using 4 to 5 times less memory.

	SSSS	Count-HLL	Spread
$NAE(Q_{10})$	0.02	0.05	0.81
$NAE(Q_{100})$	0.02	0.07	1.6
$NAE(Q_{1000})$	0.04	0.59	10.0
Memory	2.2 MiB	11.7 MiB	8.6 MiB

**Table 2: Accuracy and memory usage for SSSS, Count-HLL, and SpreadSketch when running on the KASANDR data set with the same size settings (log scale)**

The next two tables explore how SSSS’s behavior changes under different settings. Table 3 shows how the size parameter  $s$  and accuracy of SSSS vary when holding its memory constant at 3.0 MiB, while varying the size of its underlying count distinct sketch (in this case HLL). We see that in general it helps to increase the size of the distinct count sketch, but only until the number of counters for SSSS does not drop too low—if we care about the top 1000, it helps to have  $s$  be at least 1000.

HLL size	64	128	256	512	1024	2048	4096
SSSS size $s$	18289	13329	8642	5073	2778	1459	748
$NAE(Q_{1000})$	0.096	0.083	0.049	0.038	0.034	0.047	0.096


**Table 3: The effect of varying the underlying count distinct sketch size for SSSS at 3.0 MiB when running on the KASANDR data set.**

Table 4 shows the difference in accuracy between Algorithm 1 (SSS), Algorithm 2 (RSSS), and Algorithm 3 (SSSS) for  $s = 2000$ , showing the necessity of sampling the input.

	SSS	RSSS	SSSS
$NAE(Q_{10})$	1.2	0.68	0.02
$NAE(Q_{100})$	4.1	2.7	0.02
$NAE(Q_{1000})$	24.0	18.0	0.04

**Table 4: Accuracy when running SSS, RSSS, and SSSS at  $s = 2000$  on the KASANDR data set.**





**Figure 2: Accuracy vs Memory Usage.**  $NAE(Q_{10})$ ,  $NAE(Q_{100})$ ,  $NAE(Q_{1000})$  as defined in Section 5.1 for SSSS, Count-HLL, and SpreadSketch.

Next we explore the speed of the different sketches. Table 5 shows the average throughput (number of entries processed per millisecond) achieved by each sketch. SSSS and Count-HLL are largely comparable, whereas SpreadSketch is the slowest of the three. (Note that the throughput numbers for the real data sets include the time for data I/O. More precise microbenchmarks are provided in our open-source prototype.)

	Witty	PubMed	KASANDR	Zipf
SSSS	2970	3650	1600	21100
Count-HLL	2810	3570	1480	27900
Spread	2120	2470	1310	19700

**Table 5: Average throughput (entries processed per millisecond) for SSSS, Count-HLL, and SpreadSketch at 3 MiB.**

In addition to having the best accuracy relative to a given memory size, SSSS is also far faster to query than the other two sketches. We compare the amount of time it takes a sketch to produce the top 1000 labels along with estimates of the cardinality of their corresponding sets (Figure 3). SSSS is an order of magnitude faster than SpreadSketch, which in itself is several orders of magnitude faster than Count-HLL. SSSS is faster as it keeps what it thinks are the top labels and thus returning a top list is trivial. Both SpreadSketch and Count-HLL have to estimate the cardinalities of all the labels kept by the sketches and then return the top list from there. The cardinality-estimation method of Count-HLL is much slower than that of SpreadSketch as it involves estimating a maximum likelihood.

Next, we show how the different sketches perform when the data is segmented into separate streams (124 for Witty, 484 for PubMed,

159 for KASANDR, and 100 for Zipf), processed in parallel, and merged into a single sketch (Figure 4). All three algorithms have worse accuracy than when processing a single stream, and once again the KASANDR data set causes the most difficulties among the real data sets. Count-HLL and SpreadSketch never achieve  $NAE(Q_{1000}) < 1.0$  even at 5.0 MiB, and do substantially worse at smaller memory sizes. SSSS has  $NAE(Q_{1000})$  ranging from 0.22 to 0.48, which is much worse than the single stream version, but still an order of magnitude better than the other sketches. The results for merging the synthetic Zipf datastreams follow a similar pattern as all the sketches do worse, but only SSSS does better than the all-zero estimator.

Finally, we show how the different algorithms perform on the synthetic overlap data sets (Figure 5). Recall that there are exactly 1000 heavy sets where we vary their sizes and  $10^5$  or  $10^6$  small sets of size 1000. We configure the sketches to be of size (or “width”) exactly 1000 to match the number of heavy sets. SSSS always performs best and reaches the error inherent in its count distinct sketch. When there are  $10^6$  small sets Count-HLL does worse than the all-zero estimator until the heavy sets are 200 times the size of the small sets. Count-HLL does much better when there are only  $10^5$  small sets, but it still performs 2 to 6 times worse than SSSS. SpreadSketch does worse than the all-zero estimator until the heavy sets are 200 to 500 times the size of the small sets. We also emphasize that SSSS achieves its outside performance using only 1.1 MiB, compared to 5.9 MiB for Count-HLL and 4.3 MiB for SpreadSketch.

## 6 CONCLUSION

We have shown that Sampling Space-Saving Sets (SSSS) is the only truly practical sketch for the *heavy distinct hitter* problem. The use




Figure 3: Top 1000 Query Duration (log scale)




Figure 4: Accuracy under merging (log scale)




Figure 5: Accuracy on synthetic sets with high overlap (log scale)

of a Space-Saving sketch allows SSSS to be easily invertible, unlike SpreadSketch or sketches for the *many distinct count* problem (e.g. Count-HLL), which are only invertible with the addition of an auxiliary structure for holding labels. SSSS is the only option with practical query performance, being orders of magnitude faster than its competitors.

In addition to its invertibility, SSSS is by far the most accurate sketch. We showed its superior accuracy on both real data sets that exhibit the sharply falling tails typical of large-scale data streams, but also on synthetic data sets that have been constructed to have fat tails, and those that have been constructed to have overlapping sets. We also show that SSSS is the most accurate sketch when merging.

For future work, we believe that the worst-case bounds shown in this paper can be greatly improved if we make some reasonable assumptions about the tail of the input stream, or if we assume that the input stream is drawn i.i.d.

We have focused on insertion-only streams in this work as that corresponds to high-throughput use-cases outlined in the introduction. There is also a rich vein of work in the *bounded-deletion* model [26, 51, 52]. It would be interesting to see if the techniques outlined here could be adapted to that model.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Pankaj K. Agarwal, Graham Cormode, Zengfeng Huang, Jeff Phillips, Zhewei Wei, and Ke Yi. 2012. Mergeable Summaries. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems* (Scottsdale, Arizona, USA) (PODS '12). ACM, New York, NY, USA, 23–34. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2213556.2213562>
- [2] Ziv Bar-Yossef, T. S. Jayram, Ravi Kumar, D. Sivakumar, and Luca Trevisan. 2002. Counting Distinct Elements in a Data Stream. In *Randomization and Approximation Techniques, 6th International Workshop, RANDOM 2002, Cambridge, MA, USA, September 13-15, 2002, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 2483)*, José D. P. Rolim and Salil P. Vadhan (Eds.). Springer, Berlin, Germany, 1–10. [https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45726-7\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45726-7_1)
- [3] Betsy Beyer, Chris Jones, Jennifer Petoff, and Niall Richard Murphy. 2016. *Site Reliability Engineering: How Google Runs Production Systems*. "O'Reilly Media, Inc.", Sebastopol, CA, USA.
- [4] Jaroslaw Blasiok. 2018. Optimal streaming and tracking distinct elements with high probability. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2018, New Orleans, LA, USA, January 7-10, 2018*, Artur Czumaj (Ed.). SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2432–2448. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611975031.156>
- [5] CAIDA. 2004. *The CAIDA UCSD Dataset on the Witty Worm - March 19-24, 2004*. CAIDA UCSD.
- [6] J. Cao, Y. Jin, A. Chen, T. Bu, and Z.-L. Zhang. 2009. Identifying High Cardinality Internet Hosts. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2009*. IEEE, Piscataway, NJ, USA, 810–818. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFCOM.2009.5061990>
- [7] Moses Charikar, Kevin C. Chen, and Martin Farach-Colton. 2002. Finding Frequent Items in Data Streams. In *Automata, Languages and Programming, 29th International Colloquium, ICALP 2002, Malaga, Spain, July 8-13, 2002, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 2380)*, Peter Widmayer, Francisco Triguero Ruiz, Rafael Morales Bueno, Matthew Hennessy, Stephan J. Eidenbenz, and Ricardo Conejo (Eds.). Springer, Berlin, Germany, 693–703. [https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45465-9\\_59](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45465-9_59)
- [8] Edith Cohen, Rasmus Pagh, and David P. Woodruff. 2020. WOR and  $p$ 's: Sketches for  $\ell_p$ -Sampling Without Replacement. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, Hugo Larochelle, Marc'Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin (Eds.). Curran Associates, Inc., Red Hook, NY, 21092–21104. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/f1507aba9fc82ffa/cc7373c58f8a613-Abstract.html>
- [9] Jeffrey Considine, Marios Hadjieleftheriou, Feifei Li, John W. Byers, and George Kollios. 2009. Robust approximate aggregation in sensor data management systems. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* 34, 1 (2009), 6:1–6:35. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1508857.1508863>
- [10] Graham Cormode and Marios Hadjieleftheriou. 2010. Methods for Finding Frequent Items in Data Streams. *The VLDB Journal* 19, 1 (feb 2010), 3–20. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00778-009-0172-z>
- [11] Graham Cormode and S. Muthukrishnan. 2004. An Improved Data Stream Summary: The Count-Min Sketch and Its Applications. In *LATIN 2004: Theoretical Informatics, 6th Latin American Symposium, Buenos Aires, Argentina, April 5-8, 2004, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 2976)*, Martin Farach-Colton (Ed.). Springer, Berlin, Germany, 29–38. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-24698-5\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-24698-5_7)
- [12] Graham Cormode and S. Muthukrishnan. 2005. Space Efficient Mining of Multi-graph Streams. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (Baltimore, Maryland) (PODS '05)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 271–282. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1065167.1065201>
- [13] Anirban Dasgupta, Kevin J. Lang, Lee Rhodes, and Justin Thaler. 2016. A Framework for Estimating Stream Expression Cardinalities. In *19th International Conference on Database Theory, ICDT 2016, Bordeaux, France, March 15-18, 2016 (LIPIcs, Vol. 48)*, Wim Martens and Thomas Zeume (Eds.). Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Wadern, Germany, 6:1–6:17. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ICDT.2016.6>
- [14] Datadog. 2018. 8 emerging trends in container orchestration. <https://www.datadoghq.com/container-orchestration-2018>. Accessed: 2023-09-01.
- [15] Datadog. 2022. Introducing Husky, Datadog's Third-Generation Event Store. <https://www.datadoghq.com/blog/engineering/introducing-husky/>. Accessed: 2023-09-01.
- [16] Dheeru Dua and Casey Graff. 2017. UCI Machine Learning Repository. <http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml>
- [17] Cristian Estan, George Varghese, and Mike Fisk. 2003. Bitmap Algorithms for Counting Active Flows on High Speed Links. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM SIGCOMM Conference on Internet Measurement (Miami Beach, FL, USA) (IMC '03)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 153–166. <https://doi.org/10.1145/948205.948225>
- [18] Shir Landau Feibish, Yehuda Afek, Anat Bremler-Barr, Edith Cohen, and Michal Shagam. 2017. Mitigating DNS Random Subdomain DDoS Attacks by Distinct Heavy Hitters Sketches. In *Proceedings of the Fifth ACM/IEEE Workshop on Hot Topics in Web Systems and Technologies (San Jose, California) (HotWeb '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 8, 6 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3132465.3132474>
- [19] Philippe Flajolet. 1990. On adaptive sampling. *Computing* 43, 4 (1990), 391–400. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02241657>
- [20] Philippe Flajolet, Eric Fusy, Olivier Gandouet, and Frédéric Meunier. 2007. HyperLogLog: the analysis of a near-optimal cardinality estimation algorithm. In *DMTCS Proceedings vol. AH, 2007 Conference on Analysis of Algorithms (AofA 07)*. DMTCS, Strasbourg, France, 127–146. <https://doi.org/10.46298/dmtcs.3545>
- [21] Philippe Flajolet and G. Nigel Martin. 1983. Probabilistic Counting. In *24th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Tucson, Arizona, USA, 7-9 November 1983*. IEEE Computer Society, Piscataway, NJ, USA, 76–82. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1983.46>
- [22] Sumit Ganguly, Minos Garofalakis, Rajeev Rastogi, and Krishan Sabnani. 2007. Streaming Algorithms for Robust, Real-Time Detection of DDoS Attacks. In *27th International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (ICDCS '07)*. IEEE Computer Society, Piscataway, NJ, USA, 4–4. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDCS.2007.142>
- [23] C. Gormley and Z. Tong. 2015. *Elasticsearch: The Definitive Guide: A Distributed Real-Time Search and Analytics Engine*. "O'Reilly Media, Inc.", Sebastopol, CA, USA.
- [24] Stefan Heule, Marc Nunkesser, and Alexander Hall. 2013. HyperLogLog in Practice: Algorithmic Engineering of a State of the Art Cardinality Estimation Algorithm. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Extending Database Technology (Genoa, Italy) (EDBT '13)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 683–692. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2452376.2452456>
- [25] Zengfeng Huang, Ke Yi, and Qin Zhang. 2012. Randomized algorithms for tracking distributed count, frequencies, and ranks. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2012, Scottsdale, AZ, USA, May 20-24, 2012*, Michael Benedikt, Markus Krötzsch, and Maurizio Lenzerini (Eds.). ACM, New York, NY USA, 295–306. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2213556.2213596> Full version at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.1763>.
- [26] Rajesh Jayaram and David P. Woodruff. 2018. Data Streams with Bounded Deletions. In *Proceedings of the 37th ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (Houston, TX, USA) (PODS '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 341–354. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3196959.3196986>
- [27] N. Kamiyama, T. Mori, and R. Kawahara. 2007. Simple and Adaptive Identification of Superspreaders by Flow Sampling. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2007 - 26th IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications*. IEEE, Piscataway, NJ, USA, 2481–2485. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFCOM.2007.305>
- [28] Daniel M. Kane, Jelani Nelson, and David P. Woodruff. 2010. An optimal algorithm for the distinct elements problem. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2010, June 6-11, 2010, Indianapolis, Indiana, USA*, Jan Paredaens and Dirk Van Gucht (Eds.). ACM, New York, NY, USA, 41–52. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1807085.1807094>
- [29] Kevin J. Lang. 2017. Back to the Future: an Even More Nearly Optimal Cardinality Estimation Algorithm. [arXiv:1708.06839](https://arxiv.org/abs/1708.06839) <https://arxiv.org/abs/1708.06839>
- [30] Tao Li, Shigang Chen, Wen Luo, Ming Zhang, and Yan Qiao. 2013. Spreader Classification Based on Optimal Dynamic Bit Sharing. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking* 21, 3 (2013), 817–830. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNET.2012.2218255>
- [31] Weijiang Liu, Wenyu Qu, Jian Gong, and Keqiu Li. 2016. Detection of Superpoints Using a Vector Bloom Filter. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 11, 3 (2016), 514–527. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIFS.2015.2503269>
- [32] Yang Liu, Wenji Chen, and Yong Guan. 2016. Identifying High-Cardinality Hosts from Network-Wide Traffic Measurements. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* 13, 5 (2016), 547–558. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TDSC.2015.2423675>
- [33] Thomas Locher. 2011. Finding Heavy Distinct Hitters in Data Streams. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures (San Jose, California, USA) (SPAA '11)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 299–308. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1989493.1989541>
- [34] Charles Masson, Jee E Rim, and Homin K Lee. 2019. DDSketch: A fast and fully-mergeable quantile sketch with relative-error guarantees. *The VLDB Journal* 12, 12 (2019), 2195–2205.
- [35] Charles Masson and Celia Watt. 2019. Computing Accurate Percentiles with DDSketch. <https://www.datadoghq.com/blog/engineering/computing-accurate-percentiles-with-ddsketch>. Accessed: 2023-06-27.
- [36] Ahmed Metwally, Divyakant Agrawal, and Amr El Abbadi. 2005. Efficient Computation of Frequent and Top-k Elements in Data Streams. In *Database Theory - ICDT 2005, 10th International Conference, Edinburgh, UK, January 5-7, 2005, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 3363)*, Thomas Eiter and Leonid Libkin (Eds.). Springer, Berlin, Germany, 398–412. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-30570-5\\_27](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-30570-5_27)

- [37] Ahmed Metwally, Divyakant Agrawal, and Amr El Abbadi. 2008. Why Go Logarithmic If We Can Go Linear? Towards Effective Distinct Counting of Search Traffic. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Extending Database Technology: Advances in Database Technology* (Nantes, France) (EDBT '08). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 618–629. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1353343.1353418>
- [38] Jayadev Misra and David Gries. 1982. Finding Repeated Elements. *Sci. Comput. Program.* 2, 2 (1982), 143–152. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-6423\(82\)90012-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-6423(82)90012-0)
- [39] Dave Plonka. 2000. FlowScan: A Network Traffic Flow Reporting and Visualization Tool. In *Proceedings of the 14th USENIX Conference on System Administration* (New Orleans, Louisiana) (LISA '00). USENIX Association, USA, 305–318.
- [40] Martin Roesch. 1999. Snort - Lightweight Intrusion Detection for Networks. In *Proceedings of the 13th USENIX Conference on System Administration* (Seattle, Washington) (LISA '99). USENIX Association, USA, 229–238.
- [41] Rana Shahout, Roy Friedman, and Ran Ben Basat. 2022. SQUAD: Combining Sketching and Sampling is Better than Either for per-Item Quantile Estimation. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM International Conference on Systems and Storage* (Haifa, Israel) (SYSTOR '22). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 152. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3534056.3535009>
- [42] Sumit Sidana, Charlotte Laclau, Massih R. Amini, Gilles Vandelle, and André Bois-Crettez. 2017. KASANDR: A Large-Scale Dataset with Implicit Feedback for Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 40th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (Shinjuku, Tokyo, Japan) (SIGIR '17). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1245–1248. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3077136.3080713>
- [43] Lu Tang, Qun Huang, and Patrick P. C. Lee. 2020. SpreadSketch: Toward Invertible and Network-Wide Detection of Superspreaders. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2020 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*. IEEE, Piscataway, NJ, USA, 1608–1617. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFOCOM41043.2020.9155541>
- [44] Daniel Ting. 2019. Approximate Distinct Counts for Billions of Datasets. In *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD Conference 2019, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, June 30 - July 5, 2019*, Peter A. Boncz, Stefan Manegold, Anastasia Ailamaki, Amol Deshpande, and Tim Kraska (Eds.). ACM, New York, NY, USA, 69–86. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3299869.3319897>
- [45] Shobha Venkataraman, Dawn Song, Phillip B Gibbons, and Avrim Blum. 2005. New streaming algorithms for fast detection of superspreaders. In *Proceedings of the Network and Distributed System Security Symposium, NDSS 2005, San Diego, California, USA*. The Internet Society, Reston, VA, 1–1.
- [46] Pinghui Wang, Xiaohong Guan, Tao Qin, and Qiuzhen Huang. 2011. A Data Streaming Method for Monitoring Host Connection Degrees of High-Speed Links. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 6, 3 (2011), 1086–1098. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIFS.2011.2123094>
- [47] Ralf Weber. 2014. Latest Internet Plague: Random Subdomain Attacks. (2014). <https://indico.uknof.org.uk/event/31/contributions/349/> UKNOF29 & Internet Society ION Conference.
- [48] Qingjun Xiao, Shigang Chen, Min Chen, and Yibei Ling. 2015. Hyper-Compact Virtual Estimators for Big Network Data Based on Register Sharing. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM SIGMETRICS International Conference on Measurement and Modeling of Computer Systems, Portland, OR, USA, June 15-19, 2015*, Bill Lin, Jun (Jim) Xu, Sudipta Sengupta, and Devavrat Shah (Eds.). ACM, New York, NY, USA, 417–428. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2745844.2745870>
- [49] MyungKeun Yoon, Tao Li, Shigang Chen, and Jih-Kwon Peir. 2011. Fit a Compact Spread Estimator in Small High-Speed Memory. *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.* 19, 5 (oct 2011), 1253–1264. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNET.2010.2080285>
- [50] Minlan Yu, Lavanya Jose, and Rui Miao. 2013. Software Defined Traffic Measurement with OpenSketch. In *Proceedings of the 10th USENIX Conference on Networked Systems Design and Implementation* (Lombard, IL) (NSDI '13). USENIX Association, USA, 29–42.
- [51] Fuheng Zhao, Divyakant Agrawal, Amr El Abbadi, and Ahmed Metwally. 2022. SpaceSaving±: An Optimal Algorithm for Frequency Estimation and Frequent Items in the Bounded-Deletion Model. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 15, 6 (feb 2022), 1215–1227. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3514061.3514068>
- [52] Fuheng Zhao, Sujaya Maiyya, Ryan Wiener, Divyakant Agrawal, and Amr El Abbadi. 2021. KLL± Approximate Quantile Sketches over Dynamic Datasets. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 14, 7 (mar 2021), 1215–1227. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3450980.3450990>
- [53] Qi Zhao, Abhishek Kumar, and Jun Xu. 2005. Joint Data Streaming and Sampling Techniques for Detection of Super Sources and Destinations. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACM SIGCOMM Conference on Internet Measurement* (Berkeley, CA) (IMC '05). USENIX Association, USA, 7.