In the previous lecture, we discussed the Misra-Greis deterministic counting algorithm for finding the $k$ most frequent elements in a stream. However, it was not a sketching algorithm. Today we see Sketching algorithms that work in the turnstile model where deletion is allowed in addition to insertion. In this lecture, we discuss two sketching algorithm to estimate $f_{i}$, the number of occurrences of $a_{i} \in \sigma$. In the last section, we will discuss various application of these algorithms.

### 7.1 CountSketch

In this section, we will study the CountSketch algorithm for estimating the frequency of an element in the stream. This was the work of Charikar, Chen and Farach-Colton[CCFC04] from 2004 . The algorithm is as follows,

## CountSketch (Basic)

1. $k \leftarrow \frac{3}{\epsilon^{2}}$
2. $c \in \mathbb{Z}^{k}$ and $c[1, \ldots, k]=0$.
3. $h$ is a a random hash function $h:\{1, \ldots, n\} \rightarrow\{1, \ldots, k\}$ from a 2 -universal hash function family.
4. $g$ is a random hash function $g:\{1, \ldots, n\} \rightarrow\{-1,+1\}$ from a 2-universal hash function family.
5. While there is at least one token left:
6. Each token $a_{j}=\left(i_{j}, \Delta_{j}\right)$ where $i_{j}$ is the element and $\Delta_{j} \in\{-1,+1\}$ denotes insert or delete.
7. $c\left[h\left(i_{j}\right)\right] \leftarrow c\left[h\left(i_{j}\right)\right]+\Delta_{j} g\left(i_{j}\right)$
8. for each $i \in[n]$ set $\hat{f}_{i}=g(i) c[h(i)]$.

### 7.1.1 Analysis

Consider a fixed $a \in\{1, \ldots, n\}$ and let $X$ be a random variables where $X=\hat{f}_{a}$. Let $Y_{1}, \ldots, Y_{n}$ be independent Bernoulli random variable where

$$
Y_{i}= \begin{cases}1, & \text { if } h(i)=h(a) \\ 0, & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

We will use the fact that any token with value $i$ and $Y_{i}=1$ changes the counter $c[h(a)]$ since both $h(i)$ and $h(a)$ hash to the same value.

$$
\begin{aligned}
X & =g(a) \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{i} g(i) Y_{i} \\
& =f_{a} \underbrace{g(a)^{2}}_{1}+\sum_{i: i \neq a} f_{i} g(a) g(i) Y_{i} \\
& =f_{a}+\sum_{i: i \neq a} f_{i} g(a) g(i) Y_{i}
\end{aligned}
$$

We must also note that since hash functions $g$ and $h$ are independent, $\mathrm{E}\left[g(i) Y_{i}\right]=\underbrace{\mathrm{E}[g(i)]}_{0} \mathrm{E}\left[Y_{i}\right]=0$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}[X] & =\mathrm{E}\left[f_{a}+\sum_{i: i \neq a} f_{i} g(a) g(i) Y_{i}\right] \\
& =\mathrm{E}\left[f_{a}\right]+\mathrm{E}\left[\sum_{i: i \neq a} f_{i} g(a) g(i) Y_{i}\right] \\
& =f_{a}+\sum_{i: i \neq a} \mathrm{E}\left[f_{i} g(a) g(i) Y_{i}\right] \\
& =f_{a}+\sum_{i: i \neq a} \mathrm{E}\left[f_{i}\right] \mathrm{E}[g(a)] \underbrace{\mathrm{E}[g(i)] \mathrm{E}\left[Y_{i}\right]}_{0} \\
& =f_{a}
\end{aligned}
$$

For any Bernoulli random variable $Y_{i}, \mathrm{E}\left[Y_{i}^{2}\right]=\mathrm{E}\left[Y_{i}\right]$. Combining it with the properties of 2-universal hash functions, we get that for each $i \in\{1, \ldots, n\} \backslash\{a\}$ and a 2-universal hash function $h$,

$$
\mathrm{E}\left[Y_{i}^{2}\right]=\mathrm{E}\left[Y_{i}\right]=\operatorname{Pr}[h(i)=h(a)]=\frac{1}{k}
$$

Suppose $g$ and $h$ are independent 2-universal hash functions, then

$$
\mathrm{E}\left[g(i) g(j) Y_{i} Y_{j}\right]=\underbrace{\mathrm{E}[g(i)]}_{0} \mathrm{E}[g(j)] \mathrm{E}\left[Y_{i} Y_{j}\right]=0
$$

We will bound the probability of failure using Chebyshev's inequality, but we would need to compute the variance first.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Var}[X] & =\operatorname{Var}\left[f_{a}+\sum_{i: i \neq a} f_{i} g(a) g(i) Y_{i}\right] \\
& =0+\underbrace{g(a)^{2}}_{1} \operatorname{Var}\left[\sum_{i: i \neq a} f_{i} g(i) Y_{i}\right] \\
& =\mathrm{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i: i \neq a} f_{i} g(i) Y_{i}\right)^{2}\right]-\mathrm{E}\left[\sum_{i \neq a} f_{i} g(i) Y_{i}\right]^{2} \\
& =\mathrm{E}\left[\sum_{i \neq a} f_{i}^{2} Y_{i}^{2}+\sum_{i, j \in[n] \backslash\{a\}} f_{i} f_{j} g(i) g(j) Y_{i} Y_{j}\right]-\mathrm{E}\left[\sum_{i \neq a} f_{i} g(i) Y_{i}\right]^{2} \\
& =\mathrm{E}\left[\sum_{i \neq a} f_{i}^{2} Y_{i}^{2}\right]+\mathrm{E}\left[\sum_{i, j \in[n] \backslash\{a\}} f_{i} f_{j} g(i) g(j) Y_{i} Y_{j}\right]-\underbrace{\left(\sum_{i \neq a} f_{i} \mathrm{E}\left[g(i) Y_{i}\right]\right)^{2}}_{0 \operatorname{since} \mathrm{E}\left[g(i) g(j) Y_{i} Y_{j}\right]=0} \\
& =\sum_{i \neq a} \mathrm{E}\left[f_{i}^{2} Y_{i}^{2}\right]=\sum_{i \neq a} f_{i}^{2} \mathrm{E}\left[Y_{i}^{2}\right]=\sum_{i \neq a} \frac{f_{i}^{2}}{k} \\
& =\frac{\|f\|_{2}^{2}-f_{a}^{2}}{k} \leq \frac{\|f\|_{2}^{2}}{k}
\end{aligned}
$$

We will now use Chebyshev's inequality to bound the probability,

Theorem 1 (Chebyshev's inequality) Let $X$ be a random variable and $t>0$. Then $\operatorname{Pr}[|X-\mathrm{E}[X]|>t \leq$ $\frac{\operatorname{Var}[X]}{t^{2}}$. Alternatively $\operatorname{Pr}\left[|X-\mathrm{E}[X]|>t \sigma_{X}\right] \leq \frac{1}{t^{2}}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Pr}\left[\left|\hat{f}_{a}-f_{a}\right| \geq \epsilon\|f\|_{2}\right] & =\operatorname{Pr}\left[|X-\mathrm{E}[X]| \geq \epsilon\|f\|_{2}\right] \\
& \leq \frac{\operatorname{Var}[X]}{\epsilon^{2}\|f\|^{2}} \leq \frac{\|f\|_{2}^{2}}{\epsilon^{2} k\|f\|^{2}} \\
& =\frac{1}{k \epsilon^{2}}=\frac{1}{3}
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the median of means trick, we can run $t$ independent copies of it while setting $k=\frac{3}{\epsilon^{2}}$ and $t=O\left(\log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$ and running the more improved algorithm,

## CountSketch

1. $k \leftarrow \frac{3}{\epsilon^{2}}$
2. $t=O\left(\log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$
3. $c \in \mathbb{Z}^{t} \times \mathbb{Z}^{k}$ and $c[1, \ldots, t][1, \ldots, k]=0$.
4. Choose $t$ 2-universal hash functions $h_{1}, \ldots, h_{t}$ such that $h_{i}$ is random hash function $h_{i}:\{1, \ldots, n\} \rightarrow$ $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ from a 2 -universal hash function family.
5. Choose $t$ 2-universal hash functions $g_{1}, \ldots, g_{t}$ such that $g_{i}$ is a random hash function $g_{i}:\{1, \ldots, n\} \rightarrow$ $\{-1,+1\}$ from a 2 -universal hash function family.
6. While there is at least one token left:
7. Each token $a_{j}=\left(i_{j}, \Delta_{j}\right)$ where $i_{j}$ is the element and $\Delta_{j} \in\{-1,+1\}$ denotes insert or delete.
8. for $i \leftarrow 1$ to $t$ do,
9. $\quad c\left[i, h_{i}\left(i_{j}\right)\right] \leftarrow c\left[i, h_{i}\left(i_{j}\right)\right]+\Delta_{j} g_{i}\left(i_{j}\right)$
10. For each $a \in[n]$, let $\hat{f}_{a}=\underset{1 \leq i \leq t}{\operatorname{median}} g_{i}(a) \cdot c\left[i, h_{i}(a)\right]$.

Just like the previous analysis, suppose we fix $l$ and $X_{l}=g_{l}(a) \cdot c\left[l, h_{l}(a)\right]$ is a random variable, then

$$
\mathrm{E}\left[X_{l}\right]=f_{a}
$$

Using the same analysis as before and Chebyshev's inequality,

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left[\left|X_{l}-f_{a}\right| \geq \epsilon\|f\|_{2}\right] \leq \frac{1}{3}
$$

Using the median of means trick, we can show

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left[\mid \text { median }\left\{X_{1}, \ldots, X_{t}\right\}-f_{a} \mid>\epsilon\|f\|_{2}\right] \leq e^{-O\left(\log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)} \leq \delta
$$

The space required to store the hash functions is $O(t \log n)$ and each counter might need to store a value up to $m$ and there are $t k$ counters, taking up $O(t k \log m)$ space. Hence, the total space complexity is $O(k t(\log m+$ $\log n))=O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^{2}} \log \frac{1}{\delta}(\log m+\log n)\right)$. We will now look at an alternate algorithm called CountMinSketch which solves the same problem but gives different guarantees.

### 7.2 CountMinSketch

This algorithm was introduced by Cormode and Muthukrishnan [CM05] in 2005. The ideas of the algorithm are very close to the algorithm we saw before. We maintain an array of size $t \times k$ consisting of counters which we update using hash functions. We can visualize it as a matrix where for each row, $i$, there is a 2 -universal hash function $h_{i}:\{1, \ldots, n\} \rightarrow\{1, \ldots, k\}$ which, like the previous algorithm, we will use to map elements to counters. The algorithm works as follows,

## CountMinSketch

1. Choose $t$ 2-universal hash functions $h_{1}, \ldots, h_{t}$ such that $h_{i}$ is random hash function $h_{i}:\{1, \ldots, n\} \rightarrow$ $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ from a 2 -universal hash function family.
2. $c \in \mathbb{Z}^{t} \times \mathbb{Z}^{k}$ and $c[1, \ldots, t][1, \ldots, k]=0$.
3. While there is at least one token left:
4. for $i \leftarrow 1$ to $t$ do,
5. $\quad c\left[i, h_{i}\left(i_{j}\right)\right] \leftarrow c\left[i, h_{i}\left(i_{j}\right)\right]+\Delta_{j}$
6. For each $a \in[n]$, let $\hat{f}_{a}=\min _{1 \leq i \leq t} c\left[i, h_{i}(a)\right]$.

Suppose for the purpose of this analysis, we assume that $\Delta_{j} \geq 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$, then

$$
\sum_{l: h_{i}\left(i_{l}\right)=j} \Delta_{l}=c[i, j]
$$

In any case, $\hat{f}_{a}$ will be an over estimation of $f_{a}$ (for $\Delta_{j} \geq 1$ ). Let $X_{i}$ be the random variable denoting the excess of $c\left[i, h_{i}(a)\right]$ compared to $f_{a}$. We can write $X_{i}=c\left[i, h_{i}(a)\right]-f_{a}$. Just like before, we will also have a random variable $Y_{i j}$ for $j \in\{1, \ldots, n\} \backslash\{a\}$ where

$$
Y_{i j}= \begin{cases}1, & \text { if } h_{i}(j)=h_{i}(a) \\ 0, & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

According to our definition, if $Y_{i j}=1$, then $f_{j}$ is added to the $i^{\text {th }}$ counter for $f_{a}$.

$$
X_{i}=\sum_{j \in\{1, \ldots, n\} \backslash\{a\}} f_{i} Y_{i j}
$$

Since $Y_{i j}$ is a Bernoulli random variable and by the properties of 2-universality, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Pr}\left[Y_{i}=1\right] & =\frac{1}{k}=\mathrm{E}\left[Y_{i j}\right] \\
\mathrm{E}\left[X_{i}\right] & =\mathrm{E}\left[\sum_{j \in\{1, \ldots, n\} \backslash\{a\}} f_{j} Y_{i j}\right] \\
& =\sum_{j \in\{1, \ldots, n\} \backslash\{a\}} f_{j} \mathrm{E}\left[Y_{i j}\right] \\
& =\sum_{j \in\{1, \ldots, n\} \backslash\{a\}} \frac{f_{j}}{k} \\
& =\frac{\|f\|_{1}-f_{a}}{k} \text { which we will denote by }\left\|f_{-a}\right\|
\end{aligned}
$$

We will now use Markov's inequality to bound the probability of failure.

Theorem 2 (Markov's inequality) Let $X$ be a non-negative random variable. Then for all $a>0: \operatorname{Pr}[X \geq$ $a] \leq \frac{\mathrm{E}[X]}{a}$. Alternatively $\operatorname{Pr}[X \geq a \mathrm{E}[X]] \leq \frac{1}{a}$.

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left[X_{i} \geq \epsilon\left\|f_{-a}\right\|_{1}\right] \leq \frac{\left\|f_{-a}\right\|_{1}}{k \epsilon \mid\left\|f_{-a}\right\|_{1}}=\frac{1}{2}
$$

By our choice of $k$ and using the fact that we have $t$ independent counters, we will show $\hat{f}_{a}-f_{a}$ is the minimum over all with high probability.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Pr}\left[\hat{f}_{a}-f_{a} \geq \epsilon\left\|f_{-a}\right\|_{1}\right] & =\operatorname{Pr}\left[\min \left\{X_{1}, \ldots, X_{t}\right\} \geq \epsilon\left\|f_{-a}\right\|_{1}\right] \\
& =\operatorname{Pr}\left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^{t}\left(X_{i} \geq \epsilon\left\|f_{-a}\right\|_{1}\right)\right] \\
& =\prod_{i=1}^{t} \operatorname{Pr}\left[X_{i} \geq \epsilon\left\|f_{-a}\right\|_{1}\right] \\
& \leq 2^{-t}=\delta
\end{aligned}
$$

To make our error as small as delta, we can find a choice of $t=O\left(\log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$. We have shown that that we can guarantee the value of $f_{a}$ with additive error with high probability,

$$
f_{a} \leq \hat{f}_{a} \leq f_{a}+\epsilon\left\|f_{-a}\right\|_{1} \leq f_{a}+\epsilon\|f\|_{1}
$$

While both CountSketch and CountMinSketch have the same approach and same goal of estimating the frequency $f_{a}$ of some element $a$, they both provide different guarantees. For instance, suppose we consider the problem of estimating frequency moments, CountSketch outputs an estimate $\hat{f}_{a}$ of $f_{a}$ with an additive error of $\epsilon\|f\|_{2}$ while CountMinSketch provides an error of $\epsilon\|f\|_{1}$ and $\|f\|_{2} \leq\|f\|_{1}$, meaning the additive error of CountMinSketch is much worse in comparison. One could always pick an algorithm depending on what metric $\left(L_{2}\right.$ or $\left.L_{1}\right)$ they wish to optimize for. However, CountMinSketch has a one-sided error guarantee when $\Delta \geq 0$ which could be useful depending on the application. CountMinSketch is also more preferable when it comes to space complexity since one would only need $O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$ counters. We can summarize what we described in the following table,

| Algorithm | Error Bound | Space Complexity |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CountSketch | $\left\|\hat{f}_{a}-f_{a}\right\| \leq \epsilon\left\\|f_{-a}\right\\|_{2}$ | $O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^{2}} \log \frac{1}{\delta}(\log m+\log n)\right)$ |
| CountMinSketch | $\left\|\hat{f}_{a}-f_{a}\right\| \leq \epsilon\\|f\\|_{1}$ | $O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \log \frac{1}{\delta}(\log m+\log n)\right)$ |

### 7.3 Applications

In this section, we will discuss applications of the algorithms we previously discussed.

1. Point Queries: Given an item $i$, the point query $Q(i)$ would return an estimate of $f_{i}$. This query would require returning the value of a counter in the sketch.
2. Range Queries : Given $Q(l, r)$, we would want to estimate the number of elements of each type from $l$ to $r$, so we would like to return $\sum_{l \leq i \leq r} f_{i}$.
3. Inner Product : Given $Q(\vec{f}, \vec{g})$, we would to approximate $\langle\vec{f}, \vec{g}\rangle=\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{i} g_{i}$.
4. Heavy Hitter: We call an index $i$ an $\alpha$-HH (for heavy hitter) where $\alpha \in(0,1]$ if $f_{i} \geq \alpha\|f\|_{1}$. We wish to identify elements that are $\alpha$-HH.

We can use CountSketch and CountMinSketch to solve all the problems mentioned above. Next lecture, we will look at how to solve range queries using dyadic intervals.
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