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(ABSTRACT)

The field of efficient web archive searching is at a turning point. In the early years of web archive searching, the organizations only use the URL as a key to search through the dataset, which is inefficient but acceptable. In recent years, as the volume of data in web archives has grown larger and larger, the ordinary search methods have been gradually replaced by more efficient searching methods. This report will address the theoretical and methodological implications of choosing and running some suitable hashing algorithms locally, and eventually to improve the whole performance of web archive searching in time and space complexity. The report introduces the design and implementation of various hashing algorithms to convert URLs to a sortable and shortened format, then chooses the best one by comparing benchmark results.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Before we begin to examine the various methods and approaches to web archive searching, it is essential to start by asking why we archive web materials at all. Nowadays, the web is an important cultural resource as the venue for a large amount of social interaction and many cultural productions, and the forum for much of the public debate. The web plays an important role in society and people’s lives. Therefore, the web has become a key source for scholars studying social and cultural phenomena. Web archives facilitate this work by documenting and preserving snapshots of the web for future research [5].

As a result, many websites have been collected by companies and organizations. Most of them are non-profit groups, aiming to create a public web library and provide a free platform for online users to conduct research and data analysis. In the meantime, one thing we are gradually facing is web-mutability. The web is an unpredictable medium. The pace of change is rapid, and it can be hard to predict what types of new online content and services will become the next hit on the web. Since we want to create a library storing all historical versions of the websites, this large collection of data becomes enormously large as more and more data is gathered along the way, and leads to searching efficiency issues when looking it up. With more social scientists, historians and other researchers accessing these online archives more frequently, we can not simply reduce the size of the dataset but have to resolve this problem by bringing some methods to improve searching efficiency.

According to the Internet Archive Organization, the largest web archives dataset we have
now is approximately 50 PB, it contains 9.8 petabytes books/music/video collections, 18.5 petabytes unique data [8]. We will give more details here about web archive service by introducing a public website called “Wayback Machine”. Wayback Machine is a non-profit digital library of internet sites and digital-formed cultural artifacts, whose main purpose is to provide universal access to all knowledge.

The Internet Archive service has been active for more than 20 years since 1996 and it already collected over 330 billion web pages, 20 million books and text, 4.5 million audio records. Anyone with a free account can upload media to the Internet Archive and they work with thousands of partners globally to save copies of their work into special collections [8].

Just like mentioned above, with the ever-increasing datasets, there seem to be demands for making some improvements regarding the searching efficiency. An idea of making the URLs shorten and sortable to reduce time and space complexity and increase the searching speed was brought out by our client Xinyue Wang.

We will be implementing several hashing algorithms to run locally which can shorten the URL and makes it sortable. TinyURL is a useful website to provide services that take an original URL and produce a shortened URL. However, we can not abuse such services with our huge collection of data. Therefore, our hashing process must be performed locally.

We can explain why shortened and sortable URLs could be really helpful for making progress in web archive searching. The reason why we need to make the URL shorter is quite simple, to increase the searching efficiency by reducing the factors we need to consider and check for each URL. For example, we have a 50 characters long URL compared to a 15 characters URL, it is obvious that the latter will be easier to be checked and searched. Also, it is necessary to have the URLs sortable because we need to improve the clustering of the datasets, thereby the values in the set are widely scattered, then enhance the searching efficiency.
Chapter 2

Requirements

The main purpose of our project is to find a method to convert URLs to a sortable and shortened format locally and provide corresponding design and implementation. A benchmark method will be provided to measure the searching efficiency improvement in terms of time and space complexity. We will also deliver multiple alternative hashing functions with their benchmarking results and detailed analysis to demonstrate the pros and cons of each method. Therefore, users can decide on which method to apply, based on their use cases.
Chapter 3

Design

3.1 Goals in Detail

To support both of the goals of (a) examining how different hash functions convert URLs and the time/space complexity during web archive searching, and (b) implementation of the method which converts URLs and reduces the time and space complexity during web archive searching, the system needs to support three tasks.

1. Extract from the sample dataset.

2. Apply hashing functions, which depend on the dataset.

3. Benchmark the functions; this is dependent on the hashing result values from the functions.

As shown in Figure 3.1, the tasks are dependent on one another. As a result, we can derive a sequence of tasks required to accomplish the goal; these are explained in the following subsections.
3.1. Goals in Detail

Figure 3.1: Project Goals and Tasks
3.2 Sub-tasks in Detail

Task: Data extraction (see Figure 3.2)

Input file: Sample data in Apache Parquet format

Output file: Extracted original URLs in CSV format

This task requires the Python API for Apache Arrow to extract information from the Apache Parquet file. It also requires Python data science libraries such as Pandas and Numpy to
process extracted data and send output to a CSV file for better accessibility and readability.

Figure 3.3: Apply Hash Function
Task: Apply hash function (see Figure 3.3)

Input file: Extracted original URLs in CSV format

Output file: CSV file with original URLs and hashed values

For the task of the apply hash function, the required input file is a CSV file with cleaned original URLs (URLs with no special characters). This CSV file is provided by the task of extracting from the sample dataset. The hash function takes the cleaned original URLs as input and outputs the hash values which will be written back to the CSV file. The libraries, functions, and the environment depend on which hash function we are using. For example, since the Spooky Hash function is written in C++, the required libraries are stdlib, iostream, stdio, etc.
3.2. Sub-tasks in Detail

Figure 3.4: Benchmarking
Task: Benchmarking (see Figure 3.4)

Input file: CSV file with cleaned original URLs and hashed values

Output file: Execution time, Space usage

This task will take the CSV file with cleaned URLs and hash values from the previous task as an input. Then, Pyarrow and the Pandas library are used to generate a new Apache Parquet file. Next, we will call the Pyarrow build-in query function to search in the Apache Parquet file (Environment: Python). Meanwhile, we use the system time and the memory usage function to measure the query function execution time and memory usage for further comparison.

3.3 Workflow

Figure 3.5 summarizes our overall project workflow.
3.3. Workflow

Figure 3.5: Project Workflow
Chapter 4

Implementation

4.1 Spooky Hash

SpookyHash is the first Hash Function chosen in this project. SpookyHash is a public domain non-cryptographic hash function written in C++ producing well-distributed 128-bit hash values for byte arrays of any length. Each 128-bit hash value is stored in two uint64 variables and one is for storing the 64 low bits and the other is for storing the 64 high bits. 32-bit and 64-bit hash values are supported as well by using only the 64 low bits and cast to the correct size accordingly. Spooky Hash has two main advantages. One is that the hash function is fast; long keys hash in 3 bytes per cycle; short keys take about 1 byte per cycle, and there is a 30 cycle startup cost [7]. In cryptography, the avalanche effect is a desirable property that stands for a slight change, in either the key or the plain-text resulting in a significant change in the cipher-text [11]. The second advantage is that it can achieve avalanche for 1-bit and 2-bit input; it can also produce different hash values based on the seed [7].

This hash function takes a pointer of the stream of bytes to be hashed, length of the message, and a seed. The inner loop of Spooky Hash consumes 8 bytes of the input and uses xor, rotation, and addition to manipulate that input [7]. The hash values which are generated at the end are used to create short URLs for the later part of the project.
4.2 Simple Hash

The web archive is known to be huge, so any associated database will be very large. One of the reasons why SpookyHash is chosen for this project is because its hash values’ chances of collision are small. According to the creator of Spooky Hash, libraries using 128-bit checksums should expect 1 collision once they hit 16 quintillion documents [7]. Since the short URL is created based on the hash values, the fact that the hash values have a low chance of collision means the short URLs will also have a low collision chance. This works well with web archive databases. Besides the 128-bit hash value, the 64-bit and 32-bit values are produced as well in order to test against each other and compare their performance.

4.2 Simple Hash

Our second implementation is called Simple Hash. The basic idea of this algorithm was inspired by Dr. Lenwood Heath from the CS department at Virginia Tech. All URLs are structured with at least one protocol and one domain. A fully structured URL example is shown in Figure 4.1.
According to our client, our goal is to not only shorten the URL but also make it sortable. Especially when it comes to looking for a specific URL in the dataset, without hashing the server will need to look through the whole database to find the result. But if we can split the original URL into different categories, the server will be able to only look at one category instead of looking through the whole database.

Based on the requirement and our analysis, we made a decision on the first step we will do for the hashing: remove everything except protocol and domains. This step is presented in the diagram with the name “Protocol & Domain Only”. For example, “https://vt.edu/”, “https://vt.edu/innovationcampus/index.html” and “https://vt.edu/visit.html” will be shortened to “https://vt.edu”. Without doing any hashing, this step already tremendously reduced the length of URLs.

Since we are planning to apply hashing on the URLs, special characters like dash and period aren’t easy to deal with and most of them are meaningless, so the second step we did is to
4.2. Simple Hash

filter out all the special characters.

The core part of this hashing algorithm is the third step: Simple Hash. In our data set, there are only two kinds of protocols, “http” and “https”. In order to shorten the URLs’ length, we decided on using 0 and 1 to represent them. Since protocol can be used to divide URLs into subcategories, we are putting 0 and 1 as the first index for the hashed result. Other than protocols, as we know, the domain is structured by a sub-domain (optional), a domain name, and a first-level domain(FLD). An easy example would be “vt.edu”. Here “vt” is the domain name, and “edu” is the first-level domain. There are other first-level domain names, for instance: .com, .org, .gov, etc. We realized that there are only about two thousand unique first-level domains, and most of them are more than two characters in length [6]. So we decided on hashing them into two bytes which could help to shorten the hash length. As for the method we used to hash the first-level domain into two bytes, we simply did an indexing hashing. Those two thousand first-level domains are listed and each of them has a unique index. We count numbers from 0 to 9, then letters a to z and capitalized letters A to Z; there are a total of 62. Using them can accommodate 3844 unique strings which are more than the available number of first-level domain names. Each first-level domain is designated with a unique 2-bytes string. This string will be appended next to the protocol’s bit number since the first-level domain name can divide URLs into the second-largest group other than protocols. Other than that, we just go ahead and append everything left of the tail of hashed URLs. Other than that, we appended the domain name at the end of the hashed value, and then ignore everything after the domain name. Since our goal is to improve the searching efficiency, after applying our simple hash, we will not be searching through the dataset for a specific URL. Instead, we will find all the URLs with the same first-level domains, domain names, and the same protocols. For instance, both https://canvas.vt.edu/courses/104585 and https://canvas.vt.edu/courses/104564 will
be hashed into the same value “0Q2canvasvt”, we will first query with this hashed value, then perform a secondary search with the original URL. In this way, we will be able to reduce the time cost of searching through the dataset one by one. See an example in Figure 4.2.

![Figure 4.2: Simple Hash Process](image)

4.3 xxHash

xxHash is one of the hash functions we chose for this project. xxHash is an extremely fast non-cryptographic hash algorithm, working at speeds close to RAM limits. It is proposed in two flavors, 32 and 64 bits [4]. It is firstly written in C, and different language versions can produce the xxHash-compatible results, such as Java, Python. The two constructors for hash algorithms are xxh32() and xxh64(), which support well for 32-bits and 64-bits systems separately.

The xxh32() function has three parameters: input, length, and seed. It first gets the sequence
stored at memory address from “input” to “input + length of the sequence”. Then, if the
length of the sequence is not less than 16, adding the seed into four local variables for future
hashing process, the “seed” parameter can be used to alter the hashing result predictably.
After that, there will be several callings of different hash methods within a do-while loop
to get a temp result value. If the input sequence is less than 16, simply add the seed and
a constant variable as the temp result value. Now, it is time for further hashing processes.
There will be two more while loops, within each loop, the temp result value will be changed
by calling the helper hashing methods. Finally, It will use = and * = operators to change
the temp result value with constant values and the shift values of itself, and return the
32-bit hash of sequences. Calling this function requires that the memory between input
& input+length must be allocated and read-accessible. The xxh64() function returns the
64-bit hash of the sequence instead, and to be noted that this function runs faster on 64-bit
systems, but slower on 32-bit systems.

The main advantage of xxHash function is its process speed, according to the Q-score(a
measurement of quality of the hash function) table of different hash algorithms, it has a
5.4GB/s speed and 10 points on quality, which means a perfect score. Another advantage of
this algorithm is that the return values are unsigned 32 and 64-bit integers, which makes it
easy for future processes. Our project is efficiency-web-archive, and the goal of our project
requires us to find relatively fast hashing algorithms, and also since we have a huge dataset,
it would be better if we can have a simple and fast output format. That's the reason why
we would consider xxHash as one of our hashing algorithm choices.
4.4 MurmurHash

The reason why the Murmur Hash is chosen for this project is because it is a very fast, non-cryptographic hash suitable for general hash-based lookup \cite{1}. Three Murmur Hash versions are implemented by c++ and released publicly. The MurmurHash3 is the latest version of Murmur Hash. It contains algorithms which are optimized for each of the x86 and x 64 platforms.

The function used for this project is MurmurHash3_x64__128, which is optimized for the x64 platform to produce 128-bit hash values. It takes a pointer to stream of bytes to be hashed, length of the stream, a seed, and a pointer to store the output value. Then they will be passed to the mix functions which are based on the following code:

```
k *= c1;
k = rotl(k,r1);
k *= c2;

h ^= k;

h = rotl(h,r1);
h = h\times m1+n1;
```

Figure 4.3: Snippet of the MurmurHash3

As figure 4.3 shown, k is a block of the key, h is a block of the hash state, and rN/mN/cN are constant; each block of the key is pre-mixed using two constants and a rotate, xor the block of key into the hash block, and then mix the hash block using a rotate and a multiply-add \cite{2}. The function MurmurHash64A from MurmurHash2 (the second version of the Murmur Hash) is called to produce 64 bit Hash Values in order to compare the results.
4.5 CityHash

City Hash is another hash function we chose for our project. It is implemented in c++ by Geoff Pike and Jyrki Alakuijala. City Hash has a relatively good performance at smaller data sizes which are between 10-500 bytes [10]. Based on figure 4.4, cleaned original url’s maximum length is about 300 characters which makes city hash suitable for our project. The functions used in this project are CityHash32 and CityHash64 which can produce 32-bit and 64-bit hash values. They both take a pointer to the stream of bytes and the length of the stream as input. This hash function is were designed with heavy reliance on previous work by Austin Appleby, Bob Jenkins [3] who are the developer of Murmur Hash and Spooky Hash; this makes the way how City Hash handles and processes the stream similar to both Murmur Hash and Spooky Hash.

![Figure 4.4: Original URL vs. Cleaned URL Character Size](image-url)
Chapter 5

Testing/Evaluation/Assessment

5.1 Spooky Hash

Figure 5.1 compares the distribution of the original URL and SpookyHash Value in terms of character size. Since the number of SpookyHash values is much larger than the number of original URLs, the y-axis scale is rescaled to log base in order to display the skewness of the graph. Figure 5.1 shows that the original URL number is skewed to the right which means the data is more spread out in large URL/Value character size than in small URL/Value character. After the spooky Hash is applied to the original URL, the 32-bit, 64-bit, and 128-bit SpookyHash values it generates are concentrated on range 1-15, 15-25 , and 30-50 character sizes. This shows that the overall character sizes of the original URL are greatly reduced after the hashing process.
5.2. Simple Hash

Figure 5.2 compares the distribution of the original URL and Simple Hash Value in terms of character size. Figure 5.2 shows that the original URL number is skewed to the right which means the data is more spread out in large URL/Value character size than in small URL/Value character. After the Simple Hash is applied to the original URL, the SpookyHash values it generates are symmetrically concentrated between 0 and 40 character sizes whereas the majority of the original URLs have character size larger than 40. The data of the Simple Hash Value is located on almost the left side edge of the graph, compared to the original URL; this shows that the overall character sizes of the original URLs are tremendously reduced after the hashing process.
Chapter 5. Testing/Evaluation/Assessment

Figure 5.2: Original URL vs. Simple Hash value’s size and frequency

5.3 xxHash

The figure 5.3 below compares the distribution of the original URL and xxHash Value in terms of character size. As we can see, the original URLs are relatively bigger, and after applying the xxHash algorithm, the returned 32-bit and 64-bit values are mostly distributed around 10, which are much shorter than the original URL and meet our expectation. Also, what needs our attention is that the returned 32-bit and 64 bit values are in fixed length. We can see that from the graph, the two lines representing xxHash32 and xxHash64 values are vertical to the x-axis.

In conclusion, the testing/evaluation result shows that the xxHash algorithm reduces the length of original URLs, and compared with xxHash64, xxHash32 can generate shorter new URLs.
5.4 MurmurHash

The figure 5.4 compares the distribution of the original URL and Murmur Hash Value in terms of character size. We can see from the graph that the length of most original URLs are more than 50, ranging from 50 to 300.

After applying Murmur Hash, the new generated hash 32-bit and 64-bit values are closely fixed in a very narrow area around 20 and 35 separately in terms of character size, which are far shorter than most of the original URLs’ length. There are some few original URLs that have smaller character size than the new hash values, but overall, Murmur Hash does a good job on reducing the URLs.
Figure 5.4: Original URL vs. MurmurHash values’s size and frequency

5.5 CityHash

The figure 5.5 shows the comparison of the distribution of the original URL and City Hash Value in terms of character size. As we can see that the original URLs’ character sizes range from 50 to 300, which are all relatively long. Then, let’s take a look at the performance of City Hash 32-bit and 64-bit, from the graph, we can easily see that both of the two values are less than 25, which are far shorter than the original URL. Also, the length of new URLs are relatively fixed to one specific value, and the character size after applying City Hash 32-bit are shorter than City Hash 64-bit.

The test and evaluation result shows that the City Hash function can generate shorter URLs and meet the basic requirement of the algorithms chosen for our project.
Figure 5.5: Original URL vs. CityHash values’s size and frequency
Chapter 6

Benchmark

We used Apache Zeppelin for testing. First of all, we need to generate a new parquet file, combining all calculated hash values and the original parquet variable to be the new data frame. That is the database we will use for querying. Then go to the Zeppelin web server and load the database and run the querying script.

In order to make our results more accurate, we randomly pick 1000 records and query in the entire data frame. Next, query the corresponding hash value from each hash algorithm. Finally, divide the running time by 1000 to get the average query time. This represents the average time cost for a single request.

Another thing to be aware of is when we generate the parquet file, we have to combine all the hash algorithm results in a single data frame. So when we do the benchmark, we will have a comparison between different hash algorithms by using the same database.

Figure 6.1 shows the results we got from the Zeppelin. It is clear that the query for a 32 bits hash value is normally faster than the original URL, 64 bits as well as 128 bits. And If we take a look at our sample hash, which is a 32 bits hash algorithm, with a larger number of collisions. It takes longer than querying the original URL, So it is very straightforward that collisions are the biggest effect on time cost, because the query function needs to check more bits to make sure there is a collision. In our benchmark, we recommend using spooky has since it provides a wider range of character positions: 32 bit, 64 bit, and 128 bit. Depending
on the size of the database, different ranges of hash algorithms can be used.

Figure 6.1: Benchmark Results
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Users’ Manual

This section will go into detail on how a user can use our project.

7.1 Pre-processing

The pre-processing file is called basic_clean_url.py which takes origin_surt_url.csv that passed from the previous (parquet) step. This file only contains one column: original URLs. And the output for this file is a CSV named origin_simpleclean.csv, which contains two columns, the first one is the original URL, another is the cleaned URL. The cleaned URL is the original URL without special characters.

To generate a new origin_simpleclean.csv output file, users need to create a new origin_surt_url.csv which contains the new URLs as the one provided above and replace the original one under the current folder. Open the terminal and call command “python basic_clean_url.py” in the current directory. A new origin_simpleclean.csv file for the new input file should be generated.
7.2 SpookyHash & MurmurHash

Spooky Hash and Murmur Hash are called by the same Main.cpp under the SpookyMurmurHash folder. Spooky Hash takes the originalURL.csv as input. This file only contains one column of cleaned original URLs without any column title. Each row of the column contains one cleaned original URL.

The output file is called hash128bit.csv and it contains 6 columns. The cleaned original URL column stores the input value and the rest of the columns are the hash value generated by different hash functions. Column 2-4 are 128 bit, 64 bit, and 32 bit hash values generated by spooky hash. Column 5 and 6 are 64 bit and 128 bit hash values generated by Murmur Hash.

To generate a new hash128bit.csv output file, users need to create a new originalURL.csv which contains the new URLs as the one provided above and replace the original one under the SpookyMurmurHash folder. Open the terminal and call command “g++ -o Hash.o SpookyV2.cpp MurmurHash2.cpp MurmurHash3.cpp Main.cpp” under the spooky-MurmurHash directory. Then call command “./Hash.o” when the last step is finished. A new hash128bit.csv file with hash values for the new input file should be generated.

7.3 Simple Hash

The simple Hash file is called simple_hash.py which takes the origin_surt_url.csv that passed from the previous(parquet) step. This file contains two columns, one is the original URLs, another column is the same URL with domain name being split by slashes, surrounded by braces, and still been placed at the original position in URLs. Another input file it takes is tld-list-basic.txt, which is a list of all top-level domains in the world. The output for this
file is `origin_simplehash.csv` which has two columns, the first column is still the original URL, the second column is the Simple hashed value for URL in the first column.

To generate a new `origin_simplehash.csv` output file, users need to create a new `origin_surt_url.csv` which contains the new URLs like the one provided above and replace the original one in the current folder. Open the terminal and call the command “python simple_hash.py” under the current directory. A new `origin_simplehash.csv` file with hash values for the new input file should be generated.

While if there are new top-level domains being created, in that case, the user can generate a new `tld-list-basic.txt` to replace the original one with the same format in the original folder. Open the terminal and call the command “python simple_hash.py” under the current directory. A new `origin_simplehash.csv` file with hash values for the new input file should be generated.

### 7.4 xxHash

The XXHash file is called `xxhash_parse.py`, which takes the `origin_simpleclean.csv` that passed from the previous(pre-processing) step. This file contains two columns, the first one is the original URL, another is the cleaned URL. The cleaned URL is the original URL without special characters. The output file is named `xxhash3264.csv` which contains three columns. The first column is still the original URL, the second column is the 32 bits XXHash value, and the third column is the 64 bits XXHash value.

To generate a new `xxhash3264.csv` output file, users need to create a new `origin_surt_url.csv` which contains the new URLs like the one provided above and replace the original one in the current folder. Open the terminal and call the command “python xxhash_parse.py” under
current directory. A new xxhash3264.csv file with hash values for the new input file should be generated.

7.5 CityHash

City Hash is called by the same main.cc under the cityHash folder. City Hash takes the originalURL.csv as input which has the same format as the input of Spooky Hash and Murmur Hash which are mentioned above. The output file is called hashValue.csv. This file contains 3 columns. The cleaned original URL column stores the input value. The second column stores the 64 bit Hash values and the third column stores the 32 bit Hash values.

To generate a new hashValue.csv output file, users need to create a new originalURL.csv which contains the new URLs as the one provided above and replace the original one under the cityHash folder. Open the terminal and call command “g++ -o city.o city.cc Main.cc” under the cityHash directory. Then call command “./city.o” when the last step is finished. A new hashValue.csv file with hash values for the new input file should be generated.
Chapter 8

Developer’s Manual

8.1 System Compatibility

Our project supports Windows, macOS, and various Linux distributions (including Ubuntu 16.04, Ubuntu 18.04).
A 64-bit system is required.

8.2 Installation and Setup

1. 64-bit version of Python 3.7 or higher (32-bit will lead to a PEP517 Error during the installation process).

2. Go to GitHub and clone the repository by following the link below

   • https://github.com/GBKKN/EWAS

   • If the link does not work, please contact our project contact person, Ming Cheng at ming98@vt.edu

3. Install requirements by using python -m pip install -r python_requirement.txt
8.2. Installation and Setup

- Window: Command Prompt
- Linux: Terminal
- macOS: Terminal

4. Run hashing

- Spooky Hash & Murmur Hash
  (a) Go to SpookyMurmurHash directory
  (b) Run command:
      ```
      g++ -o Hash.o SpookyV2.cpp MurmurHash2.cpp
      MurmurHash3.cpp Main.cpp
      ```
  (c) `.Hash.o`

- Simple Hash
  (a) Go to SimpleHash directory
  (b) Run command:
      ```
      python simple_hash.py
      ```

- xxHash
  (a) Go to XXHash directory
  (b) Run command:
      ```
      pip install xxhash
      python xxhash_parse.py
      ```

- City Hash
  (a) Go to cityHash directory
  (b) Run command:
      ```
      g++ -o city.o city.cc Main.cc
      ```
(c) ./city.o

5. Benchmark:

- Environment:
  
  (a) Java: jdk-8u251-windows-x64.exe
  
  (b) Apache Zeppelin: zeppelin-0.8.2-bin-all.tgz

- Required Path:
  
  (a) Add “JAVA_HOME”

- Create the required file:
  
  (a) Combine all hash results and original variables to a new parquet file

- Open Zeppelin web server and run script:
  
  (a) Run “/bin/zeppelin.cmd” to start the web server

  (b) Go to “localhost:8080/”

  (c) Run query script
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Lessons Learned

- During the initial phase of implementing the design of our project, we first thought of using a two-way hashing algorithm. However, during the process of searching for information on how to use two-way hashing, we realized that this method does not fit for our project. After that, we went to Dr. Heath and asked him about the idea. He explained to us that this approach is not feasible. Because of the enormous size of the dataset, the result would be too much collision.

- We also tried various one-way hashing algorithms, and we found that lots of these algorithms will make URLs longer instead of shorter.

- We learned how to use spark script in Zeppelin web server. And how to query in a dataframe by using scala. As well as how to use pyarrow and pandas to deal with a database, like converting from parquet to csv or csv to a pandas table.
Chapter 10

Future Works

Since our dataset is comparatively small, we did not consider collision resolution in our implementation, but when it comes to a larger set, the collision might have a huge impact on searching time, and in our project, we only consider the first searching time, if there are collision occurs, we will need to search through the collision data again.

We run 1000 samples once and calculate the total query time. In future work, we recommend to run multiple times and calculate the average. This will result in a more accurate result for the benchmark.
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