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Peer-to-peer systems and applications are distributed systems without any centralized control or hierarchical organization.

The core operation in most peer-to-peer systems is efficient location of data items.

The *Chord protocol* supports just one operation: given a key, it maps the key onto a node.
System Model

Load balance:
- Chord acts as a distributed hash function, spreading keys evenly over the nodes.

Decentralization:
- Chord is fully distributed: no node is more important than any other.

Scalability:
- The cost of a Chord lookup grows as the log of the number of nodes, so even very large systems are feasible.

Availability:
- Chord automatically adjusts its internal tables to reflect newly joined nodes as well as node failures, ensuring that, the node responsible for a key can always be found.

Flexible naming:
- Chord places no constraints on the structure of the keys it looks up.
The application interacts with Chord in two main ways:

- Chord provides a `lookup(key)` algorithm that yields the IP address of the node responsible for the key.
- The Chord software on each node notifies the application of changes in the set of keys that the node is responsible for.
Distributed Storage System Based on Chord

Figure 1: Structure of an example Chord-based distributed storage system.
The Base Chord Protocol

- The Chord protocol specifies how to find the locations of keys.
- It uses consistent hashing, all nodes receive roughly the same number of keys.
- When an $N^{th}$ node joins (or leaves) the network, only an $O(1/N)$ fraction of the keys are moved to a different location.
- Improves the scalability of consistent hashing by avoiding the requirement that every node know about every other node.
- In an $N$-node network, each node maintains information only about $O(\log N)$ other nodes, and a lookup requires $O(\log N)$ messages.
Consistent Hashing

The consistent hash function assigns each node and key an \textit{m-bit identifier} using a base hash function such as SHA-1.

Identifiers are ordered in an \textit{identifier circle} modulo \(2^m\).

Key \(k\) is assigned to the first node whose identifier is equal to or follows \(k\) in the identifier space. This node is called the \textit{successor node} of key \(k\).

If identifiers are represented as a cycle of numbers from 0 to \(2^m - 1\), then \textit{successor}(\(k\)) is the first node clockwise from \(k\).
Figure 2. An identifier circle consisting of the three nodes 0, 1, and 3. In this example, key 1 is located at node 1, key 2 at node 3, and key 6 at node 0.
Consistent Hashing (cont.)

**THEOREM 1.** For any set of $N$ nodes and $K$ keys, with high probability:

1. Each node is responsible for at most $(1+\epsilon)K/N$ keys.

2. When an $(N+1)^{st}$ node joins or leaves the network, responsibility for $O(K/N)$ keys changes hands (and only to or from the joining or leaving node).
Let $m$ be the number of bits in the key/node identifiers.

Each node, $n$, maintains a routing table with (at most) $m$ entries, called the *finger table*.

The $i^{th}$ entry in the table at node $n$ contains the identity of the *first* node, $s$, that succeeds $n$ by at least $2^i - 1$ on the identity circle.
### Scalable key Location (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{finger}[k].\text{start}$</td>
<td>$(n + 2^{k-1}) \mod 2^m$, $1 \leq k \leq m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{interval}$</td>
<td>$[\text{finger}[k].\text{start}, \text{finger}[k+1].\text{start})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{node}$</td>
<td>first node $\geq n.\text{finger}[k].\text{start}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{successor}$</td>
<td>the next node on the identifier circle; $\text{finger}[1].\text{node}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{predecessor}$</td>
<td>the previous node on the identifier circle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1:** Definition of variables for node $n$, using $m$-bit identifiers.
Scalable key Location (cont.)

Figure 4: The pseudo code to find the successor node of an identifier id. Remote procedure calls and variable lookups are preceded by the remote node.

```plaintext
// ask node n to find id's successor
n.find_successor(id)
  n' = find_predecessor(id);
  return n'.successor;

// ask node n to find id's predecessor
n.find_predecessor(id)
  n' = n;
  while (id \not\in (n', n'.successor])
    n' = n'.closest_preceding_finger(id);
  return n';

// return closest finger preceding id
n.closest_preceding_finger(id)
  for i = m downto 1
    if (finger[i].node \in (n, id))
      return finger[i].node;
  return n;
```
Figure 3: (a) The finger intervals associated with node 1. (b) Finger tables and key locations for a net with nodes 0, 1, and 3, and keys 1, 2, and 6.
THEOREM 2. With high probability (or under standard hardness assumption), the number of nodes that must be contacted find a successor in an $N$-node network is $O(\log N)$. 
Each node in Chord maintains a *predecessor pointer*, and can be used work counterclockwise around the identifier circle.

When a node $n$ joins the network:

1. Initialize the predecessor and fingers of node $n$.
2. Update the fingers and predecessors of existing nodes to reflect the addition of $n$.
3. Notify the higher layer software so that it can transfer state (e.g. values) associated with keys that node $n$ is now responsible for.
Node Joins (cont.)

```c
#define successor_finger[1].node

// node n joins the network:
// n' is an arbitrary node in the network
n.join(n')
if (n')
    init_finger_table(n');
    update_others();
    // move keys in (predecessor, n] from successor
else // n is the only node in the network
for i = 1 to m
    finger[i].node = n;
    predecessor = n;

// initialize finger table of local node:
// n' is an arbitrary node already in the network
n.init_finger_table(n')
    finger[1].node = n'.find_successor(finger[1].start);
    predecessor = successor.predecessor;
    successor.predecessor = n;
for i = 1 to m - 1
    if (finger[i+1].start \in [n', finger[i].node])
        finger[i+1].node = finger[i].node;
    else
        finger[i+1].node =
            n'.find_successor(finger[i+1].start);
    // update all nodes whose finger
    // tables should refer to n
    n.update_others()
    for i = 1 to m
        // find last node p whose i-th finger might be n
        p = find_predecessor(n - 2^i - 1);
        p.update_finger_table(n, i);

    // if s is i-th finger of n, update n's finger table with s
    n.update_finger_table(s, i)
    if (s \in [n', finger[i].node])
        finger[i].node = s;
        p = predecessor; // get first node preceding n
        p.update_finger_table(s, i);
```

Figure 6: Pseudo code for the node join operation.
Figure 5: (a) Finger tables and key locations after node 6 joins. (b) Finger table and key locations after node 1 leaves. Changed entries are shown in black, and unchanged in gray.
Concurrent Operations: Stabilization

A basic “stabilization” protocol is used to keep nodes’ successor pointers up to date, which is sufficient to guarantee correctness of lookups.

If joining nodes have affected some region of the Chord ring, a lookup that occurs before stabilization has finished can exhibit one of three behaviors.

- All the finger table entries involved in the lookup are reasonably current, and the lookup finds the correct successor in $O(\log N)$ steps.
- Successor pointers are correct, but fingers are inaccurate.
- The nodes in the affected region have incorrect successor pointers, or keys may not yet have migrated to newly joined nodes, and the lookup may fail.

These cases could be detected and repaired by periodic sampling of the ring topology.
Figure 7: Pseudo code for stabilization.
Failures and Replication

When a node $n$ fails, nodes whose finger tables include $n$ must find $n$’s successor.

Each Chord node maintains a “successor-list” of its $r$ nearest successor on the Chord ring.

**THEOREM 7.** If we use a successor list of length $r = O(\log N)$ in a network that is initially stable, and then every node fails with probability $\frac{1}{2}$, then with high probability find\_successor returns the closest living successor to the query key.

**THEOREM 8.** then expected time to execute find\_successor in the failed network is $O(\log N)$

A node’s $r$ successors all fail with probability $2^{-r} = 1/N$.

A typical application using Chord might store replicas of the data associated with key at the $k$ nodes succeeding the key.
Simulation: Load Balance

Figure 8: (a) The mean and 1st and 99th percentiles of the number of keys stored per node in a $10^4$ node network.
Figure 8: (b) The probability density function (PDF) of the number of keys per node. The total number of keys is $5 \times 10^5$.  

Load Balance (cont.)
Figure 9: The 1\textsuperscript{st} and the 99\textsuperscript{th} percentiles of the number of keys per node as a function of virtual nodes mapped to a real node. The network has $10^4$ real nodes and stores $10^6$ keys.
Figure 10: (a) The path length as a function of network size.
Figure 10: (b) The PDF of the path length in the case of a $2^{12}$ node network.
Simultaneous Node Failures

Figure 11: The fraction of lookups that fail as a function of the fraction of nodes that fail.
Lookups During Stabilization

Figure 12: The fraction of lookups that fail as a function of the rate (over time) at which nodes fail and join. Only failures caused by Chord state inconsistency are included, not failures due to lost keys.
Figure 13: Lookup latency on the Internet prototype, as a function of the total number of nodes. Each of the ten physical sites runs multiple independent copies of the Chord node software.
Chord currently has no specific mechanism to heal partitioned rings; such rings could appear locally consistent to the stabilization procedure.

Instead of placing its fingers at distances that are all powers of 2, Chord could easily be changed to place its fingers at distances that are all integer powers of $1 + 1/d$.
Conclusion

The Chord protocol solves that applications need not to determine the node that stores a data item. Given a key, it determines the node responsible for storing the key’s value, and does so efficiently. In the steady state, in an $N$-node network, each node maintains routing information for only about $O(\log N)$ other nodes, and resolves all lookups via $O(\log N)$ messages to other nodes. Updates to the routing information for nodes leaving and joining require only $O(\log^2 N)$ messages. Chord scales well with the number of nodes, and answers most lookups correctly even during recovery.