Overview

- Many different ways of processing the same query
  - Scan? Sort? Hash? Use an index?
  - All with different performance characteristics
- Best choice depends on the situation
  - Implement all alternatives
  - Let the query optimizer choose at run-time

Table scan

- Scan table $R$ and process the query
  - Selection over $R$
  - Projection of $R$ without duplicate elimination
- I/O’s: $B(R)$
  - Trick for selection: stop early if it is a lookup by key
  - Memory requirement: 2 (double buffering)
  - Not counting the cost of writing the result out
  - Same for any algorithm!
  - Maybe not needed—results may be pipelined directly into another operator

Nested-loop join

- $R \Join S$
  - For each block of $R$, and for each $r$ in the block:
    - For each block of $S$, and for each $s$ in the block:
      - Output $rs$ if $p$ evaluates to true over $r$ and $s$
  - $R$ is called the outer table; $S$ is called the inner table
  - I/O’s: $B(R) + \max(|R|, B(S))$
  - Memory requirement: 4 (double buffering)
  - Improvement: block-based nested-loop join
    - For each block of $R$, and for each block of $S$:
      - For each $r$ in the $R$ block, and for each $s$ in the $S$ block:
      - I/O’s: $B(R) + B(R) \cdot B(S)$
      - Memory requirement: same as before
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Announcements

- Reading assignment for this week
  - “Query Evaluation Techniques for Large Databases,” by Graefe. ACM Computing Surveys, 1993
  - “Improved Query Performance with Variant Indexes,” by O’Neil and Quass. SIGMOD, 1997 (in red book)
- Recitation session this Friday (March 21)
  - Graded midterms and sample solution
  - Midterm common problems
- Homework #3 will be assigned next Monday (March 24)

Notation

- Relations: $R$, $S$
- Tuples: $r$, $s$
- Number of tuples: $|R|$, $|S|$
- Number of disk blocks: $B(R)$, $B(S)$
- Number of memory blocks available: $M$
- Cost metric
  - Number of I/O’s
  - Memory requirement
More improvements of nested-loop join

- Stop early
  - If the key of the inner table is being matched
  - May reduce half of the I/O's (less for block-based)
- Make use of available memory
  - Stuff memory with as much of R as possible, stream S by, and join every S tuple with all R tuples in memory
  - I/Os: \( B(R) + \lceil B(R) / (M - 2) \rceil \cdot B(S) \)
    - Or, roughly: \( B(R) \cdot B(S) / M \)
  - Memory requirement: \( M \) (as much as possible)

External merge sort

Problem: sort \( R \), but \( R \) does not fit in memory

- Pass 0: read \( M \) blocks of \( R \) at a time, sort them, and write out a level-0 run
  - There are \( \lceil B(R) / M \rceil \) level-0 sorted runs
- Pass \( i \): merge \( (M - 1) \) level-(\( i-1 \)) runs at a time, and write out a level-\( i \) run
  - \( (M - 1) \) memory blocks for input, 1 to buffer output
  - # of level-\( i \) runs = \( \lceil \# \text{ of level-(} i-1 \rceil \text{ runs} / (M - 1) \rceil \)
- Final pass produces 1 sorted run

Example of external merge sort

- Input: 1, 7, 4, 5, 2, 8, 9, 6, 3, 0
- Each block holds one number, and memory has 3 blocks
- Pass 0
  - 1, 7, 4 \( \rightarrow \) 1, 4, 7
  - 5, 2, 8 \( \rightarrow \) 2, 5, 8
  - 9, 6, 3 \( \rightarrow \) 3, 6, 9
  - 0 \( \rightarrow \) 0
- Pass 1
  - 1, 4, 7 + 2, 5, 8 \( \rightarrow \) 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8
  - 3, 6, 9 + 0 \( \rightarrow \) 0, 3, 6, 9
- Pass 2 (final)
  - 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8 + 0, 3, 6, 9 \( \rightarrow \) 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9

Performance of external merge sort

- Number of passes: \( \lceil \log_{M-1} \lceil B(R) / M \rceil \rceil + 1 \)
- I/O’s
  - Multiply by 2 \( \cdot B(R) \): each pass reads the entire relation once and writes it once
  - Subtract \( B(R) \) for the final pass
  - Roughly, this is \( O(B(R) \cdot \log_M B(R)) \)
- Memory requirement: \( M \) (as much as possible)

Some tricks for sorting

- Double buffering
  - Allocate an additional block for each run
  - Trade-off: smaller fan-in (more passes)
- Blocked I/O
  - Instead of reading/writing one disk block at time, read/write a bunch ("cluster")
  - Trade-off: more sequential I/O’s \( \leftrightarrow \) smaller fan-in (more passes)

Internal sort algorithm

- Quicksort
  - Fast
- Replacement selection
  - One block for input, one for output, rest for a heap
  - Fill the heap with input records
  - Find the smallest record in the heap that is no less than the largest record in the current run
    - If that exists, move it to the output buffer, and move a new record from input buffer into the heap
    - If that does not exist, flush output and start a new run
  - Slower than quicksort, but produces longer runs (twice the size of memory if records are in random order)
Sort-merge join

- $R \bowtie_{R.A = S.B} S$
- Sort $R$ and $S$ by their join attributes, and then merge
  - $r, s =$ the first tuples in sorted $R$ and $S$
  - Repeat until one of $R$ and $S$ is exhausted:
    - If $r.A > s.B$ then $s =$ next tuple in $S$
    - else if $r.A < s.B$ then $r =$ next tuple in $R$
    - else output all matching tuples, and $r, s =$ next in $R$ and $S$
- I/O’s: sorting $+ 2 B(R) + 2 B(S)$
  - In most cases (e.g., join of key and foreign key)
  - Worst case is $B(R) \cdot B(S)$: everything joins

Example

$R: \quad S: \quad R \bowtie_{R.A = S.B} S:$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$r_1.A$</th>
<th>$s_1.B$</th>
<th>$r_1.S$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_2.A$</td>
<td>$s_2.B$</td>
<td>$r_2.S$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_5.A$</td>
<td>$s_5.B$</td>
<td>$r_5.S$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_6.A$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_7.A$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optimization of SMJ

- Idea: combine join with the merge phase of merge sort
- Sort: produce sorted runs of size $M$ for $R$ and $S$
- Merge and join: merge the runs of $R$, merge the runs of $S$, and merge-join the result streams as they are generated!

Performance of two-pass SMJ

- I/O’s: $3 \cdot (B(R) + B(S))$
- Memory requirement
  - To be able to merge in one pass, we should have enough memory to accommodate one block from each run: $M > B(R) / M + B(S) / M$
  - $M > \sqrt{B(R) + B(S)}$

Other sort-based algorithms

- Union (set), difference, intersection
  - More or less like SMJ
- Duplication elimination
  - External merge sort
    - Eliminate duplicates in sort and merge
- GROUP BY and aggregation
  - External merge sort
    - Produce partial aggregate values in each run
    - Combine partial aggregate values during merge
    - Partial aggregate values don’t always work though
      - Examples: $\text{SUM(DISTINCT ...)}$, $\text{MEDIAN(...)}$

Hash join

- $R \bowtie_{R.A = S.B} S$
- Main idea
  - Partition $R$ and $S$ by hashing their join attributes, and then consider corresponding partitions of $R$ and $S$
  - If $r.A$ and $s.B$ get hashed to different partitions, they don’t join
Partitioning phase

- Partition R and S according to the same hash function on their join attributes

Probing phase

- Read in each partition of R, stream in the corresponding partition of S, join
  - Typically build a hash table for the partition of R
  - Not the same hash function used for partition, of course!

Performance of hash join

- I/O's: 3 \cdot (B(R) + B(S))
- Memory requirement:
  - In the probing phase, we should have enough memory to fit one partition of R: \( M - 1 \geq B(R) / (M - 1) \)
  - \( M > \sqrt{B(R)} \)
  - We can always pick R to be the smaller relation, so:
    \( M > \sqrt{\min(B(R), B(S))} \)

Hash join tricks

- What if a partition is too large for memory?
  - Read it back in and partition it further!
  - See the duality in multi-pass merge sort here?

Hybrid hash join

- What if there is extra memory available?
  - Use it to avoid writing/re-reading partitions
    - Of both R and S!

- A generalization of the idea is described in the survey paper by Graefe

Hash join versus SMJ

(assuming two-pass)

- I/O's: same
- Memory requirement: hash join is lower
  - \( \sqrt{\min(B(R), B(S))} < \sqrt{B(R) + B(S)} \)
  - Hash join wins big when two relations have very different sizes
- Other factors
  - Hash join performance depends on the quality of the hash
    - Might not get evenly sized buckets
  - SMJ can be adapted for inequality join predicates
  - SMJ wins if R and/or S are already sorted
  - SMJ wins if the result needs to be in sorted order
What about nested-loop join?

- May be best if many tuples join
  - Example: non-equality joins that are not very selective

- Necessary for black-box predicates
  - Example: \( \text{WHERE } \text{user\_defined\_pred}(R.A, S.B) \)

Other hash-based algorithms

- Union (set), difference, intersection
  - More or less like hash join

- Duplicate elimination
  - Check for duplicates within each partition/bucket

- \text{GROUP BY} and aggregation
  - Apply the hash functions to \text{GROUP BY} attributes
  - Tuples in the same group must end up in the same partition/bucket
  - Keep a running aggregate value for each group

Duality of sort and hash

- Divide-and-conquer paradigm
  - Sorting: physical division, logical combination
  - Hashing: logical division, physical combination

- Handling very large inputs
  - Sorting: multi-level merge
  - Hashing: recursive partitioning

- I/O patterns
  - Sorting: sequential write, random read (merge)
  - Hashing: random write, sequential read (partition)