Query Processing

CPS 116
Introduction to Database Systems

Announcements (November 11)

- Project milestone #2 due today!
- Homework #3 sample solution available
- Homework #4 assigned
  - Due in two weeks

Overview

- Many different ways of processing the same query
  - Scan? Sort? Hash? Use an index?
  - All have different performance characteristics and/or make different assumptions about data
- Best choice depends on the situation
  - Implement all alternatives
  - Let the query optimizer choose at run-time
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

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

Nested-loop join
- $R \bowtie S$
- 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:
- Memory requirement:
- 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:
  - Memory requirement: same as before
More improvements of nested-loop join

- Stop early if the key of the inner table is being matched
- 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/O: \( B(R) + \lceil B(R) / (M - 2) \rceil \cdot B(S) \)
  - Or, roughly: \( B(R) \cdot B(S) / M \)
  - Memory requirement: \( M \) (as much as possible)
- Which table would you pick as the outer?

External merge sort

Remember (internal-memory) 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 = \( \lceil \# \ of \ level-(i-1) \ runs / (M - 1) \rceil \)
- Final pass produces 1 sorted run

Example of external merge sort

- Input: 1, 7, 4, 5, 2, 8, 3, 6, 9
- Pass 0
  - 1, 7, 4 → 1, 4, 7
  - 5, 2, 8 → 2, 5, 8
  - 9, 6, 3 → 3, 6, 9
- Pass 1
  - 1, 4, 7 + 2, 5, 8 → 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8
  - 3, 6, 9
- Pass 2 (final)
  - 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8 + 3, 6, 9 → 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9
Performance of external merge sort

- Number of passes: $\lceil \log_{M-1} \left( \frac{B(R)}{M} \right) \rceil + 1$
- 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
  - Overlap I/O with processing
  - Trade-off:
- Blocked I/O
  - Instead of reading/writing one disk block at a time, read/write a bunch (“cluster”)
  - More sequential I/O’s
  - Trade-off:

Sort-merge join

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

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!

![Diagram of disk partitions and memory](image)

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:
    $M > \sqrt{\text{min}(B(R), B(S))}$

Hash join tricks

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

(Assuming two-pass)

- I/O's: same
- Memory requirement: hash join is lower
  - \( \sqrt{\min(B(R), B(S))} < \sqrt{B(R) + B(S)} \)
- 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?

Other hash-based algorithms

- Union (set), difference, intersection
  - More or less like hash join
- Duplicate elimination
  - Check for duplicates within each partition/bucket
- GROUP BY and aggregation
  - Apply the hash functions to 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)

### Selection using index

- **Equality predicate:** $\sigma_A = v(R)$
  - Use an ISAM, B*-tree, or hash index on $R(A)$
- **Range predicate:** $\sigma_A > v(R)$
  - Use an ordered index (e.g., ISAM or B*-tree) on $R(A)$
  - Hash index is not applicable
- **Indexes other than those on $R(A)$ may be useful**
  - Example: B*-tree index on $R(A, B)$
  - How about B*-tree index on $R(B, A)$?

### Index versus table scan

Situations where index clearly wins:

- **Index-only queries which do not require retrieving actual tuples**
  - Example: $\pi_A(\sigma_A > v(R))$
- **Primary index clustered according to search key**
  - One lookup leads to all result tuples in their entirety
Index versus table scan (cont’d)

BUT(!):
- Consider $\sigma_{A > v}(R)$ and a secondary, non-clustered index on $R(A)$
  - Need to follow pointers to get the actual result tuples
  - Say that 20% of $R$ satisfies $A > v$
    - Could happen even for equality predicates
  - I/O’s for index-based selection: lookup + 20% $|R|$
  - I/O’s for scan-based selection: $B(R)$
  - Table scan wins if a block contains more than 5 tuples

Index nested-loop join

- $R \bowtie_{R.A = S.B} S$
  - Idea: use the value of $R.A$ to probe the index on $S(B)$
  - For each block of $R$, and for each $r$ in the block:
    - Use the index on $S(B)$ to retrieve $s$ with $s.B = r.A$
    - Output $rs$
  - I/O’s: $B(R) + |R| \cdot \text{(index lookup)}$
    - Typically, the cost of an index lookup is 2-4 I/O’s
    - Beats other join methods if $|R|$ is not too big
    - Better pick $R$ to be the smaller relation
  - Memory requirement: 2

Zig-zag join using ordered indexes

- $R \bowtie_{R.A = S.B} S$
  - Idea: use the ordering provided by the indexes on $R(A)$ and $S(B)$ to eliminate the sorting step of sort-merge join
  - Trick: use the larger key to probe the other index
    - Possibly skipping many keys that don’t match
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of tricks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Selection, duplicate-preserving projection, nested-loop join</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sort</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- External merge sort, sort-merge join, union (set), difference, intersection, duplicate elimination, GROUP BY and aggregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hash</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hash join, union (set), difference, intersection, duplicate elimination, GROUP BY and aggregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Index</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Selection, index nested-loop join, zig-zag join</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>