Indexing

CPS 116

Introduction to Database Systems

Announcements (November 8)

- Homework #3 sample solution available
- Project milestone #2 due this Thursday
  - Platform, production dataset, and performance tuning

Basics

- Given a value, locate the record(s) with this value

```
SELECT * FROM R WHERE A = value;
SELECT * FROM R, S WHERE R.A = S.B;
```

- Other search criteria, e.g.
  - Range search

```
SELECT * FROM R WHERE A > value;
```

  - Keyword search

database indexing | Search

Dense and sparse indexes

- Dense: one index entry for each search key value
- Sparse: one index entry for each block
  - Records must be clustered according to the search key



Dense versus sparse indexes

- Index size
  - Sparse index is smaller
- Requirement on records
  - Records must be clustered for sparse index
- Lookup
  - Sparse index is smaller and may fit in memory
  - Dense index can directly tell if a record exists
- Update
  - Easier for sparse index

Primary and secondary indexes

- Primary index
  - Created for the primary key of a table
  - Records are usually clustered according to the primary key
  - Can be sparse
- Secondary index
  - Usually dense
- SQL
  - `PRIMARY KEY` declaration automatically creates a primary index, `UNIQUE` key automatically creates a secondary index
  - Additional secondary index can be created on non-key attribute(s) `CREATE INDEX StudentGPAIndex ON Student(GPA);`

ISAM

- What if an index is still too big?
  - Put a another (sparse) index on top of that!
  - ☞ISAM (Index Sequential Access Method), more or less

Example: look up 197



Updates with ISAM

Example: insert 107
Example: delete 129



- Overflow chains and empty data blocks degrade performance
  - Worst case: most records go into one long chain

B^+-tree

- A hierarchy of intervals
- Balanced (more or less): good performance guarantee
- Disk-based: one node per block; large fan-out



Sample B$^+$-tree nodes



B$^+$-tree balancing properties

- Height constraint: all leaves at the same lowest level
- Fan-out constraint: all nodes at least half full (except root)

	Max # pointers	Max # keys	Min # active pointers	Min # keys
Non-leaf	f	$f-1$	$\lceil f/2 \rceil$	$\lceil f/2 \rceil - 1$
Root	f	$f-1$	2	1
Leaf	f	$f-1$	$\lfloor f/2 \rfloor$	$\lfloor f/2 \rfloor$

Lookups


```
SELECT * FROM R WHERE k = 179;
SELECT * FROM R WHERE k = 32;
```



Range query

`SELECT * FROM R WHERE k > 32 AND k < 179;`



Insertion

❖ Insert a record with search key value 32



Another insertion example

❖ Insert a record with search key value 152



Node splitting



More node splitting



- In the worst case, node splitting can "propagate" all the way up to the root of the tree (not illustrated here)
  - Splitting the root introduces a new root of fan-out 2 and causes the tree to grow "up" by one level

Deletion

- Delete a record with search key value 130



Stealing from a sibling



Another deletion example

❖ Delete a record with search key value 179



Cannot steal from siblings
Then coalesce (merge) with a sibling!

Coalescing



- Deletion can "propagate" all the way up to the root of the tree (not illustrated here)
  - When the root becomes empty, the tree "shrinks" by one level

Performance analysis

- How many I/O's are required for each operation?
  - h, the height of the tree (more or less)
  - Plus one or two to manipulate actual records
  - Plus $O(h)$ for reorganization (should be very rare if f is large)
  - Minus one if we cache the root in memory
- How big is h?
  - Roughly $\log_{\text{fan-out}} N$, where N is the number of records
  - B^+-tree properties guarantee that fan-out is least $f / 2$ for all non-root nodes
  - Fan-out is typically large (in hundreds)—many keys and pointers can fit into one block
  - A 4-level B^+-tree is enough for typical tables

B^+-tree in practice

- Complex reorganization for deletion often is not implemented (e.g., Oracle, Informix)
  - Leave nodes less than half full and periodically reorganize
- Most commercial DBMS use B^+-tree instead of hashing-based indexes because B^+-tree handles range queries

The Halloween Problem

- Story from the early days of System R…

```
UPDATE Payroll
SET salary = salary * 1.1
WHERE salary >= 100000;
```

  - There is a B^+-tree index on *Payroll*(*salary*)
  - The update never stopped (why?)
- Solutions?

B^+-tree versus ISAM

B^+-tree versus B-tree

- B-tree: why not store records (or record pointers) in non-leaf nodes?
  - These records can be accessed with fewer I/O's
- Problems?

Beyond ISAM, B-, and B^+-trees

- Other tree-based indexs: R-trees and variants, GiST, etc.
- Hashing-based indexes: extensible hashing, linear hashing, etc.
- Text indexes: inverted-list index, suffix arrays, etc.
- Other tricks: bitmap index, bit-sliced index, etc.