Indexing

CPS 116

Introduction to Database Systems

Announcements (November 6)

- Homework #3 due today!
  - Sample solution will be available next Tuesday
- Project milestone #2 due next Tuesday

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

7

- 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



Updates with ISAM

8



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

B$^+$-tree

9

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



Sample B$^+$-tree nodes

10



B$^+$-tree balancing properties

11

- 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

12

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



Range query

13

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



Insertion

14

❖ Insert a record with search key value 32



Another insertion example

15

❖ Insert a record with search key value 152



Node splitting

16



More node splitting

17



❖ 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

18

❖ Delete a record with search key value 130



Stealing from a sibling

19



Another deletion example

20

❖ Delete a record with search key value 179



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

Coalescing

21



❖ 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

22

❖ 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

23

❖ 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

24

❖ 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?
- Scan index in reverse
- Before update, scan index to create a complete "to-do" list
- During update, maintain a "done" list
- Tag every row with transaction/statement id

B^+-tree versus ISAM

25

- ISAM is more static; B^+-tree is more dynamic
- ISAM can be more compact (at least initially)
  - Fewer levels and I/O's than B^+-tree
- Overtime, ISAM may not be balanced
  - Cannot provide guaranteed performance as B^+-tree does

B^+-tree versus B-tree

26

- B-tree: why not store records (or record pointers) in non-leaf nodes?
  - These records can be accessed with fewer I/O's
- Problems?
  - Storing more data in a node decreases fan-out and increases *h*
  - Records in leaves require more I/O's to access
  - Vast majority of the records live in leaves!

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

27

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