

Query Processing

CPS 116
Introduction to Database Systems

Announcements (November 11) 2

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

Overview 3

- ❖ 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

4

- ❖ 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

5

- ❖ 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

6

- ❖ $R \bowtie_p S$
- ❖ 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 ⁷

- ❖ 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's: $B(R) + \lceil B(R) / (M - 2) \rceil \cdot B(S)$
 - 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 ⁸

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 = $\lceil \# \text{ of level-}(i-1) \text{ runs} / (M - 1) \rceil$
- ❖ Final pass produces 1 sorted run

Example of external merge sort ⁹

- ❖ Input: 1, 7, 4, 5, 2, 8, 3, 6, 9
- ❖ Pass 0
 - 1, 7, 4 \rightarrow 1, 4, 7
 - 5, 2, 8 \rightarrow 2, 5, 8
 - 9, 6, 3 \rightarrow 3, 6, 9
- ❖ Pass 1
 - 1, 4, 7 + 2, 5, 8 \rightarrow 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8
 - 3, 6, 9
- ❖ Pass 2 (final)
 - 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8 + 3, 6, 9 \rightarrow 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9

Performance of external merge sort ¹⁰

- ❖ 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 ¹¹

- ❖ 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 time, read/write a bunch ("cluster")
 - More sequential I/O's
 - Trade-off:

Sort-merge join ¹²

- ❖ $R \bowtie_{R.A = S.B} S$
- ❖ 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


13

$R:$	$S:$	$R \text{ } \mathcal{R} \text{ }_{R.A = S.B} \text{ } S:$
$\Rightarrow r_{1.A} = 1$	$\Rightarrow s_{1.B} = 1$	$r_1 s_1$
$\Rightarrow r_{2.A} = 3$	$\Rightarrow s_{2.B} = 2$	$r_2 s_3$
$r_{3.A} = 3$	$\Rightarrow s_{3.B} = 3$	$r_2 s_4$
$\Rightarrow r_{4.A} = 5$	$s_{4.B} = 3$	$r_3 s_3$
$\Rightarrow r_{5.A} = 7$	$\Rightarrow s_{5.B} = 8$	$r_3 s_4$
$\Rightarrow r_{6.A} = 7$		$r_7 s_5$
$\Rightarrow r_{7.A} = 8$		

Optimization of SMJ

14

- ❖ 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

15

- ❖ 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: $M > B(R) / M + B(S) / M$
 - $M > \text{sqrt}(B(R) + B(S))$

Other sort-based algorithms


16

- ❖ 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

17


- ❖ $R \bowtie_{R.A = S.B} S$
- ❖ 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

18


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



Probing phase

19

- ❖ 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


20

- ❖ 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

21

- ❖ 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

22

(Assuming two-pass)

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

23

Other hash-based algorithms

24

- ❖ 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

25

- ❖ 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

26

- ❖ 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

27

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)

28

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


29

- ❖ $R \bowtie_{R.A = S.B} S$
- ❖ 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

30

- ❖ $R \bowtie_{R.A = S.B} S$
- ❖ 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



Summary of tricks

31

- ❖ Scan
 - Selection, duplicate-preserving projection, nested-loop join
- ❖ Sort
 - External merge sort, sort-merge join, union (set), difference, intersection, duplicate elimination, GROUP BY and aggregation
- ❖ Hash
 - Hash join, union (set), difference, intersection, duplicate elimination, GROUP BY and aggregation
- ❖ Index
 - Selection, index nested-loop join, zig-zag join
