Query Optimization I

CPS 216

Advanced Database Systems

Announcements (April 8)

- Reading assignments for next week
  - Selinger et al. "Access Path Selection in a Relational Database Management System." *SIGMOD* 1979
  - Ioannidis and Kang. "Randomized Algorithms for Optimizing Large Join Queries." *SIGMOD* 1990
- Homework #4 (short) will be assigned next Tuesday and due the following Tuesday
- Final exam in 18 days (Monday, April 26)

A query's trip through the DBMS






```
SELECT title, SID
FROM Enroll, Course
WHERE Enroll.CID =
      Course.CID;
```



Parsing & validation

- Parser: SQL → parse tree
  - Good old lex & yacc
  - Detect and reject syntax errors
- Validator: parse tree → logical plan
  - Detect and reject semantic errors
    - Nonexistent tables/views/columns
    - Type mismatches (e.g., `AVG(name)`, `name + GPA`, `Student UNION Enroll`)
  - Wildcard (`SELECT *`) and view expansion
  - Use information stored in system catalog tables (contains all metadata/schema information)

Logical plan

- A tree whose nodes are logical operators
  - Often a tree of relational algebra operators
  - DB2 uses QGM (Query Graph Model)
- There are many equivalent logical plans



An equivalent plan:




```
SELECT Course.title
FROM Student, Enroll, Course
WHERE Student.name = 'Bart'
AND Student.SID = Enroll.SID
AND Enroll.CID = Course.CID;
```


Query optimization and execution

- Recall that a physical plan tells the DBMS query execution engine how to execute the query
  - One logical plan can have many possible physical plans (with equivalent results, but different costs and assumptions)



- Query optimizer: one logical plan → "best" physical plan
- Query execution engine: physical plan → results

Query optimization

- Conceptually
  - Consider a space of possible plans (next)
  - Estimate costs of plans in the search space (next Tuesday)
  - Search through the space for the "best" plan (next Thursday)
- Often the goal is not picking the absolute optimum, but instead avoiding the horrible ones



Plan enumeration in relational algebra

- Apply relational algebra equivalences
- ☞ Join reordering: $\times$ and $\bowtie$ are associative and commutative (except when column ordering is considered, but that is unimportant)



More relational algebra equivalences

- Convert σ_p-$\times$ to/from $\bowtie_p$: $\sigma_p(R \times S) = R \bowtie_p S$
- Merge/split σ's: $\sigma_{p1}(\sigma_{p2}\ R) = \sigma_{p1 \wedge p2}\ R$
- Merge/split π's: $\pi_{L1}(\pi_{L2}\ R) = \pi_{L1}\ R$, where $L1 \subseteq L2$
- Push down/pull up σ:
  $\sigma_{p \wedge pr \wedge ps}\ (R \times S) = (\sigma_{pr}\ R) \bowtie_p (\sigma_{ps}\ S)$, where
  - pr is a predicate involving only R columns
  - ps is a predicate involving only S columns
  - p is a predicate involving both R and S columns
- Push down π: $\pi_L\ (\sigma_p\ R) = \pi_L\ (\sigma_p\ (\pi_{L\,L'}\ R))$, where
  - L' is the set of columns referenced by p that are not in L
- Many more (seemingly trivial) equivalences…
  - Can be systematically used to transform a plan to new ones

Relational query rewrite example



Heuristics-based query optimization

- Start with a logical plan
- Push selections/projections down as much as possible
  - Why? Reduce the size of intermediate results
  - Why not? May be expensive; maybe joins filter better
- Join smaller relations first, and avoid cross product
  - Why? Reduce the size of intermediate results
  - Why not? Size depends on join selectivity too
- Convert the transformed logical plan to a physical plan (by choosing appropriate physical operators)

SQL query rewrite

- More complicated—subqueries and views divide a query into nested "blocks"
  - Processing each block separately forces particular join methods and join order
  - Even if the plan is optimal for each block, it may not be optimal for the entire query
- Unnest query: convert subqueries/views to joins
- ☞ Then we just deal with select-project-join queries
  - Where the clean rules of relational algebra apply

DB2's QGM

Leung et al. "Query Rewrite Optimization Rules in IBM DB2 Universal Database."

- ❖ Query Graph Model: DB2's logical plan language
  - More high-level than relational algebra
- ❖ A graph of boxes
  - Leaf boxes are tables
  - The standard box is the `SELECT` box (actually a select-project-join query block with optional duplicate elimination)
  - Other types include `GROUPBY` (aggregation), `UNION`, `INTERSECT`, `EXCEPT`
  - Can always add new types (e.g., `OUTERJOIN`)

More on QGM boxes

- ❖ Head: declarative description of the output
  - Schema: list of output columns
  - Property: Are output tuples `DISTINCT`?
- ❖ Body: how to compute the output
  - Quantifiers: tuple variables that range over other boxes
    - F: regular tuple variable, e.g., `FROM` *R* `AS` *r*
    - E: existential quantifier, e.g., `IN` (*subquery*), or `= ANY`(*subquery*)
    - A: universal quantifier, e.g., `> ALL`(*subquery*)
    - S: scalar subquery, e.g., `=` (*subquery*)
  - Quantifiers are connected a hypergraph
    - Hyperedges are predicates
  - Enforce `DISTINCT`, preserve duplicates, or permit duplicates?
    - For the output of this box, and for each quantifier

QGM example




```
SELECT DISTINCT
  q1.partno, q1.descr, q2.suppno
FROM inventory q1, quotations q2
WHERE q1.partno = q2.partno
AND q1.descr = 'engine'
AND q2.price <= ALL
    (SELECT q3.price
     FROM quotations q3
     WHERE q2.partno = q3.partno);
```


Query rewrite in DB2

- ❖ Goal: make the logical plan as general as possible, i.e., merge boxes
- ❖ Rule-based transformations on QGM
  - Merge subqueries in `FROM`
  - Convert E to F (e.g., `IN`/`ANY` subqueries to joins)
  - Convert intersection to join
  - Convert S to F (i.e., scalar subqueries to joins)
  - Convert outerjoin to join
  - Magic (i.e., correlated subqueries to joins)

E to F conversion

- ❖
```
SELECT DISTINCT name
FROM Student
WHERE SID = ANY (SELECT SID FROM Enroll);
```
- ❖
```
SELECT DISTINCT name
FROM Student, (SELECT SID FROM Enroll) t
WHERE Student.SID = t.SID;
```
  (EtoF rule)
- ❖
```
SELECT DISTINCT name
FROM Student, Enroll
WHERE Student.SID = Enroll.SID;
```
  (SELMERGE rule)

Problem with duplicates

Same query, without `DISTINCT`

- ❖
```
SELECT name
FROM Student
WHERE SID = ANY (SELECT SID FROM Enroll);
```
- ❖
```
SELECT name
FROM Student, Enroll
WHERE Student.SID = Enroll.SID;
```
- ❖ Suppose some student takes multiple classes
  - The first query returns name once; the second multiple times
- ❖ Adding `DISTINCT` to the second query does not help
  - Suppose two students have the same name

A way of preserving duplicates

❖
```
SELECT name
FROM Student
WHERE SID = ANY (SELECT SID FROM Enroll);
```

Suppose that `SID` is a key of `Student`

❖
```
SELECT DISTINCT Student.SID, name
FROM Student, Enroll
WHERE Student.SID = Enroll.SID;
```
(ADDKEYS rule)

❖ Then simply project out `Student.SID`

Another E to F trick

❖ Sometimes an `ANY` subquery can be turned into an aggregate subquery without `ANY`, to improve performance further

❖
```
SELECT * FROM Student s1
WHERE GPA > ANY
(SELECT GPA FROM Student s2
 WHERE s2.name = 'Bart');
```

❖
```
SELECT * FROM Student s1
WHERE GPA >
(SELECT MIN(GPA) FROM Student s2
 WHERE s2.name = 'Bart');
```

Does the same trick apply to `ALL`?

❖
```
SELECT * FROM Student s1
WHERE GPA > ALL
(SELECT GPA FROM Student s2
 WHERE s2.name = 'Bart');
```

❖
```
SELECT * FROM Student s1
WHERE GPA >
(SELECT MAX(GPA) FROM Student s2
 WHERE s2.name = 'Bart');
```

❖ Suppose there is no student named Bart
- The first query returns all students; the second returns none

Correlated subqueries

❖
```
SELECT CID FROM Course
WHERE title LIKE 'CPS%'
AND min_enroll >
    (SELECT COUNT(*) FROM Enroll
     WHERE Enroll.CID = Course.CID);
```

❖ Executing correlated subquery is expensive
- The subquery is evaluated once for every CPS course

☞ Decorrelate!

`COUNT` bug

❖
```
SELECT CID FROM Course
WHERE title LIKE 'CPS%'
AND min_enroll > (SELECT COUNT(*) FROM Enroll
                  WHERE Enroll.CID = Course.CID);
```

❖ First compute the enrollment for all(?) courses
```
SELECT CID
FROM Course, (SELECT CID, COUNT(*) AS cnt
              FROM Enroll GROUP BY CID) t
WHERE t.CID = Course.CID AND min_enroll > t.cnt
AND title LIKE 'CPS%';
```

❖ Suppose a CPS class is empty
- The first query returns this course; the second does not

Magic decorrelation

❖ Simple idea
- Process the outer query using other predicates
  - To collect bindings for correlated variables in the subquery
- Evaluate the subquery using the bindings collected
  - It is a join
  - Once for the entire set of bindings
    - Compared to once per binding in the naïve approach
- Use the result of the subquery to refine the outer query
  - Another join

❖ Name "magic" comes from a technique in recursive processing of Datalog queries

Magic decorrelation example

- ```
  SELECT CID FROM Course
  WHERE title LIKE 'CPS%'
  AND min_enroll > (SELECT COUNT(*) FROM Enroll
                    WHERE Enroll.CID = Course.CID);
  ```
- ```
  CREATE VIEW Supp_Course AS
  SELECT * FROM Course WHERE title LIKE 'CPS%';
  ```
  Process the outer query without the subquery
  ```
  CREATE VIEW Magic AS
  SELECT DISTINCT CID FROM Supp_Course;
  ```
  Collect bindings
  ```
  CREATE VIEW DS AS
  (SELECT Enroll.CID, COUNT(*) AS cnt
   FROM Magic, Enroll WHERE Magic.CID = Enroll.CID
   GROUP BY Enroll.CID) UNION
  (SELECT Magic.CID, 0 AS cnt FROM Magic
   WHERE Magic.CID NOT IN (SELECT CID FROM Enroll);
  ```
  Evaluate the subquery with bindings
  ```
  SELECT Supp_Course.CID FROM Supp_Course, DS
  WHERE Supp_Course.CID = DS.CID
  AND min_enroll > DS.cnt;
  ```
  Finally, refine the outer query

Summary of query rewrite

- Break the artificial boundary between queries and subqueries
- Combine as many query blocks as possible in a select-project-join block, where the clean rules of relational algebra apply
- Handle with care—extremely tricky with duplicates, `NULL`'s, empty tables, and correlation