Carnegie Mellon Univ.
Dept. of Computer Science
15-415/615 - DB Applications

C. Faloutsos – A. Pavlo

Lecture#14: Implementation of Relational Operations

Cost-based Query Sub-System



Last Class

- **Sorting:**
  - External Merge Sort
- **Projection:**
  - External Merge Sort
  - Two-Phase Hashing

These are for when the data is larger than the amount of memory available.

Query Processing

- Some database operations are **expensive**.
- The DBMS can greatly improve performance by being “smart”
  - e.g., can speed up 1,000,000x over naïve approach

Query Processing

- There are clever implementation techniques for operators.
- We can exploit "equivalencies" of relational operators to do less work.
- Use statistics and cost models to choose among these.

Work smarter, not harder.

Today's Class

- Introduction
- Selection
- Joins
- Explain

Sample Database

SAILORS

sid	sname	rating	age
1	Trump	999	45.0
3	Obama	50	52.0
2	Tupac	32	26.0
6	Bieber	10	19.0

RESERVES

sid	bid	day	rname
6	103	2014-02-01	matlock
1	102	2014-02-02	macgyver
2	101	2014-02-02	a-team
1	101	2014-02-01	dallas

Sailors(*sid*: int, *sname*: varchar, *rating*: int, *age*: real)
Reserves(*sid*: int, *bid*: int, *day*: date, *rname*: varchar)

Sample Database

SAILORS

sid	sname	rating	age
1	Trump	999	45.0
3	Obama	50	52.0
2	Tupac	32	26.0
6	Bieber	10	19.0

Each tuple is 50 bytes
80 tuples per page
500 pages total
N=500, p_S=80

RESERVES

sid	bid	day	rname
6	103	2014-02-01	matlock
1	102	2014-02-02	macgyver
2	101	2014-02-02	a-team
1	101	2014-02-01	dallas

Each tuple is 40 bytes
100 tuples per page
1000 pages total
M=1000, p_R=100

CMU SCS

Single-Table Selection

```
SELECT *
  FROM Reserves AS R
 WHERE R.rname < 'C%'
```

$\sigma_{rname<'C\%'}$ (Reserves)



CMU SCS

Single-Table Selection

```
SELECT *
  FROM Reserves AS R
 WHERE R.rname < 'C%'
```

- **What's the best way to execute this query?**
- A: It depends on…
  - What **indexes** and **access paths** are available.
  - What is the **expected size** of the result (in terms of number of tuples and/or number of pages)

CMU SCS

Access Paths

- How the DBMS retrieves tuples from a table for a query plan.
  - **File Scan** (aka Sequential Scan)
  - **Index Scan** (Tree, Hash, List, …)
- Selectivity of an access path:
  - % of pages we retrieve
  - e.g., Selectivity of a hash index, on range query: 100% (no reduction!)

CMU SCS

Simple Selections

- Size of result approximated as:
  - *(size of R) · (selectivity)*
- Selectivity is also called **Reduction Factor**.
- The estimate of reduction factors is based on statistics – we will discuss shortly.

CMU SCS

Selection Options

- No Index, Unsorted Data
- No Index, Sorted Data
- B+Tree Index
- Hash Index, Equality Selection

CMU SCS

Selection: No Index, Unsorted Data

```
SELECT *
  FROM Reserves AS R
 WHERE R.rname < 'C%'
```

- Must scan the whole relation.
  - *Cost: M*
- For "Reserves" = 1000 I/Os.

CMU SCS

Selection: No Index, Sorted Data

```
SELECT *
  FROM Reserves AS R
 WHERE R.rname < 'C%'
```

- Cost of binary search + number of pages containing results.
  - *Cost:* $log_2 M + \lceil selectivity \cdot \#pages \rceil$

CMU SCS

Selection: B+Tree Index

```
SELECT *
  FROM Reserves AS R
 WHERE R.rname < 'C%'
```

- With an index on selection attribute:
  - Use index to find qualifying data entries, then retrieve corresponding data records.
- *Note: Hash indexes are only useful for equality selections.*

CMU SCS

Selection: B+Tree Index

- Cost depends on #qualifying tuples, and clustering.
  - Finding qualifying data entries (typically small)
  - Plus cost of retrieving records (could be large w/o clustering).

CMU SCS

B+Tree Indexes



CMU SCS

B+Tree Indexes



CMU SCS

Selection: B+Tree Index

```
SELECT *
  FROM Reserves AS R
 WHERE R.rname < 'C%'
```

- In example "Reserves" relation, if 10% of tuples qualify (100 pages, 10,000 tuples):
  - With a **clustered** index, cost is little more than 100 I/Os;
  - If **unclustered**, could be up to 10,000 I/Os! unless…

Selection: B+Tree Index

- Refinement for unclustered indexes:
  - Find qualifying data records by their ***rid***.
  - Sort ***rid***'s of the data records to be retrieved.
  - Fetch ***rids*** in order. This ensures that each data page is looked at just once (though # of such pages likely to be higher than with clustering).

Partial Indexes

- Create an index on a ***subset*** of the entire table. This potentially reduces its size and the amount of overhead to maintain it.

```
CREATE INDEX idx_foo
          ON foo (a, b)
       WHERE c = 'WuTang'
```

```
SELECT b FROM foo
 WHERE a = 123 AND c = 'WuTang'
```

Covering Indexes

- If all of the fields needed to process the query are available in an index, then the DBMS does not need to retrieve the tuple.

```
CREATE INDEX idx_foo
          ON foo (a, b)
```

```
SELECT b FROM foo WHERE a = 123
```

Index Include Columns

- Embed additional columns in indexes to support index-only queries.
- Not part of the search key.

```
CREATE INDEX idx_foo
          ON foo (a, b)
     INCLUDE (c)
```

```
SELECT b FROM foo
 WHERE a = 123 AND c = 'WuTang'
```

Selection Conditions

- A B-tree index matches terms that involve only attributes in a prefix of the search key.
  - Index on `<a,b,c>` matches `(a=5 AND b=3)`, but not `(b=3)`.
- For Hash index, we must have **all** attributes in search key.

B+Tree Prefix Search

Key = xy
Key = _y



Two Approaches to Selection

- **Approach #1:** Find the cheapest access path, retrieve tuples using it, and apply any remaining terms that don't match the index
- **Approach #2:** Use multiple indexes to find the intersection of matching tuples.

Approach #1

- Find the cheapest access path, retrieve tuples using it, and apply any remaining terms that don't match the index:
  - Cheapest access path: An index or file scan with fewest I/Os.
  - Terms that match this index reduce the number of tuples retrieved; other terms help discard some retrieved tuples, but do not affect number of tuples/pages fetched.

Approach #1 – Example

```
(day<'10/13/2015' AND bid=5 AND sid=3)
```

- A B+ tree index on **day** can be used;
  - then, **bid=5** and **sid=3** must be checked for each retrieved tuple.
- Similarly, a hash index on **<bid,sid>** could be used;
  - Then, **day<'10/13/2015'** must be checked.

Approach #1 – Example

```
(day<'10/13/2015' AND bid=5 AND sid=3)
```

- How about a B+tree on **<rname,day>**?
- How about a B+tree on **<day,rname>**?
- How about a Hash index on **<day,rname>**?

What if we have multiple indexes?

Approach #2

- Get ***rids*** from first index; ***rids*** from second index; intersect and fetch.
- If we have 2 or more matching indexes:
  - Get sets of ***rids*** of data records using each matching index.
  - Then intersect these sets of ***rids***.
  - Retrieve the records and apply any remaining terms.

Approach #2 – Example

```
(day<'10/13/2015' AND bid=5 AND sid=3)
```

- With an index on **day** and an index on **sid**,
  - We can retrieve ***rids*** of records satisfying **day<'10/13/2015'** using the first,
  - ***rids*** of recs satisfying **sid=3** using the second,
  - intersect,
  - retrieve records and check **bid=5**.

CMU SCS

Approach #2 – Example



CMU SCS

Summary

almost!

- For selections, we always want an index.
  - B+Trees are more versatile.
  - Hash indexes are faster, but only support equality predicates.
- Last resort is to just scan entire table.

CMU SCS

Today's Class

- Introduction
- Selection
- Joins
- Explain

CMU SCS

Joins

- **R⋈S** is very common and thus must be carefully optimized.
- **R×S** followed by a selection is inefficient because cross-product is large.
- There are many approaches to reduce join cost, but no one works best for all cases.
- Remember, join is associative and commutative.

CMU SCS

Joins

- Join techniques we will cover:
  - Nested Loop Joins
  - Index Nested Loop Joins
  - Sort-Merge Joins
  - Hash Joins

CMU SCS

Joins

- Assume:
  - ***M*** pages in R, ***pR*** tuples per page, ***m*** tuples total
  - ***N*** pages in S, ***pS*** tuples per page, ***n*** tuples total
  - In our examples, R is Reserves and S is Sailors.
- We will consider more complex join conditions later.
- ***Cost metric: # of I/Os***

We will ignore output costs

CMU SCS

First Example

```
SELECT *
  FROM Reserves R, Sailors S
 WHERE R.sid = S.sid
```

- Assume that we don't know anything about the tables and we don't have any indexes.

CMU SCS

Simple Nested Loop Join

- **Algorithm #0:** Simple Nested Loop Join

```
foreach tuple r of R
  foreach tuple s of S
    output, if they match
```

R(A,..)



S(A, ...)

Simple Nested Loop Join

- **Algorithm #0:** Simple Nested Loop Join

```
foreach tuple r of R
  foreach tuple s of S
    output, if they match
```

outer relation

inner relation

Simple Nested Loop Join

- **Algorithm #0:** Why is it bad?
- How many disk accesses (‘M’ and ‘N’ are the number of blocks for ‘R’ and ‘S’)?
  - *Cost:* $M + (pR \cdot M) \cdot N$

Simple Nested Loop Join

- Actual number:
  - $M + (pR \cdot M) \cdot N$ = 1000 + 100 · 1000 · 500 = 50,001,000 I/Os
  - At 10ms/IO, Total time ≈ **5.7 days**

Simple Nested Loop Join

- Actual number:
  - $M + (pR \cdot M) \cdot N$ = 1000 + 1... = 50,001,0...
  - At 10ms/IO, Total time ≈ **5.7 days**

SSD ≈ 1.3 hours at 0.1ms/IO

Simple Nested Loop Join

- Actual number:
  - $M + (pR \cdot M) \cdot N$ = 1000 + 1
    = 50,001,0
  - At 10ms/IO, Total time ≈ **5.7 days**

SSD ≈ 1.3 hours
at 0.1ms/IO

- What if smaller relation (S) was outer?
- What assumptions are being made here?

Simple Nested Loop Join

- Actual number:
  - $M + (pR \cdot M) \cdot N$ = 1000 + 1
    = 50,001,0
  - At 10ms/IO, Total time ≈ **5.7 days**

SSD ≈ 1.3 hours
at 0.1ms/IO

- What if smaller relation (S) was outer?
  - *Slightly better…*
- What assumptions are being made here?
  - *1 buffer for each table (and 1 for output)*

Block Nested Loop Join

- **Algorithm #1:** Block Nested Loop Join

```
read block from R
  read block from S
    output, if tuples match
```

Block Nested Loop Join

- **Algorithm #1:** Things are better.
- How many disk accesses (‘*M*’ and ‘*N*’ are the number of blocks for ‘*R*’ and ‘*S*’)?
  - *Cost: $M + (M \cdot N)$*

Block Nested Loop Join

- Actual number:
  - $M + (M \cdot N)$ = 1000 + 1000 · ...
  - At 10ms/IO, Total time ≈ **1.4 hours**

SSD ≈ **50 seconds** at 0.1ms/IO

- What if we use the smaller one as the outer relation?
  - The smallest in terms of # of pages.

Block Nested Loop Join

- Actual number:
  - $N + (M \cdot N)$ = 500 + 1000 · 500 = 500,500 I/Os
  - At 10ms/IO, Total time ≈ **1.4 hours**

- What if we have ***B*** buffers available?

Block Nested Loop Join

- **Algorithm #1:** Using multiple buffers.

```
read B-2 blocks from R
  read block from S
    output, if tuples match
```

Block Nested Loop Join

- **Algorithm #1:** Using multiple buffers.
- How many disk accesses (‘***M***’ and ‘***N***’ are the number of blocks for ‘***R***’ and ‘***S***’)?
  - *Cost:* $M + (\lceil M/(B-2) \rceil \cdot N)$

Block Nested Loop Join

- **Algorithm #1:** Using multiple buffers.
- But if the outer relation fits in memory:
  - *Cost: $M+N$*

Block Nested Loop Join

- Actual number:
  - $M + N = 1000 + 500 = 1500$
  - At 10ms/IO, Total time ≈ **15 seconds**

SSD ≈ 0.15 seconds at 0.1ms/IO

Joins

- Join techniques we will cover:
  - Nested Loop Joins
  - Index Nested Loop Joins
  - Sort-Merge Joins
  - Hash Joins

Index Nested Loop

- Why do basic nested loop joins suck?
  - *For each tuple in the outer table, we have to do a sequential scan to check for a match in the inner table.*
- A better approach is to use an **index** to find inner table matches.
  - We could use an existing index, or even build one on the fly.

Index Nested Loop Join

- **Algorithm #2:** Index Nested Loop Join

```
foreach tuple r of R
  foreach tuple s of S, where ri==sj
    output
```

Index Probe

Index Nested Loop Join

- **Algorithm #2:** Index Nested Loop Join
- How many disk accesses ('*M*' and '*N*' are the number of blocks for '*R*' and '*S*')?
  - *Cost:* $M + m \cdot C$

Look-up Cost

Nested Loop Joins Guideline

- Pick the smallest table as the outer relation
  - *i.e., the one with the fewest pages*
- Put as much of it in memory as possible
- Loop over the inner

Joins

- Join techniques we will cover:
  - Nested Loop Joins
  - Index Nested Loop Joins
  - Sort-Merge Joins
  - Hash Joins

Sort-Merge Join

- First sort both tables on joining attribute.
- Then step through each one in lock-step to find matches.

Sort-Merge Join

- This algorithm is useful if:
  - One or both tables are already sorted on join attribute(s)
  - Output is required to be sorted on join attributes
- The "Merge" phase can require some back tracking if duplicate values appear in join column.

Sort-Merge Join

- **Algorithm #3:** Sort-Merge Join
- How many disk accesses ('*M*' and '*N*' are the number of blocks for '*R*' and '*S*')?
  - *Cost:* $(2M \cdot \log M/\log B) + (2N \cdot \log N/\log B) + M + N$

Sort-Merge Join

- **Algorithm #3:** Sort-Merge Join
- How many disk accesses ('*M*' and '*N*' are the number of blocks for '*R*' and '*S*')?
  - *Cost:* $(2M \cdot \log M/\log B) + (2N \cdot \log N/\log B) + M + N$

Sort Cost
Sort Cost
Merge Cost



Sort-Merge Join Example

```
SELECT *
  FROM Reserves R, Sailors S
 WHERE R.sid = S.sid
```

sid	sname	rating	age
1	Trump	999	45.0
3	Obama	50	52.0
2	Tupac	32	26.0
6	Bieber	10	19.0

sid	bid	day	rname
6	103	2014-02-01	matlock
1	102	2014-02-02	macgyver
2	101	2014-02-02	a-team
1	101	2014-02-01	dallas

Sort! ***Sort!***

Sort-Merge Join Example

```
SELECT *
  FROM Reserves R, Sailors S
 WHERE R.sid = S.sid
```

sid	sname	rating	age
1	Trump	999	45.0
2	Tupac	32	26.0
3	Obama	50	52.0
6	Bieber	10	19.0

sid	bid	day	rname
1	102	2014-02-02	macgyver ✓
1	101	2014-02-01	dallas ✓
2	101	2014-02-02	a-team ✓
6	103	2014-02-01	matlock ✓

Merge! ***Merge!***

Sort-Merge Join Example

- With 100 buffer pages, both Reserves and Sailors can be sorted in 2 passes:
  - ***Cost: 7,500 I/Os***
  - At 10ms/IO, Total time ≈ **75 seconds**
- Block Nested Loop:
  - ***Cost: 2,500 to 15,000 I/Os***

Sort-Merge Join Example

- With 100 buffer pages, both Reserves and Sailors can be sorted in 2 passes:
  - ***Cost: 7,500 I/Os***
  - At 10ms/IO, Total time ≈ **75 seconds**
- Block Nested Loop:
  - ***Cost: 2,500 to 15,000 I/Os***

SSD ≈ 0.75 seconds at 0.1ms/IO

CMU SCS

Sort-Merge Join

- Worst case for merging phase?
  - When all of the tuples in both relations contain the same value in the join attribute.
  - *Cost: (M · N) + (sort cost)*
- Don't worry kids! This is unlikely!

CMU SCS

Sort-Merge Join Optimizations

- All the refinements from external sorting
- Plus overlapping of the merging of sorting with the merging of joining.
- Multi-threaded optimizations.

CMU SCS

Joins

- Join techniques we will cover:
  - Nested Loop Joins
  - Index Nested Loop Joins
  - Sort-Merge Joins
  - Hash Joins

CMU SCS

In-Memory Hash Join

- **Algorithm #4:** In-Memory

This assumes H fits in memory!

```
build hash table H for R
foreach tuple s of S
  output, if h(sj)∈ H
```

Hash Probe



Grace Hash Join

- Hash join when tables don't fit in memory.
  - **Partition Phase:** Hash both tables on the join attribute into partitions.
  - **Probing Phase:** Compares tuples in corresponding partitions for each table.
- Named after the GRACE database machine.

Grace Hash Join

- Hash R into (0, 1, ..., 'max') buckets
- Hash S into buckets (same hash function)



Grace Hash Join

- Join each pair of matching buckets:
  - Build another hash table for $H_{S(i)}$, and probe it with each tuple of $H_{R(i)}$



Grace Hash Join

- Choose the (page-wise) smallest - if it fits in memory, do a **nested loop join**
  - Build a hash table (with H_2 != H)
  - And then probe it for each tuple of the other

Grace Hash Join

- What if $H_{S(i)}$ is too large to fit in memory?
  - Recursive Partitioning!
  - More details (overflows, hybrid hash joins) available in textbook (Ch 14.4.3)

Grace Hash Join

- Cost of hash join?
  - Assume that we have enough buffers.
  - ***Cost: 3(M + N)***
- **Partitioning Phase:** read+write both tables
  - ***2(M+N) I/Os***
- **Probing Phase:** read both tables
  - ***M+N I/Os***

Grace Hash Join

- Actual number:
  - ***3(M + N)*** = 3 • (1000 + 500)
  - At 10ms/IO, Total time ≈ **45 seconds**

SSD ≈ 0.45 seconds at 0.1ms/IO

Sort-Merge Join vs. Hash Join

- Given a minimum amount of memory both have a cost of ***3(M+N) I/Os***.
- When do we want to choose one over the other?

Sort-Merge Join vs. Hash Join

- **Sort-Merge:**
  - Less sensitive to data skew.
  - Result is sorted (may help upstream operators).
  - Goes faster if one or both inputs already sorted.
- **Hash:**
  - Superior if relation sizes differ greatly.
  - Shown to be highly parallelizable.

Today's Class

- Introduction
- Selection
- Joins
- Explain

EXPLAIN

- When you precede a **SELECT** statement with the keyword **EXPLAIN**, the DBMS displays information from the optimizer about the statement execution plan.
- The system "explains" how it would process the query, including how tables are joined and in which order.

EXPLAIN

```
SELECT bid, COUNT(*) AS cnt
  FROM Reserves
 GROUP BY bid
 ORDER BY cnt
```

Pseudo Query Plan:



EXPLAIN

```
EXPLAIN SELECT bid, COUNT(*) AS cnt
  FROM Reserves
 GROUP BY bid
 ORDER BY cnt
```

```
15-415=# EXPLAIN SELECT bid, COUNT(*) AS cnt FROM reserves GROUP BY bid ORDER BY cnt;
                                QUERY PLAN
-----------------------------------------------------------------------
 Sort  (cost=48.74..49.24 rows=200 width=4)
   Sort Key: (count(*))
   ->  HashAggregate  (cost=39.10..41.10 rows=200 width=4)
         ->  Seq Scan on reserves  (cost=0.00..29.40 rows=1940 width=4)
(4 rows)
```

Postgres v9.1

EXPLAIN

```
EXPLAIN SELECT bid, COUNT(*) AS cnt
  FROM Reserves
 GROUP BY bid
 ORDER BY cnt
```

```
mysql> EXPLAIN SELECT bid, COUNT(*) AS cnt FROM reserves GROUP BY bid ORDER BY cnt;
+----+-------------+----------+-------+---------------+------+---------+------+------+----------------------------------------------+
| id | select_type | table    | type  | possible_keys | key  | key_len | ref  | rows | Extra                                        |
+----+-------------+----------+-------+---------------+------+---------+------+------+----------------------------------------------+
|  1 | SIMPLE      | reserves | index | NULL          | bid  | 4       | NULL |   10 | Using index; Using temporary; Using filesort |
+----+-------------+----------+-------+---------------+------+---------+------+------+----------------------------------------------+
1 row in set (0.00 sec)
```

MySQL v5.5

EXPLAIN ANALYZE

- **ANALYZE** option causes the statement to be actually executed.
- The actual runtime statistics are displayed.
- This is useful for seeing whether the planner's estimates are close to reality.
- Note that **ANALYZE** is a Postgres idiom.

EXPLAIN ANALYZE

```
EXPLAIN ANALYZE
SELECT bid, COUNT(*) AS cnt
  FROM Reserves
 GROUP BY bid
 ORDER BY cnt
```

```
15-415=# EXPLAIN ANALYZE SELECT bid, COUNT(*) AS cnt FROM reserves GROUP BY bid ORDER BY cnt;
                                QUERY PLAN
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 Sort  (cost=48.74..49.24 rows=200 width=4) (actual time=0.020..0.020 rows=4 loops=1)
   Sort Key: (count(*))
   Sort Method: quicksort  Memory: 25kB
   ->  HashAggregate  (cost=39.10..41.10 rows=200 width=4) (actual time=0.013..0.014 rows=4 loops=1)
         ->  Seq Scan on reserves  (cost=0.00..29.40 rows=1940 width=4) (actual time=0.006..0.008 rows=10 loops=1)
 Total runtime: 0.051 ms
(6 rows)
```

Postgres v9.1

EXPLAIN ANALYZE

- Works on any type of query.
- Since **ANALYZE** actually executes a query, if you use it with a query that modifies the table, that modification will be made.

Summary

- There are multiple ways to do selections if you have different indexes.
- Joins are difficult to optimize.
  - Index Nested Loop when selectivity is small.
  - Sort-Merge/Hash when joining whole tables.

Next Class

- Set & Aggregate Operations
- Query Optimizations
- Mid-Term Review