Lecture 3

Database Management Systems

Winter 2004

CMPUT 391: Query Processing: The Basics

Dr. Osmar R. Zaïane

University of Alberta

Chapter 13 of Textbook

Based on slides by Lewis, Bernstein and Kifer.

External Sorting

- Sorting is used in implementing many relational operations
- Problem:
  - Relations are typically large, do not fit in main memory
  - So cannot use traditional in-memory sorting algorithms
- Approach used:
  - Combine in-memory sorting with clever techniques aimed at minimizing I/O
  - I/O costs dominate ➔ cost of sorting algorithm is measured in the number of page transfers

External Sorting (cont'd)

- External sorting has two main components:
  - Computation involved in sorting records in buffers in main memory
  - I/O necessary to move records between mass store and main memory

Simple Sort Algorithm

- M = number of main memory page buffers
- F = number of pages in file to be sorted
- Typical algorithm has two phases:
  - **Partial sort phase**: sort M pages at a time; create F/M sorted *runs* on mass store, cost = $2F$ *(read the file and write the file ➔ 2F I/Os)*



Example: $M = 2$, $F = 7$

K-Way Merge Algorithm

– **Merge Phase**: merge all runs into a single run using *M-1* buffers for input and 1 output buffer

• Merge step: divide runs into groups of size *M-1* and merge each group into a run; cost = 2*F*

each step reduces number of runs by a factor of M-1



K-Way Merge Algorithm

- Cost of merge phase:
  - $(F/M)/(M-1)^k$ runs after k merge steps
  - $\lceil \text{Log}_{M-1}(F/M) \rceil$ merge steps needed to merge an initial set of F/M sorted runs

  ➔ Cost = # merge steps * 2F (R & W every page)

  $= 2F\lceil \text{Log}_{M-1}(F/M) \rceil$
- Total cost = cost of partial sort phase + cost of merge phase $2F + 2F\lceil \text{Log}_{M-1}(F/M) \rceil = 2F(1+\lceil \text{Log}_{M-1}(F/M) \rceil)$
- *Simplification in text book (not to use in 391 tests)*

  $cost = \lceil 2F \text{ Log}_{M-1}(F/M) \rceil \approx 2F(\text{Log}_{M-1}F - 1) \approx 2F \text{ Log}_{M-1}F$

Duplicate Elimination

- A major step in computing *projection*, *union*, and *difference* relational operators
- Algorithm:
  - Sort
  - At the last stage of the merge step eliminate duplicates on the fly
  - No additional cost (with respect to sorting) in terms of I/O

Sort-Based Projection

- Algorithm:
  - Sort rows of relation at cost of $2F(1+\lceil \text{Log}_{M-1}(F/M) \rceil)$ eliminate unwanted columns in partial sort phase (no additional cost)
  - Eliminate duplicates on completion of last merge step (no additional cost)
- Cost: the cost of sorting

Quick review …

- At this point many decisions (regarding query processing/optimizations) will be depend on what type of index(es), if any, are available.
- Hence, a quick review is in order … (for details refer to Chapter 11 in the textbook).

B+ Tree

- Supports equality and range searches, multiple attribute keys and partial key searches
- Either a secondary index (in a separate file) or the basis for an integrated storage structure

➢ *Responds to dynamic changes in the table*

B+ Tree Structure



– Leaf level is a (sorted) linked list of index entries
– Sibling pointers support range searches in spite of allocation and deallocation of leaf pages (but leaf pages might not be physically contiguous on disk)

Example B+ Tree



Hash Index

- Index entries partitioned into *buckets* in accordance with a *hash function*, *h(v),* where *v* ranges over search key values
  - Each bucket is identified by an address, *a*
  - Bucket at address *a* contains all index entries with search key *v* such that *h(v) = a*
- Each bucket is stored in a page (with possible overflow chain)
- If index entries contain rows, set of buckets forms an integrated storage structure; else set of buckets forms an (unclustered) secondary index

Equality Search with Hash Index

Given *v*:

1. Compute *h(v)*
2. Fetch bucket at *h(v)*
3. Search bucket

There are techniques to avoid/minimize overflow (see textbook)



Hash-Based Projection

- *Phase* 1:
  - Input rows
  - Project out columns
  - Hash remaining columns using a hash function with range *1…M-1* creating *M-1* buckets on disk
  - **Cost** = *2F*
- *Phase* 2:
  - Sort each bucket to eliminate duplicates
  - **Cost** (assuming a bucket fits in *M-1* buffer pages) = *2F*
- **Total cost** = *4F*



Computing Selection $\sigma_{(attr\ \text{op}\ value)}$

- No index on *attr*:
  - If rows are not sorted on *attr:*
    - Scan all data pages to find rows satisfying selection condition
    - Cost = *F*
  - If rows are sorted on *attr* and op is =, >, < then:
    - Use *binary search* (at $\log_2 F$) to locate first data page containing row in which (*attr* = *value*)
    - Scan further to get all rows satisfying (*attr op value*)
    - Cost = $\log_2 F$ + (cost of scan)

Computing Selection $\sigma_{(attr\ \text{op}\ value)}$

- Clustered B^+ tree index on *attr* (for "=" or range search):
  - Locate first index entry corresponding to a row in which (*attr* = *value*). **Cost = depth of tree**
  - Rows satisfying condition packed in sequence in successive data pages; scan those pages.

Cost: number of pages occupied by qualifying rows



Computing Selection $\sigma_{(attr\ \text{op}\ value)}$

- Unclustered B^+ tree index on *attr* (for "=" or range search):
  - Locate first index entry corresponding to a row in which (*attr* = *value*).

    Cost = depth of tree
  - Index entries with pointers to rows satisfying condition are packed in sequence in successive index pages
    - Scan entries and sort record Ids to identify table data pages with qualifying rows

      Any page that has at least one such row must be fetched once.
- **Cost: number of rows that satisfy selection condition**

Unclustered B^+ Tree Index



Computing Selection $\sigma_{(attr\ =\ value)}$

- Hash index on *attr* (for "=" search only):
  - Hash on *value*. **Cost ≈ 1.2**
    - 1.2 – typical average cost of hashing (> 1 due to possible overflow chains)
    - Finds the (unique) bucket containing all index entries satisfying selection condition
    - Clustered index – all qualifying rows packed in the bucket (a few pages)

      Cost: number of pages occupies by the bucket
    - Unclustered index – sort row Ids in the index entries to identify data pages with qualifying rows

      Each page containing at least one such row must be fetched once

      Cost: number of rows in bucket

Computing Selection $\sigma_{(attr\ =\ value)}$

- Unclustered hash index on *attr* (for equality search)



Access Path

- *Access path* is the notion that denotes *algorithm* + *data structure* used to locate rows satisfying some condition
- *Examples*:
  - *File scan*: can be used for any condition
  - *Hash*: equality search; *all* search key attributes of hash index are specified in condition
  - *B⁺ tree*: equality *or* range search; a *prefix* of the search key attributes are specified in condition
    - B⁺ tree supports a variety of access paths
  - *Binary search*: Relation sorted on a sequence of attributes and some *prefix* of that sequence is specified in condition

Access Paths Supported by B⁺ tree

- ***Example***: Given a B⁺ tree whose search key is the sequence of attributes *a2, a1, a3, a4*
  - Access path for search $\sigma_{a1>5 \wedge a2=3 \wedge a3='x'}(R)$: find first entry having $a2=3 \wedge a1>5 \wedge a3='x'$ and scan leaves from there until entry having *a2>3* or $a3 \neq 'x'$. Select satisfying entries
  - Access path for search $\sigma_{a2=3 \wedge a3>'x'}(R)$: locate first entry having *a2=3* and scan leaves until entry having *a2>3*. Select satisfying entries
  - Access path for search $\sigma_{a1>5 \wedge a3='x'}(R)$: Scan of *R*

Choosing an Access Path

- *Selectivity* of an access path = number of pages retrieved using that path
- If several access paths support a query, DBMS chooses the one with *lowest* selectivity
- Size of domain of attribute is an indicator of the selectivity of search conditions that involve that attribute
- Example: $\sigma_{CrsCode='CS305' \wedge Grade='B'}$ (Transcript)
  - a B⁺ tree with search key *CrsCode* has lower selectivity than a B⁺ tree with search key *Grade*

Computing Joins

- The cost of joining two relations makes the choice of a join algorithm crucial
- *Block-nested loops* join algorithm for computing $\mathbf{r} \bowtie_{A=B} \mathbf{s}$

```
foreach page p_r in r do
  foreach tuple t_r in p_r do
    foreach page p_s in s do
      foreach tuple t_s in p_s do
        if t_r.A = t_s.B then output (t_r, t_s)
```


Block-Nested Loops Join

- If β_r and β_s are the number of pages in r and s, the cost of algorithm is

  Number of scans of relation **s**

  $\beta_r + \beta_r * \beta_s +$ *cost of outputting final result*

  – If **r** and **s** have 10^3 pages each, cost is $10^3 + 10^3 * 10^3$

  – *Choose smaller relation for the outer loop*:
  - If $\beta_r < \beta_s$ then $\beta_r + \beta_r * \beta_s < \beta_s + \beta_r * \beta_s$

Block-Nested Loops Join

- Cost can be reduced to

  Number of scans of relation **s**

  $\beta_r + (\beta_r/(M-2)) * \beta_s +$ *cost of outputting final result*

  by using M buffer pages instead of 1.



Index-Nested Loop Join $\mathbf{r} \bowtie_{A=B} \mathbf{s}$

- Use an index on **s** with search key B (instead of scanning **s**) to find rows of **s** that match t_r
  – Cost = $\beta_r + \tau_r * \omega +$ *cost of outputting final result*

  Number of rows in **r**

  avg cost of retrieving *all* rows in **s** that match t_r

  – Effective if number of rows of **s** that match tuples in **r** is small (i.e., $\omega << 1$) and index is clustered

```
foreach tuple t_r in r do {
    use index to find all tuples t_s in s satisfying t_r.A=t_s.B;
    output (t_r, t_s)
}
```

Sort-Merge Join $\mathbf{r} \bowtie_{A=B} \mathbf{s}$

sort **r** on A;
sort **s** on B;
while !*eof*(**r**) and !*eof*(**s**) **do** {
  scan **r** and **s** concurrently until $t_r.A=t_s.B$;
  if ($t_r.A=t_s.B$=c) { *output* $\sigma_{A=c}(\mathbf{r})\times\sigma_{B=c}(\mathbf{s})$ }
}



Sort-Merge Join

- Cost of *sorting* assuming *M* buffers:
  $2\,\beta_r \log_{M-1} \beta_r + 2\,\beta_s \log_{M-1} \beta_s$ + *cost of final result*
- Cost of *merging* depends on whether $\sigma_{A=c}(\mathbf{r})$ and $\sigma_{B=c}(\mathbf{s})$ can be fit in buffers
  - If yes, merge step takes $\beta_r + \beta_s$
  - In no, then each $\sigma_{A=c}(\mathbf{r})\times\sigma_{B=c}(\mathbf{s})$ has to be computed using *block-nested* join.

    (Think why indexed methods or sort-merge are inapplicable.)

Hash-Join $\mathbf{r} \bowtie_{A=B} \mathbf{s}$

- *Step* 1: Hash **r** on A and **s** on B into the same set of buckets
- *Step* 2: Since matching tuples must be in same bucket, read each bucket in turn and output the result of the join
- *Cost*: $3\,(\beta_r + \beta_s)$ + *cost of output of final result*
  - assuming each bucket fits in memory

Hash Join



Star Joins

- $\mathbf{r} \bowtie_{cond_1} \mathbf{r}_1 \bowtie_{cond_2} \cdots \bowtie_{cond_n} \mathbf{r}_n$
  - Each $cond_i$ involves only the attributes of $\mathbf{r}_i$ and $\mathbf{r}$



Star Join



Computing Star Joins

- Use *join index* (Chapter 11)
  - Scan $\mathbf{r}$ and the join index $\{<r,r_1,\ldots,r_n>\}$ (which is a set of tuples of rids) in one scan
  - Retrieve matching tuples in $\mathbf{r}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{r}_n$
  - Output result

Computing Star Joins

- Use *bitmap indices* (Chapter 11)
  - Use one bitmapped join index, J_i, per each partial join $\mathbf{r} \bowtie_{cond_i} \mathbf{r}_i$
  - *Recall*: J_i is a set of $<v, bitmap>$, where v is an rid of a tuple in $\mathbf{r}_i$ and *bitmap* has 1 in k-th position iff k-th tuple of $\mathbf{r}$ joins with the tuple pointed to by v
1. Scan J_i and logically OR all bitmaps. We get all rids in $\mathbf{r}$ that join with $\mathbf{r}_i$
2. Now logically AND the resulting bitmaps for $J_1, \ldots, J_n$.
3. Result: a subset of $\mathbf{r}$, which contains all tuples that can possibly be in the star join
   - *Rationale*: only a few such tuples survive, so can use indexed loops

Choosing Indices

- DBMSs may allow user to specify
  - Type (hash, B^+ tree) and search key of index
  - Whether or not it should be clustered
- Using information about the frequency and type of queries and size of tables, designer can use cost estimates to choose appropriate indices
- Several commercial systems have tools that suggest indices
  - Simplifies job, but index suggestions must be *verified*

Choosing Indices – Example

- If a frequently executed query that involves selection or a join and has a large result set, use a clustered B^+ tree index

  Example: Retrieve all rows of Transcript for *StudId*
- If a frequently executed query is an equality search and has a small result set, an unclustered hash index is best
  - Since only one clustered index on a table is possible, choosing unclustered allows a different index to be clustered

  Example: Retrieve all rows of Transcript for (*StudId*, *CrsCode*)