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Goals for Today

• Discuss algorithms for implementing query plan operators: selection, joins, set operations
  – Reason about cost in I/Os

• Understand how external sorting and hashing can be used for these algorithms

• Prepare for final exercises of Lab 2

Logical Plan to Physical Plan

• Logical query plan partially shows us how to evaluate query
  – Missing: choice of specific algorithm for executing operators

Review: Relational Operations

• Finding algorithms for:
  – Selection (σ)
  – Projection (π)
  – Cross-product and Join (×)
  – Set-difference (-)
  – Union (∪)
  – Aggregation (SUM, MIN, etc.) and GROUP BY

• After we cover choices for algorithms, we will discuss how to optimize queries formed by composing operators
General Themes

- **What can we do when all data cannot fit in RAM**
  - *Out-of-core* algorithms
    - Conceptually: form partitions to get “like” things together

- **Factors in cost algorithm for an operator:**
  - Input size (number of pages)
  - Indexes available
  - Buffer pool space

Simple Selections

- Of the form $\sigma_{R.\text{attr} \ op \ \text{value}}(R)$

- **Size of result** approximated as *size of R * reduction factor
  - “Reduction factor” also called *selectivity*
  - Statistics in Catalog can help us estimate

- How best to execute a selection? Depends on:
  - What indexes/access paths are available
  - Expected size of the result (in terms of number of tuples and/or number of pages)

Schema for Examples

Sailors $(sid: \text{integer}, \ sname: \text{string}, \ rating: \text{integer}, \ age: \text{real})$

Reserves $(sid: \text{integer}, \ bid: \text{integer}, \ day: \text{date}, \ rname: \text{string})$

- Similar to old schema; $rname$ added for variations.

- Reserves:
  - Each record is 40 bytes long
  - 100 record per page
  - $M = 1000$ pages

- Sailors:
  - Each record is 50 bytes long,
  - 80 record per page
  - $N = 500$ pages

Simple Selections: No indexes (Review)

- With **no index, unsorted**:
  - Must scan the whole relation
  - For Reserves = \text{cost is M (\#pages in R)} \rightarrow 1000 \text{ I/Os.}

- With **no index, sorted**:
  - Cost of binary search + number of pages containing results
  - For Reserves = $\log_2 1000$ I/Os + [selectivity $\times$ number of pages]
Using an Index for Selections

- Cost depends on # qualifying tuples and if clustered
  - Cost has two components:
    - Finding qualifying data entries (typically small, e.g., finding leaf in tree)
    - Plus cost of retrieving records (could be large without clustering)
- For example query on “Reserves”, if 10% of tuples qualify: (result size estimate = 100 pages or 10,000 tuples)

Selections using Index (cont)

- Important refinement for unclustered indexes:
  1. Find qualifying data entries.
  2. Sort the record ids of the data records to be retrieved.
  3. Fetch pages in order!

Ensures that each data page is looked at just once (though # of such pages likely to be higher than with clustering).

When using this refinement, is using the unclustered index ever better than sequential scan?

General Selection Conditions

```
SELECT *
FROM Reserves R
WHERE R.bid = 103 AND R.sid = 42;
```

- A B-tree index matches (a conjunction of) terms if the term(s) involve only attributes in a prefix of the search key.
  - E.g., Index on <a, b, c> matches predicate “a=5 AND b=3”, but not “b=3”

- For Hash index: index must involve all attributes in search key

General Selections: Two Approaches

- What if several indexes exist that could be used?

- Approach 1: pick one index to use
  - Find the most selective access path, retrieve tuples using it, then apply the other conditions

Most selective access path: Index with file scan estimated to require fewest page I/Os

Applying other conditions won’t impact number of pages fetched
General Selections: Two Approaches

- **Approach 2**: use *multiple* indexes

- To use two or more matching indexes (Alt 2 or 3 for data entries):
  - Get *sets of record ids* of data records using *each* matching index.
  - Then *intersect* these sets of rids.
  - Retrieve the records and apply any remaining conditions

- Example: *day < 8/9/94 AND bid=103 AND sid=42*
  
  Suppose have B+ tree index on *day* and an *index on sid*
  
  - Intersect: rids using index on *day* with rids using index on *sid*
  
  - Then check *bid=103*

Exercise: Selection

- **Exercise 2**
  
  I. B+tree index on <rname,day>
  
  II. B+tree on <day, rname>
  
  III. Hash index on <day, rname>

- Disjunction:
  
  - if all conditions have index, use the union of rids!
  
  - But if even one of them does not have index, have to do sequential scan anyway

Join Operators

- Joins are a very common query operation!

- Joins can be very expensive:
  
  - Consider an inner join of R and S each with 1M records

  *How many tuples in the answer (worst case)?*

- Two main classes of JOIN algorithms:
  
  - Algorithms that effectively *enumerate cross product*
  
  - Algorithms that *avoid cross product* by getting “like” partitions together

Equality Joins With One Join Column

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

- **Relation info**:
  
  - M = 1000 pages in R, \( t_R = 100 \) tuples per page.
  
  - N = 500 pages in S, \( t_S = 80 \) tuples per page.

  - In examples, R is Reserves and S is Sailors.

- **Cost metric**: # of I/Os
  
  (We will ignore cost of final output from query)
Simple Nested Loops Join

- For each tuple in the **outer** relation R, we scan the entire **inner** relation S.
  - Cost: \((t_R \times M) \times N + M = 100,000 \times 500 + 1000\) I/Os.

- What if smaller relation (S) was outer?
  - \((t_S \times N) \times M + N = 40,000 \times 1000 + 500\) I/Os.

Page-Oriented Nested Loops Join

- For each page of R, get each page of S, and write out matching pairs of tuples \(<r, s>\), where \(r\) is in R-page and S is in S-page.

- What is the cost of this approach? (Try Exercise 3)
  - With R as outer, cost = \(M \times N + M = 1000 \times 500 + 1000\)
    - If smaller relation (S) is outer, cost = \(500 \times 1000 + 500\)

Block Nested Loops Join

- Page-oriented NL doesn’t use all available buffer frames!

- Alternative approach:
  - Use one page as an input buffer for scanning the inner S,
  - one page as the output buffer
  - and use all remaining pages to hold block of outer R

- For each block of R, scan through each page of S for matches

Cost: Scan of outer + \# outer blocks * scan of inner

\# outer blocks = ceiling(\# pages of outer/blocksize)

- With Reserves (R) as outer, and 100 pages/block:
  - Scanning R is 1000 I/Os; a total of 10 blocks.
  - Per block of R, scan Sailors (S); 10*500 I/Os.

- With 100-page block of Sailors as outer:
  - Cost of scanning S is 500 I/Os; a total of 5 blocks.
  - Per block of S, scan Reserves: 5*1000 I/Os.
Avoiding Cross-product

• Simple, Page-oriented, and Block Nested-loop join algorithms effectively enumerate the cross-product
  — every pair of tuples is compared

• Next: algorithms that avoid cross-product (for equality joins)
  — tuples in the two relations can be thought of as belonging to *partitions*

Exercise 4: Index Nested Loops

• Have Hash-index (Alt. 2) on *sid* of Sailors (as inner)
  Scan Reserves: **1000 page I/Os**, 100*1000 tuples.
  — For each Reserves tuple:
    • **1.2 I/Os** to get data entry in index,
    • plus 1 I/O to get *the exactly one* matching Sailors tuple
    Total cost: $1000 + 2.2 \times 100,000 = 221,000$ I/Os

• Hash-index (Alt. 2) on *sid* of Reserves (as inner):
  — Scan Sailors: **500 page I/Os**, 80*500 tuples.
  — For each Sailors tuple:
    • **1.2 I/Os** to find index page with data entries,
    • plus cost of retrieving matching Reserves tuples
    — Assuming uniform distribution, **2.5 reservations per sailor**
      (100,000 tuples in R / 40,000 tuples in S).
    — Cost of retrieving them is 1 or 2.5 I/Os depending on whether
      the index is clustered

Index Nested Loops Join

```
foreach tuple r in R do
  foreach tuple s in S where s == r do
    add <r, s> to result
```

• If there is an index on the join column of one relation (say S),
  can make that relation the inner and use the index
  — Cost: $M + (M*\text{tp}) * \text{cost of finding matching S tuples}$

• Typical “probe” costs:
  — 1.2 I/Os for hash index
  — 2-4 I/Os for B+ tree

• The cost of finding S tuples (assuming Alt. (2) or (3) for data entries) depends on if index is clustered
  — Clustered: 1 I/O per page of matching S tuples.
  — Unclustered: up to 1 I/O per matching S tuple.

Sort-Merge Join \((R \bowtie S)\)

• Sort R and S on the join column, then scan them to do a “merge” (on join field), and output result tuples.

• Particularly useful if
  — one or both inputs are already sorted on join field(s)
  — output is required to be sorted on join field(s)
Example of Sort-Merge Join

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sid</th>
<th>sname</th>
<th>rating</th>
<th>age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>dustin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>yuppy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>lubber</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>guppy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>rusty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sid</th>
<th>bid</th>
<th>day</th>
<th>rname</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>12/4/96</td>
<td>guppy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>11/3/96</td>
<td>yuppy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>10/10/96</td>
<td>dustin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10/12/96</td>
<td>lubber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>10/11/96</td>
<td>lubber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>11/12/96</td>
<td>dustin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Suppose joining on sid = sid
- Cost for this JOIN: Sort S + Sort R + (M+N)
  - The cost of merging: typically M+N

Reflection: Sort-Merge Join

- Outer relation is scanned once
- Each partition of Inner relation is scanned once per matching Outer tuple
  - “Merge” phase can require some backtracking if duplicate values appear in join column
  - Multiple scans of an Inner partition will probably find needed pages in buffer pool

Exercise 5: Hash-Join vs. Sort-Merge

- Sort-Merge Join vs. Hash Join:
  - Hash-based join superior if relation sizes differ greatly (e.g., if one relation fits in memory, called the In-Memory Hash Join).
  - Sort-Merge less sensitive to data skew; result is sorted
**SimpleDb: Insert and Delete**

- **Insert operator**
  - Inserts tuples it gets from its child into a given relation
  - Output: number of tuples inserted

```sql
INSERT INTO Students(sid, name, gpa)
VALUES (42, "Alice", 3.5);
```

- **Delete operator**
  - Deletes the tuples it gets from its child
  - Output: number of tuples deleted

```sql
DELETE FROM Students
WHERE gpa < 2.0;
```

- Ask the BufferPool to insert/delete

---

**SimpleDb: Buffer Pool Eviction**

- Implement a page eviction policy
  - Update getPage() to evict if necessary

- Flushing pages
  - Before a dirty page is evicted, its changes must be written to disk!
  - However, calling flushPage() should not evict pages!!

---

**Aggregation Operations**

(AVG, MIN, etc.)

- **Without grouping:**
  - In general, requires scanning the relation.
  - Given a tree index whose search key includes all attributes in the SELECT or WHERE clauses, can do index-only scan.

- **With grouping:**
  - Sort on group-by attributes, then scan relation and compute aggregate for each group.
  - Similar approach based on hashing on group-by attributes.
  - Can use a tree index whose search key “covers” all attributes in SELECT, WHERE and GROUP BY clauses