



























BitMap Indexes (Reading: 5.4.1-5.4.3)

 Bit Vector for every distinct value in the column
 As many bits as there are records in the data
 R1:25, R2:50 R3:25 R4: 50 R5: 50 R6: 70 R7:70 R8:25
 25: 10100001; 50: 01011000 70: 00000110

%25. Inforce(), 50. Office() /0. object() %Easy Index OR-ing (score = 25 or score = 50) %Easy Index AND-ing (last score = new score)

15

Compressed BitMaps: Run Length Encoding Represent sequence of I 0-s followed by 1 as a binary encoding of I Concatenate codes for each run together But, must be able to recover runs Scheme B_I = #of bits in binary encoding of I Represent as B_I - 1 1-s followed by 0 and then binary encoding of I

Example

%13 0-s followed by 1. 4 bits to represent 13. Hence represent as (11101101) %Decode: (11101101001011) %Run-Length: (13,0,3) %00000000000110001 %Note: Trailing 0-s not recovered

17

Index AND-ing and OR-ing

Read Example 5.26

Query Execution

Required Reading: 2.3.3-2.3.5, 6.1- 6.7 Suggested Reading: 6.8, 6.9



20

Logical Operators in the Algebra

 $\begin{array}{ll} \mbox{${\tt \#}$Union, intersection, difference} \\ \mbox{${\tt \#}$Selection σ} \\ \mbox{${\tt \#}$Projection Π} \\ \mbox{${\tt \#}$Join $${\tt >}{\tt <}$} \\ \mbox{${\tt \#}$Duplicate elimination δ} \\ \mbox{${\tt \#}$Grouping γ} \\ \mbox{${\tt \#}$Sorting τ} \end{array}$







Sorting While Scanning

- #Sometimes it is useful to have the output sorted
- ℜThree ways to scan it sorted:
 □If there is a primary or secondary index on it, use it during scan
 □If it fits in memory, sort there
 □If not, use multiway merging

25

Estimating the Cost of Operators

%Very important for the optimizer (next week) **%**Parameters for a relation R
□B(R) = number of blocks holding R
□Meaningful if R is clustered
□T(R) = number of tuples in R
□E.g. may need when R is unclustered
□V(R,a) = number of distinct values of the attribute a

26

Sorting

ℜIllustrates the difference in algorithm design when your data is not in main memory:
△Problem: sort 1Gb of data with 1Mb of RAM.
ℜArises in many places in database systems:
△Data requested in sorted order (ORDER BY)
△Needed for grouping operations
△First step in sort-merge join algorithm
△Duplicate removal

⊡Bulk loading of B+-tree indexes.







Cost Model for Our Analysis

#B: Block size **#M:** Size of main memory **#N:** Number of records in the file **#R:** Size of one record













One-pass Algorithms Duplicate elimination δ(R) %Need to keep tuples in memory %When new tuple arrives, need to compare it with previously seen tuples %Balanced search tree, or hash table %Cost: B(R) %Assumption: B(δ(R)) <= M

One-pass Algorithms

Grouping: γ_{city, sum(price)} (R) #Need to store all cities in memory #Also store the sum(price) for each city #Balanced search tree or hash table #Cost: B(R) #Assumption: number of cities fits in memory

39

One-pass Algorithms

Binary operations: $R \cap S$, $R \cup S$, R - S#Assumption: min(B(R), B(S)) <= M #Scan one table first, then the next, eliminate duplicates #Cost: B(R)+B(S)

Nested Loop Joins

HTuple-based nested loop R \bowtie S

For each tuple r in R do For each tuple s in S do if r and s join then output (r,s)

41

Nested Loop Joins

Block-based Nested Loop Join

For each (M-1) blocks bs of S do for each block br of R do for each tuple s in bs for each tuple r in br do if r and s join then output(r,s)

42





Two-Pass Algorithms Based on Sorting

%Recall: multi-way merge sort needs only two passes ! %Assumption: B(R) <= M² %Cost for sorting: 3B(R)

Two-Pass Algorithms Based on Sorting

Duplicate elimination δ(R) %Trivial idea: sort first, then eliminate duplicates

- ₩Step 1: sort chunks of size M, write
- ⊠cost 2B(R)
 Step 2: merge M-1 runs, but include each tuple only once

. ⊡cost B(R)

#Total cost: 3B(R), Assumption: B(R) <= M²

46

Two-Pass Algorithms Based on Sorting

Grouping: γ_{city, sum(price)} (R)
Same as before: sort, then compute the sum(price) for each group
As before: compute sum(price) during the merge phase.
Total cost: 3B(R)
Assumption: B(R) <= M²

47

45

Two-Pass Algorithms Based on Sorting

Binary operations: $R \cap S$, $R \cup S$, R - S#Idea: sort R, sort S, then do the right thing #A closer look: \Box Step 1: split R into runs of size M, then split S into runs of size M. Cost: 2B(R) + 2B(S) \Box Step 2: merge M/2 runs from R; merge M/2 runs from S; ouput a tuple on a case by cases basis # Total cost: 3B(R)+3B(S)# Assumption: $B(R)+B(S) <= M^2$



Two-Pass Algorithms Based on Sorting

Join R ⋈ S #If the number of tuples in R matching those in S is small (or vice versa) we can compute the join during the merge phase #Total cost: 3B(R)+3B(S) #Assumption: B(R) + B(S) <= M²

50

52



Hash Based Algorithms for δ

#Recall: δ(R) = duplicate elimination
#Step 1. Partition R into buckets
#Step 2. Apply δ to each bucket (may read in main memory)
#Cost: 3B(R)
#Assumption:B(R) <= M²



 $Assumption:B(R) <= M^2$







Partitioned Hash Join

%Cost: 3B(R) + 3B(S)
%Assumption: min(B(R), B(S)) <= M²

Hybrid Hash Join Algorithm

₩Partition S into k buckets
₩But keep first bucket S₁ in memory, k-1 buckets to disk
₩Partition R into k buckets
△First bucket R₁ is joined immediately with S₁
△Other k-1 buckets go to disk
₩Finally, join k-1 pairs of buckets:
△(R₂,S₂), (R₃,S₃), ..., (R_k,S_k)

58

57

59

Hybrid Join Algorithm

₩How big should we choose k ?
₩Average bucket size for S is B(S)/k
₩Need to fit B(S)/k + (k-1) blocks in memory
□B(S)/k + (k-1) <= M
□k slightly smaller than B(S)/M

Hybrid Join Algorithm
#How many I/Os ?
#cecal: cost of partitioned hash join:
□3B(R) + 3B(S)
#Now we save 2 disk operations for one bucket
#cecal there are k buckets
#hence we save 2/k(B(R) + B(S))
#cost: (3-2/k)(B(R) + B(S)) =
(3-2M/B(S))(B(R) + B(S))