Query Processing

- Selection operation
- Join operators
- Sorting
- Other operators
- Putting it all together…
Overview

User

\[ \text{select } * \text{ from } R, S \text{ where } \ldots \]

Query Parser

Query Optimizer

Query Processor

R, B+Tree on R.a
S, Hash Index on S.a

Results

Resolve the references,
Syntax errors etc.
Converts the query to an
internal format

relational algebra like

Find the best way to evaluate
the query
Which index to use?
What join method to use?

Read the data from the files
Do the query processing

joins, selections, aggregates

“Cost”

- Complicated to compute
- We will focus on disk:
  - Number of I/Os?
    - Not sufficient
    - Number of seeks matters a lot... why?
  - \( t_T \) – time to transfer one block
  - \( t_S \) – time for one seek
  - Cost for \( b \) block transfers plus \( S \) seeks
    \[ b \cdot t_T + S \cdot t_S \]
  - Measured in seconds
Selection Operation

- SELECT * FROM person WHERE SSN = “123”
- Option 1: **Sequential Scan**
  - Read the relation start to end and look for “123”
  - Can always be used (not true for the other options)
- Cost?
  - Let \( b_r \) = *Number of relation blocks*
  - Then:
    - 1 seek and \( b_r \) block transfers
  - So:
    - \( t_S + b_r \cdot t_T \) sec
- **Improvements**:
  - If SSN is a key, then can stop when found
    - So on average, \( b_r/2 \) blocks accessed

Selection Operation

- SELECT * FROM person WHERE SSN = “123”
- Option 2: **Binary Search**:
  - Pre-condition:
    - *The relation is sorted on SSN*
    - *Selection condition is an equality*
      - E.g. can’t apply to “Name like ‘%424%’”
  - Do binary search
    - Cost of finding the first tuple that matches
      - \( \lceil \log_2(b_r) \rceil \cdot (t_T + t_S) \)
      - *All I/Os are random, so need a seek for all*
        - The last few are short hops, but we ignore such small effects
  - Not quite: What if 10000 tuples match the condition?
    - Incurs additional cost
## Selection Operation

- SELECT * FROM person WHERE SSN = "123"
- Option 3: **Use Index**
  - Pre-condition:
    - *An appropriate index must exist*
  - Use the index
    - Find the first leaf page that contains the search key
    - Retrieve all the tuples that match by following the pointers
      - If primary index, the relation is sorted by the search key
        - Go to the relation and read blocks sequentially
      - If secondary index, must follow all pointers using the index

## Selection w/ B+-Tree Indexes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Cost of Finding the First Leaf</th>
<th>Cost of Retrieving the Tuples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary index, candidate key, equality</td>
<td>$h_i \times (t_T + t_S)$</td>
<td>$1 \times (t_T + t_S)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary index, not a key, equality</td>
<td>$h_i \times (t_T + t_S)$</td>
<td>$1 \times (t_T + t_S) + (b - 1) \times t_T$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  
  *Note: primary == sorted*
  
  $b = number$ of pages that contain the matches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Cost of Finding the First Leaf</th>
<th>Cost of Retrieving the Tuples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary index, candidate key, equality</td>
<td>$h_i \times (t_T + t_S)$</td>
<td>$1 \times (t_T + t_S)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary index, not a key, equality</td>
<td>$h_i \times (t_T + t_S)$</td>
<td>$n \times (t_T + t_S)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  
  *n = number of records that match*
  
  This can be bad

$h_i = height$ of the index
Selection Operation

- Selections involving ranges
  - `select * from accounts where balance > 100000`
  - `select * from matches where matchdate between '10/20/06' and '10/30/06'`
- Option 1: Sequential scan
- Option 2: Using an appropriate index
  - Can't use hash indexes for this purpose

Selection Operation

- Complex selections
  - **Conjunctive**: `select * from accounts where balance > 100000 and SSN = "123"`
  - **Disjunctive**: `select * from accounts where balance > 100000 or SSN = "123"`
- Option 1: Sequential scan
- Option 2 (Conjunctive only): Using an appropriate index on one of the conditions
  - E.g. Use SSN index to evaluate SSN = "123". Apply the second condition to the tuples that match
  - Or do the other way around (if index on balance exists)
  - Which is better?
- Option 3 (Conjunctive only): Choose a multi-key index
  - Not commonly available
Selection Operation

- Complex selections
  - **Conjunctive**: `select * from accounts where balance > 100000 and SSN = "123"`
  - **Disjunctive**: `select * from accounts where balance > 100000 or SSN = "123"

- Option 4: Conjunction or disjunction of *record identifiers*
  - Use indexes to find all RIDs that match each of the conditions
  - Do an *intersection* (for conjunction) or a *union* (for disjunction)
  - Sort the records and fetch them in one shot
  - Called “Index-ANDing” or “Index-ORing”
- Heavily used in commercial systems

Query Processing

- **Overview**
- **Selection operation**
- **Join operators**
- **Sorting**
- **Other operators**
- **Putting it all together…**
Join

- `select * from R, S where R.a = S.a`
  - Called an “equi-join”
- `select * from R, S where |R.a - S.a| < 0.5`
  - Not an “equi-join”

- **Option 1:** Nested-loops
  
  for each tuple `r` in `R`
  
  for each tuple `s` in `S`

  check if `r.a = s.a` (or whether `|r.a - s.a| < 0.5`)

- Can be used for any join condition
  - As opposed to some algorithms we will see later
- R called *outer relation*
- S called *inner relation*

---

**Nested-loops Join**

- **Cost**? Depends on the actual values of parameters, especially memory

- `b_r, b_s \rightarrow Number of blocks of R and S`

- `n_r, n_s \rightarrow Number of tuples of R and S`

- **Case 1:** Minimum memory required = 3 blocks
  - One to hold the current `R` block, one for current `S` block, one for the result being produced
  - Blocks transferred:
    - Must scan `R` tuples once: `b_r`
    - For each `R` tuple, must scan `S`: `n_r * b_s`
  - Seeks?
    - `n_r + b_r`
Nested-loops Join

- **Case 1: Minimum memory required = 3 blocks**
  - Blocks transferred: $n_r \cdot b_s + b_r$
  - Seeks: $n_r + b_r$

- **Example:**
  - Number of records -- $R$: $n_r = 10,000$, $S$: $n_s = 5000$
  - Number of blocks -- $R$: $b_r = 400$, $S$: $b_s = 100$

- **Then for $R$ "outer relation":**
  - Blocks transferred: $n_r \cdot b_s + b_r = 10000 \cdot 100 + 400 = 1,000,400$
  - Seeks: 10400
  - Time: $1000400 \cdot 0.1ms + 10400(4ms) = 1020.8$ sec

- **What if $S$ outer relation?**
  - $5000 \cdot 400 + 100 = 2,000,100$ block transfers,
  - 5100 seeks
  - $= 2000100 \cdot 0.1ms + 5100(4ms) = 2041.7$ sec

*Order matters!*

---

Nested-loops Join

- **Case 2: S fits in memory**
  - Blocks transferred: $b_s + b_r$
  - Seeks: 2

- **Example:**
  - Number of records -- $R$: $n_r = 10,000$, $S$: $n_s = 5000$
  - Number of blocks -- $R$: $b_r = 400$, $S$: $b_s = 100$

- **Then:**
  - Blocks transferred: $400 + 100 = 500$
  - Seeks: 2

*Orders of magnitude difference*
Block Nested-loops Join

- Simple modification to “nested-loops join” (block at a time)
  
  \[
  \begin{align*}
  & \text{for each block } B_r \text{ in } R \\
  & \text{for each block } B_s \text{ in } S \\
  & \text{for each tuple } r \text{ in } B_r \\
  & \text{for each tuple } s \text{ in } B_s \\
  & \quad \text{check if } r.a = s.a \text{ (or whether } |r.a - s.a| < 0.5) \\
  \end{align*}
  \]

- Case 1: Minimum memory required = 3 blocks
  - Blocks transferred: \( b_r \times b_s + b_r \)
  - Seeks: 2 \* \( b_r \)

- For the example:
  - blocks: 40400, seeks: 800

- Case 2: \( S \) fits in memory
  - Blocks transferred: \( b_s + b_r \)
  - Seeks: 2

- What about in between?
  - Say there are 50 blocks, but \( S \) is 100 blocks
  - Why not use all the memory that we can…
Block Nested-loops Join

- **Case 3: 50 blocks (S = 100 blocks)**?
  
  for each group of 48 blocks in R
  for each block B_s in S
  for each tuple r in the group of 48 blocks
    for each tuple s in B_s
      check if \( r.a = s.a \) (or whether \(|r.a - s.a| < 0.5\))

- **Why is this good?**
  - We only have to read \( S \) a total of \( \frac{b_r}{48} \) times (instead of \( b_r \) times)
  - Blocks transferred: \( b_s \cdot \frac{b_r}{48} + b_r = 100 \cdot 400/48 + 400 = 1233 \)
    - Or \( b_s b_r / 48 + b_r = 400 \cdot 100/48 + 100 = 933 \) (but more seeks)
  - Seeks: \( 2 \cdot \frac{b_r}{48} \)

Index Nested-loops Join

- **select * from R, S where R.a = S.a**
  - “equi-join”
- **Nested-loops**
  
  for each tuple r in R
  for each tuple s in S
    check if \( r.a = s.a \) (or whether \(|r.a - s.a| < 0.5\))

- **Suppose there is an index on \( S.a \)**
- **Why not use the index instead of the inner loop?**
  
  for each tuple r in R
    use the index to find \( S \) tuples with \( S.a = r.a \)
Index Nested-loops Join

- \textit{select * from } R, S \textit{ where } R.a = S.a
  - Called an “equi-join”
- \textit{Why not use the index instead of the inner loop?}
  
  \textit{for each tuple } r \textit{ in } R \\
  \textit{use the index to find } S \textit{ tuples with } S.a = r.a

- \textit{Cost of the join:}
  - \( b_r (t_r + t_s) + n_r \times c \)
  - \( c \) == the cost of index access
    - \textit{Computed using the formulas discussed earlier}

---

Index Nested-loops Join

- \textit{W/ indexes for both } R, S \textit{, use one w/ fewer tuples as outer.}
- \textit{Recall example:}
  - Number of records -- \( R: n_r = 10,000 \), \( S: n_s = 5000 \)
  - Number of blocks -- \( R: b_r = 400 \), \( S: b_s = 100 \)
- \textit{Assume } S \textit{ outer, B+\text{-}tree for } R \textit{, avg fanout of 20}
  - implies height \( R \) is 4 (leaf level has \( 20^3 = 8000 \) nodes, some w/ mult keys)
  - Cost is \( 100 + 5000 \times (4 + 1) = 25,100 \), each w/ seek and transfer
- \textit{Assume } R \textit{ outer, B+\text{-}tree is on } S \textit{: height = 3}
  - Cost is \( 400 + 10000 \times (3+1) = 40,400 \), each w/ seek and transfer
Index Nested-loops Join

- Restricted applicability
  - An appropriate index must exist
  - What about $|R.a - S.a| < 5$?
- Great for queries with joins and selections
  ```sql
  SELECT *
  FROM accounts, customers
  WHERE accounts.customer-SSN = customers.customer-SSN AND
    accounts.acct-number = "A-101"
  ```
  - Use `accounts` as outer, use select to prune reads of customers

So far…

- Block Nested-loops join
  - Can always be applied irrespective of the join condition
  - If the smaller relation fits in memory, then cost:
    - $b_r + b_s$
    - This is the best we can hope if we have to read the relations once each
  - CPU cost of the inner loop is high
  - Typically used when the smaller relation is really small (few tuples) and index nested-loops can’t be used
- Index Nested-loops join
  - Only applies if an appropriate index exists
  - Very useful when we have selections that return small number of tuples
    - `select balance from customer, accounts where customer.name = "j. s." and customer.SSN = accounts.SSN`
Mid-term

- **Stats**
  - Average: 67%
  - Stdev: 15%
  - Max: 98%
  - Min: in the 20s

- **Grades (curve is at end of course, not on test, but for kicks and grins):**
  - A- = avg + stdev = 82%
  - B- = avg = 67%
  - C- = avg – stdev = 52%

- **NOTE:**
  - stdev tends to get smaller as course goes on
    - A- threshold gets lower
    - C- threshold gets higher