Query 1: union + subquery Default:

- -> Table scan on <union temporary> (cost=2.50 rows=0) (actual time=0.001..0.146 rows=1808 loops=1)
 - -> Union materialize with deduplication (actual time=7.757..8.094 rows=1808 loops=1)
 - -> Filter: (food.Calories < (select #2)) (cost=63.64 rows=614) (actual time=0.504..1.728 rows=1842 loops=1)
 - -> Table scan on food (cost=63.64 rows=1842) (actual time=0.057..1.000 rows=1842 loops=1)

CREATE Index Idx on Food(Food name):

- -> Table scan on <union temporary> (cost=2.50 rows=0) (actual time=0.001..0.147 rows=1808 loops=1)
 - -> Union materialize with deduplication (actual time=7.190..7.528 rows=1808 loops=1)
 - -> Filter: (food.Calories < (select #2)) (cost=63.64 rows=614) (actual time=0.461..1.482 rows=1842 loops=1)
 - -> Table scan on food (cost=63.64 rows=1842) (actual time=0.015..0.772 rows=1842 loops=1)

CREATE Index Idx on Customer(name):

- > Table scan on <union temporary> (cost=2.50 rows=0) (actual time=0.001..0.185 rows=1808 loops=1) -> Union materialize with deduplication (actual time=7.487..7.865 rows=1808 loops=1)
 - - -> Filter: (food.Calories < (select #2)) (cost=63.64 rows=614) (actual time=0.463..1.500 rows=1842 loops=1)
 - -> Table scan on food (cost=63.64 rows=1842) (actual time=0.016..0.780 rows=1842 loops=1)

CREATE Index Idx on Customer(favorite food):

- -> Table scan on <union temporary> (cost=2.50 rows=0) (actual time=0.001..0.153 rows=1808 loops=1)
 - -> Union materialize with deduplication (actual time=7.499..7.842 rows=1808 loops=1)
 - -> Filter: (food.Calories < (select #2)) (cost=63.64 rows=614) (actual time=0.467..1.567 rows=1842 loops=1)
 - -> Table scan on food (cost=63.64 rows=1842) (actual time=0.016..0.820 rows=1842 loops=1)

Analysis:

Based on our data, we see that index based on Food Name is slightly faster.

We think that its because food name has many similar food names, so in terms of hashing,

There is less bucket splitting in the table, thus it is slightly faster to lookup the data.