

# MapReduce on a Chord Distributed Hash Table

Andrew Rosen      Brendan Benshoof      Matt Erwin      Robert W. Harrison      Anu G. Bourgeois

Department of Computer Science  
Georgia State University  
Atlanta, Georgia  
rosen@cs.gsu.edu

**Abstract**—This paper proposes ChordReduce, a novel implementation of Chord that acts as middleware for creating and running MapReduce jobs. ChordReduce satisfies the desired properties for a distributed MapReduce platform. Chord is a peer-to-peer networking protocol for distributed storage and file sharing that provides  $\log_2(n)$  lookup time for any particular file or node. Files and nodes are evenly distributed across a ring overlay and organized such that the responsibilities of a failed node are automatically reassigned. ChordReduce leverages these features to distribute Map and Reduce tasks evenly among nodes and maintain a high degree of robustness during execution. The loss of a single node or a group of nodes during execution does not impact the soundness of the results and the tasks are automatically reassigned. An additional benefit is that nodes joining the ring during runtime can automatically have work distributed to them.

MapReduce frameworks are generally hierarchical, with the responsibility of scheduling work, distributing data and tasks, and tracking progress at the top. This leads to centralized MapReduce implementations having a single point of failure. A MapReduce framework with both responsibility and work distributed among its members would eliminate the need for a central source of coordination. Such a framework would need to be highly scalable, fault-tolerant during execution, able to handle a high degree of churn, and minimize the amount of traffic that results from maintaining the network.

Our experiments show that ChordReduce is an efficient implementation of MapReduce. The applications are far-reaching, especially for big data problems and those that are massively parallel. Implementing MapReduce on a Chord peer-to-peer network demonstrates that the Chord network is an excellent platform for distributed and concurrent programming in cloud and loosely coupled environments.

**Index Terms**—MapReduce; P2P; Parallel Processing; Peer-to-Peer Computing; Cloud Computing; Middleware;

## I. INTRODUCTION

Google’s MapReduce [1] paradigm has rapidly become an integral part in the world of data processing and is capable of efficiently executing numerous Big Data programming and data-reduction tasks. By using MapReduce, a user can take a large problem, split it into small, equivalent tasks and send those tasks to other processors for computation. The results are sent back to the user and combined into one answer. Many popular platforms for MapReduce, such as Hadoop [2], utilize a central source of coordination and organization to store and operate on data. The hierarchical structure of Hadoop results in a single point of failure at the node that concentrates the results and also requires a complicated scheme for handling worker-node failures.

We have developed a system, called ChordReduce, which employs a less hierarchical structure. It is a system that can scale, is fault tolerant, has a minimal amount of latency, and distributes tasks evenly. ChordReduce leverages the underlying protocol from Chord [3] to distribute Map and Reduce tasks to nodes evenly, provide greater data redundancy, and guarantee a greater amount of fault tolerance. Rather than viewing Chord solely as a means for sharing files, we see it as a means for distributing work. This paper establishes the effectiveness of using Chord as a framework for distributed programming. At the same time we avoid the architectural and file system constraints of systems like Hadoop.

Chord [3] is a peer-to-peer (P2P) protocol for file sharing and distributed storage that guarantees a worst-case  $\log n$  lookup time for a particular node or file in the network. It is highly fault-tolerant to node failures and churn, the constant joining and leaving of nodes. It scales extremely well and the network requires little maintenance to handle individual nodes. Files in the network are distributed evenly among its members.

Our experiments demonstrate that the ChordReduce framework is highly scalable, solving problems significantly faster when distributed. The larger the problem is, the greater the speedup gained by incorporating more nodes into the problem. Our framework also provides a high level of robustness during execution; we can lose many nodes to churn, and still process jobs successfully. If we find a job requires more computational power, we can add more nodes to the job during runtime.

While Chord could be used to implement a grid computing environment similar to BOINC [4] or Folding-at-Home [5], it would be difficult to efficiently implement the MapReduce algorithm using grid computing tools. MapReduce uses persistent data to amortize the cost of distributing the data across the nodes over many calls, while grid environments typically transmit a transient bundle of data and computation to a volunteer node. BOINC and Folding-at-Home use a master-slave architecture with critical point of failure similar to Hadoop, while ChordReduce is a true peer-based approach.

Section II covers the background of the Chord and MapReduce. Related Work is discussed in Section III. Details of ChordReduce’s implementation and code is described in Section IV, while our experiments and their results are covered in Section V. Lastly, Section VI discusses potential avenues for future research.




Fig. 1: A Chord ring with 16 nodes. The bold lines are incoming edges. Each node has a connection to its successor, as well as 4 fingers, some of which are duplicates.

## II. BACKGROUND

Chord and MapReduce are integral parts of ChordReduce. We summarize these frameworks in this section.

### A. Chord

Chord [3] is a P2P protocol for file sharing that uses a hash function to assign addresses to nodes and files for a ring overlay. The Chord protocol takes in some key and returns the identity (ID) of the node responsible for that key. These keys are generated by hashing a value of the node, such as the IP address and port, or by hashing the filename of a file. The hashing process creates a  $m$ -bit hash identifier.

The nodes are then arranged in a ring from the lowest hash-value to highest. Chord next takes the hashed files and places each in the node that has the same hashed identifier as it. If no such node exists, the node with the first identifier that follows this value is selected. The node responsible for the key  $\kappa$  is called the *successor* of  $\kappa$ , or  $\text{successor}(\kappa)$ . Since the overlay is a circle, this assignment is computed in module  $2^m$  space. For example, if there were some portion of the network with nodes 20, 25, and 27, node 25 would be responsible for the files with the keys (21,22,23,24,25). If node 25 were to decide to leave the network, its absence would be detected by node 27, who would then be responsible for all the keys node 25 was covering. An example Chord network is drawn in in Fig. 1.

With this scheme, we can reliably find the node responsible for some key by asking the next node in the circle for the information, who would then pass the request through the circle until the successor was found. We can then proceed to directly connect with the successor to retrieve the file. This naive approach is largely inefficient, and is a simplification




Fig. 2: Alice has incorrectly determined that Carol is her appropriate successor. When Alice stabilizes, Carol will let her know about Bob.




Fig. 3: After completing stabilize, Alice makes Bob her successor and notifies him. Bob then made Alice as his predecessor.

of the lookup process, but it is the basis of how Chord theoretically works.

To speed up the lookup time, each node builds and maintains a *finger table*. The *finger table* contains the locations of up to  $m$  other nodes in the ring (Fig. 1). The  $i$ th entry of node  $n$ 's *finger table* corresponds to the node that is the  $\text{successor}(n + 2^{i-1}) \bmod 2^m$ . Hash values are not perfectly distributed, it is possible to have duplicate entries in the *finger table*.

When a node  $n$  is told to find some key,  $n$  looks to see if the key is between  $n$  and  $\text{successor}(n)$  and return  $\text{successor}(n)$ 's information to the requester. If not, it looks for the entry in the finger table for the closest preceding node  $n'$  it knows and asks  $n'$  to find the successor. This allows each step to skip up to half the nodes in the network, giving a  $\log_2(n)$  lookup time. Because nodes can constantly join and leave the network, each entry in the table is periodically checked and updated.

To join the network, node  $n$  first asks  $n'$  to find  $\text{successor}(n)$  for it. Node  $n$  uses the information to set his successor, but the other nodes in the ring will not acknowledge  $n$ 's presence yet. Node  $n$  relies on the stabilize routine to fully integrate into the ring.

The stabilize routine helps the network integrate new nodes and route around nodes who have left the network. Each node periodically checks to see who their successor's predecessor is. In the case of a static network, this would be the checking node. However, if the checking node gets back a different node, it looks at that returned node's hash value and changes their successor if needed. Regardless of whether the checking node changes its successor, that node then notifies the (possibly) new successor, who then checks if he needs to change

his predecessor based on this new information. While complex, the stabilization process is no more expensive than a heartbeat function. A more concrete example:

Suppose Alice, Bob, Carol, and Dan are members of the ring and everyone happens to be ordered alphabetically (Fig. 2). Alice is quite sure that Carol is her successor. Alice asks Carol who her predecessor is and Carol says Bob is. Since Bob is closer than Carol, Alice changes her successor to Bob and notifies him.

When Bob sees that notification, he can see Alice is closer than whoever his previous predecessor is and sets Alice to be his predecessor. During the next stabilization cycle, Alice will see that she is still Bob's predecessor and notify him that she's still there (Fig. 3).

To prevent loss of data due to churn, each node sends a backup of their data to their successor. The specifics of how this is implemented for ChordReduce and expanded upon to backing up Map and Reduce tasks is discussed in Section IV.

### B. MapReduce and Hadoop

At its core, MapReduce [1] is a system for division of labor, providing a layer of separation between the programmer and the more complicated parts of parallel processing. The programmer sends a large task to a master node, who then divides that task among slave nodes (which may further divide the task). This task has two distinct parts: Map and Reduce. Map performs some operation on a set of data and then produces a result for each Map operation. This resulting data can then be reduced, combining these sets of results into a set, which is further combined with other sets. This process continues until one set of data remains.

The classic example given for MapReduce is counting the occurrence of each word in a collection of documents. The master node splits up the documents into multiple chunks and sends them off to workers. Each worker then goes through each chunk and creates a small word frequency list. These lists are then used by other workers, who combine them into larger and larger lists, until the master node is left with a word frequency list of all the words in the documents.

One very popular open-source implementation of MapReduce is Apache's Hadoop [2]. Hadoop serves as both a distributed file system and framework for MapReduce [6]. However, Hadoop's MapReduce framework is very strongly tied to the Hadoop Distributed File System (HDFS) and the hierarchy of servers that is used by it. Hadoop is centralized around the NameNode. The NameNode's job is to organize and distribute information to the slave nodes, called DataNodes. This makes the NameNode a single point of failure [6] in the network, as well as a potential bottleneck for the system [7].

To do work on Hadoop, the user stores their data on the network. This is handled by the NameNode, which equally apportions the data among the DataNodes. When a user wants to run some analysis on the data or some subset the data, then that function is sent by the NameNode to each of the DataNodes that is responsible for the indicated data. After the

DataNode finishes processing, the result is sent handled by yet another node called a Reducer.

## III. RELATED WORK

We have identified two papers that focus on combining P2P concepts with MapReduce. Both papers are similar to our research, but differ in crucial ways.

### A. P2P-MapReduce

Marozzo et al. [8] investigated the issue of fault tolerance in centralized MapReduce architectures such as Hadoop. They focused on creating a new P2P based MapReduce architecture built on JXTA [9] called P2P-MapReduce. P2P-MapReduce is designed to be more robust at handling node and job failures during execution.

Rather than use a single master node, P2P-MapReduce employs multiple master nodes, each responsible for some job. If one of those master nodes fails, another will be ready as a backup to take its place and manage the slave nodes assigned to that job. This avoids the single point of failure that Hadoop is vulnerable to. Failures of the slave nodes are handled by the master node responsible for it.

Experimental results were gathered via simulation and compared P2P-MapReduce to a centralized framework. Their results showed that while P2P-MapReduce generated an order of magnitude more messages than a centralized approach, the difference rapidly began to shrink at higher rates of churn. However, when looking at actual amounts of data being passed around the network, the bandwidth required by the centralized approach greatly increased as a function of churn, while the distributed approach again remained relatively static in terms of increased bandwidth usage.

They concluded that P2P-MapReduce would, in general, use more network resources than a centralized approach. However, this was an acceptable cost as the P2P-MapReduce would lose less time from node and job failures [8].

While P2P-MapReduce is decentralized, it still relies on a very definite master/slave hierarchy for organization and computations and to scale to large sizes. During simulation, 1% of the entire network were assigned as master nodes. This means for a simulation of 40000 nodes, 400 were required to organize and coordinate jobs and unable to do any processing themselves. In addition, loosely-consistent DHT such as JXTA can be much slower and fails to maintain the same level of guarantees of an actual DHT, such as Chord [10].

### B. MapReduce using Symphony

Lee et al.'s work [11], draws attention to the fact that a P2P network can be much more than a way to distribute files and demonstrates how to accomplish different tasks using Map and Reduce functions. Rather than using Chord, Lee et al. used Symphony [12], another DHT protocol with a ring topology. To run a MapReduce job over the Symphony ring, a node is selected by the user to effectively act as the master. This ad-hoc master then performs a bounded broadcast over a subsection the ring. Each node repeats this broadcasts over a

subsection of that subsection, resulting in a tree with the first node at the top. Map tasks are disseminated evenly throughout the tree and their results are reduced on the way back up to the ad-hoc master node. This allows the ring to disseminate Map and Reduce tasks without the need for a coordinator responsible for distributing these tasks and keeping track of them, unlike Hadoop.

Their experimental results showed that the latency experienced by a centralized configuration is similar to the latency experienced in a completely distributed framework. However, there are no mechanisms in place to handle churn in the network. If a node joins during a MapReduce job, it will be unable to contribute any of its resources to the problem. If a node in the bounded broadcast tree fails, or worse the master node fails, the data that node is responsible for is lost.

#### IV. CHORDREDUCE

Marozzo et al. [8] shows that adding additional fault-tolerance features to a MapReduce architecture is worth the added cost of maintenance, as the time lost due to node failures is greatly reduced. However, Marozzo et al. do not explore the benefits of leveraging the properties of a P2P protocol to reduce the complexity of the architecture and completely distribute the responsibility of the task across the network. As a result, P2P-MapReduce still relies on a ratio of masters to slaves to coordinate and organize the network, meaning a percentage of the network is unable to contribute processing power to the actual solving of a problem.

Lee et al. [11] explores the benefits of building a MapReduce module to run on top of Symphony [12], a P2P protocol. Unlike Hadoop, this allows the MapReduce tasks to be executed without the need of a central source of coordination by distributing tasks over a bounded broadcast tree created at runtime. The MapReduce architecture is constructed at runtime, via bounded broadcast. Despite these benefits, the Symphony based MapReduce architecture would be greatly improved by the addition of components to handle the failure of nodes during execution. As it stands now, if a node crashes the job will fail due to the loss of data.

While both of these papers have promising results and confirm the capability of our own framework, both solely look at P2P networks for the purpose of routing data and organizing the network, rather than as a means of efficiently distributing responsibility throughout the network and using existing features to add robustness to nodes working on Map and Reduce tasks.

ChordReduce uses Chord to act as a completely distributed topology for MapReduce, negating the need to assign any explicit roles to nodes or have a scheduler or coordinator. ChordReduce does not need to assign specific nodes the task of backing up work; nodes backup their tasks using the same process that would be used for any other data being sent around the ring. Finally results work their way back to a specified hash address, rather than a specific hash node, eliminating any single point of failure in the network. The

result is a simple, distributed, and highly robust architecture for MapReduce.

##### A. Handling Node Failures in Chord

When a node  $n$  changes his successor,  $n$  asks if the successor is holding any data  $n$  should be responsible for. The successor looks at all the data  $n$  is responsible for and sends it to  $n$ . The successor does not have to delete this data. In fact, keeping this data as a backup is beneficial to the network as a whole, as  $n$  could decide to leave the network at any point.

Due to the potentially volatile nature of a peer-to-peer network, Chord has to be able to handle (or at the very least, tolerate) an arbitrary amount of churn. Section II described how Chord gradually guides nodes into their correct locations after they join the network. The same is true for when a node leaves the network; the stabilize procedure will guide nodes to their correct successors and predecessors. However, we can exert more control over how to handle nodes leaving the network

Chord specifies two ways a node can leave the ring. A node can either suddenly drop out of existence, or a node can tell the network he is about to leave, letting his successor and predecessor immediately perform the needed changes.

When a node politely quits, he informs both his successor and predecessor and gives them all the information they need to fill the gap that would be left over. He also sends all of the data he is responsible for to his successor, who would become responsible for that data when that node left. Fingers that pointed to that node would be corrected during the finger maintenance period. This allows for the network to adjust to the change with a minimum of overhead.

It is unlikely that every time a node leaves the network, it will do so politely. If a node suddenly quits, the data it had stored is lost. To prevent data from becoming irretrievable, a node periodically sends backups to its successor. In order to prevent a cascade of backups of backups, the node only passes along what it considers itself responsible for. What a node is responsible for changes as nodes enter and leave the network. If a node's successor leaves, the node sends a backup to his new successor.

Our prototype framework does not implement a polite disconnect; when a node quits, it does so quickly and abruptly. This design ensures that the system would be able to handle churn under the worst of cases. Polite quit could be implemented quite easily.

##### B. Implementation

ChordReduce is a fully functional Chord implementation in Python. Our installation was designed to be as simple as possible. It consists of downloading our code [13] and running `chord.py`. You can specify a port and IP of a node in the ring you want to join. With this minimal information, the node will automatically integrate into the ring. Other than a hashing library, we wrote the protocol and networking code from scratch. The ring as implemented is stable and well organized. We created various services to run on top the network, such



Fig. 4: The basic architecture of a node in ChordReduce. MapReduce runs as a service on top of each node.

as a file system. Our file system is capable of storing whole files or splitting the file up among multiple nodes the ring. Our MapReduce module is a service that runs on top of our Chord implementation, just like our the service (Fig. 4). We avoided any complicated additions to the Chord architecture; instead we used the protocol’s properties to create the features we desired in our MapReduce framework.

In our implementation of MapReduce, each node takes on responsibilities of both a worker and master, much in the same way that a node in a P2P file-sharing service will act as both a client and a server. Jobs still must start from a single location. To start a job, the user contacts a node at specified hash address and provides it with the tasks and data. The node at this hash address is designated the stager.

The job of this stager is to take the work and divide it into *data atoms*, which are the smallest individual units that work can be done on. This might be a line of text in a document, the result of a summation for a particular intermediate value, or a subset of items to be sorted. The specifics of how to divide the work are defined by the user in a *stage* function. These data atoms are then given a random hash and sent to that hash address, guaranteeing an even distribution of the data atoms throughout the network. The data atoms also contain the Map function and Reduce function, as defined by the user. A job ID is also included, so that data atoms from different jobs can be differentiated. Once the data atoms are sent out, the stager’s job is done and it behaves like any other node in the network. The staging period is the only time ChordReduce is vulnerable to churn, and only if the stager leaves the ring in the middle of sending out data atoms. The user would still get results back, but only for the data the stager managed to send out.

Nodes that receive data atoms apply the Map function to the data to create result data atoms, which are then sent back to the stager’s hash address (or some other user defined address). Traveling using Chord’s fingers, this will take  $\log n$  hops. At each hop, the node waits a predetermined minimal amount of

time to accumulate additional results (In our experiments, this was .1 seconds).

Nodes that receive at least two results merge them into result using the Reduce function. The results are continually merged until only one remains at the hash address of the stager.

Once the reductions are finished, the user retrieves his results from the node at the stager’s address. This may not be the stager himself, as the stager may no longer be in the network. The stager does not need to collect the results himself, since the work is sent to the stager’s hash address, rather than the stager itself. Thus, the stager could quit the network after staging, and both the user and the network would be unaffected by the change.

Similar precautions are taken for nodes working on Map and Reduce tasks. Those tasks get backed up by a node’s successor, who will run the task if the node leaves before finishing its work (e.g. the successor loses his predecessor). The task is given a timeout by the node. If the backup node detects that the responsible node has failed, he starts work and backs up again to his successor. Otherwise, the data is tossed away once the data expires. This is done to prevent a job being submitted twice if  $n$  goes down after finishing his task and sending it out.

An advantage of our system is the ease of development and deployment. The developer does not need to worry about distributing work evenly, nor does he have to worry about any node in the network going down. The underlying Chord ring handles that automatically. If a node joins the ring as the MapReduce process is running, that node can be assigned work automatically. The stager does not need to keep track of the status of the network. If a node goes down while performing an operation, his successor takes over for him. If the user finds they need additional processing power during runtime, they can boot up additional nodes, which would automatically be assigned work based on their hash value. This makes the system extremely robust during runtime.

All a developer needs to do is write three functions: the staging function, Map, and Reduce. These define how to split up the work into manageable portions, the work to be performed on each portion to get some results, and how to combine these results into a single result, respectively.

## V. EXPERIMENTS

In order for ChordReduce to be a viable framework, we had to show these three properties:

- 1) ChordReduce provides significant speedup during a distributed job.
- 2) ChordReduce scales.
- 3) ChordReduce handles churn during execution.

Speedup can be demonstrated by showing that a distributed job is generally performed more quickly than the same job handled by a single worker. More formally we need to establish that  $\exists n$  such that  $T_n < T_1$ , where  $T_n$  is the amount of time it takes for  $n$  nodes to finish the job.

To establish scalability, we need to show that the cost of distributing the work grows logarithmically with the number




Fig. 5: The “dartboard.” The computer throws a dart by choosing a random  $x$  and  $y$ . If  $x^2 + y^2 < 1^2$ , the dart landed inside the circle.

of workers. In addition, we need to demonstrate that the larger the job is, the number of nodes we can have working on the problem, without the overhead incurring diminishing returns, increases. This can be stated as

$$T_n = \frac{T_1}{n} + k \cdot \log_2(n)$$

where  $\frac{T_1}{n}$  is the amount of time the job would take when distributed in an ideal universe and  $k \cdot \log_2(n)$  is network induced overhead,  $k$  being an unknown constant dependent on network latency and available processing power.

Finally, to demonstrate robustness, we need to show that ChordReduce can handle arbitrary node failure in the ring and that such failures minimally impair the overall speed of the network.

#### A. Setup

To stress test our framework, we ran a Monte-Carlo approximation of  $\pi$ . This process is largely analogous to having a square with the top-right quarter of a circle going through it (Fig. 5), and then throwing darts at random locations. Counting the ratio of darts that land inside the circle to the total number of throws gives us an approximation of  $\frac{\pi}{4}$ . The more darts thrown, i.e. the more samples that are taken, the more accurate the approximation<sup>1</sup>.

We chose this experiment for a number of reasons. The job is extremely easy to distribute. This also made it very easy to test scalability. By doubling the amount of samples, we can double the amount of work each node gets. We could also test the effectiveness of distributing the job among different numbers of workers.

Each Map job is defined by the number of throws the node must make and yields a result containing the total number of throws and the number of throws that landed inside the circular section. Reducing these results is then a matter of adding the respective fields together.

<sup>1</sup>This is not intended to be a particularly good approximate of  $\pi$ . Each digit of accuracy requires increasing the number of samples taken by an order of magnitude.




Fig. 6: For a sufficiently large job, it was almost always preferable to distribute it. When the job is too small, such as with the *small* data set, our runtime is dominated by the overhead. Our results are what we would expect when overhead grows logarithmically to the number of workers

We ran our experiments using Amazon’s Elastic Compute Cloud (EC2) service. Amazon EC2 allows users to purchase an arbitrary amount virtual machines by the hour. Each node was an individual EC2 small instance [14] with a preconfigured Ubuntu 12.04 image. These instances were capable enough to provide constant computation, but still weak enough that they would be overwhelmed by traffic on occasions, creating a constant churn effect in the ring.

Once started, nodes pull the latest version of the code and run it as a service, automatically joining the network. We can choose any arbitrary node as the stager and tell it to run the MapReduce process. We found that the network was robust enough that we could take a node we wanted to be the stager out of the network, modify its MapReduce test code, have it rejoin the network, and then run the new code without any problems. Since only the stager has to know how to create the Map tasks, the other nodes do not have to be updated and execute the tasks they are given.

We ran our experiments on groups of 1, 10, 20, 30, and 40 workers, which generated a *med* sample set and a *large* sample set. Additionally, we gathered data on a *small* sample set using 1, 5, 10, 20, 30 nodes. To test churn, we ran an experiment where each node had an equal chance of leaving and joining the network and varied the level of over multiple runs.

We also utilized a subroutine we wrote called *plot*, which sends a message sequentially around the ring to establish how many members there are. If *plot* failed to return in under a second, then the ring was experiencing structural instability.

#### B. Results

Fig. 6 and Fig. 7 summarize the experimental results of job duration and speedup. Our default series was the *med*






Fig. 7: The larger the size of the job, the greater the gains of distributing with ChordReduce. In addition, the larger the job, the more workers can be added before we start seeing diminishing returns. This demonstrates that ChordReduce is scalable.

samples series. On average, it took a single node 431 seconds, or approximately 7 minutes, to generate *med* samples. Generating the same number of samples in using MapReduce with 10, 20, 30, or 40 nodes was always quicker. Notice that the samples were generated fastest when there were 20 workers, with a speedup factor of 4.96, while increasing the number of workers to 30 yielded a speedup of only 4.03. At 30 nodes, the gains of distributing the work were present, but the cost of overhead ( $k \cdot \log_2(n)$ ) had more of an impact. This effect is more pronounced at 40 workers, with a speedup of 2.25.

Since our data showed that approximating  $\pi$  on one node with *med* samples took approximately 7 minutes, collecting *large* samples on a single node would take 70 minutes at minimum. Fig. 7 shows that the *large* set gained greater benefit from being distributed than the *med* set, with the speedup factor at 20 workers being 9.07 compared to 4.03. In addition, the gains of distributing work further increased at 30 workers and only began to decay at 40 workers, compared with the *med* data set, which began its drop off at 30 workers. This behavior demonstrates that the larger the job being distributed, the greater the gains of distributing the work among many nodes using ChordReduce.

The *small* sample set confirms that the network overhead is logarithmic. At that job size, the job is too small to be effectively run concurrently and we start seeing overhead acting as the dominant factor in our dataset. This matches the behavior predicted by our equation,  $T_n = \frac{T_1}{n} + k \cdot \log_2(n)$ . For a small  $T_1$ ,  $\frac{T_1}{n}$  approaches 0 as  $n$  gets larger, while  $k \cdot \log_2(n)$ , our overhead, dominates the sample. The samples from our dataset fit the curve  $k \cdot \log_2(n)$ , establishing that our overhead is increases logarithmically with the number of workers.

Since we have now established that  $T_n = \frac{T_1}{n} + k \cdot \log_2(n)$ , we can estimate how long a job that takes an arbitrary amount




Fig. 8: The projected runtime for different sized jobs using ChordReduce. Each curve projects the behavior you would see if a job that takes a single worker the specified amount of time.




Fig. 9: The projected speedup for different sized jobs.

of time to run on a single node would take using ChordReduce. Our data points indicated that the mean value of  $k$  was 36.5. The execution time is shown in Fig. 8 and the corresponding speedup in Fig. 9. Our data shows that the larger the job, the closer our speedup is to linear. Fig. 8 shows that for jobs that would take more than  $10^4$  seconds for single worker to complete, we can expect there would still be benefit to adding an additional worker, even when there are already 5000 workers already in the ring. Fig. 9 further emphasizes this. Note that as the jobs become larger, the expected speedup from ChordReduce becomes closer and closer to linear.

Table I shows the experimental results for different rates of churn. The system is relatively insensitive to churn. 40 nodes were put in a ring and generated *med* samples at different rates of churn, as specified in Table I. At 0.8% rate of churn, there

Churn rate per second	Average Runtime	Speedup vs no churn
0.8%	191.25	2.15
0.4%	329.20	1.25
0.025%	431.86	0.95
0.00775%	445.47	0.92
0.00250%	331.80	1.24
0%	441.57	1.00

TABLE I

is a 0.8% chance each second that any given node will leave the network followed by another node joining the network at a different location. The joining rate and leaving rate being identical is not an unusual assumption to make [8] [15].

Our testing rates for churn are an order of magnitude higher than the rates used in the P2P-MapReduce simulation [8]. We chose these rates to demonstrate that ChordReduce could effectively handle this higher level of churn.

Our experiments show that for a given problem, ChordReduce can effectively distribute the problem, yielding a substantial speedup. Furthermore, our results showed that the larger the problem is, the more workers could be added before diminishing returns were incurred. During run time, we experienced multiple instances where plot would fail to run and the stager would report socket errors, indicating that it had lost connection with a node in the ring. Despite this turbulence, the nodes all managed to reestablish connection with each other and report back all the data. This demonstrated that we were able to handle the churn in the network.

## VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We presented ChordReduce, a framework for MapReduce that is completely decentralized, scalable, load balancing, and highly tolerant to churn and node failure at any point in the network. We implemented a fully functional version of ChordReduce and performed detailed experiments to test its performance. These experiments confirmed that ChordReduce is robust and effective. ChordReduce is based on Chord, which is traditionally viewed as a P2P framework for distributing and sharing files, can be used as a platform for distributed computation. Chord provides  $\log(n)$  connectivity throughout network and has built in mechanisms for handling backup, automatically assigning responsibility, routing, and load balancing.

Using Chord as the middleware for ChordReduce establishes its effectiveness for distributed and concurrent computation. The effectiveness of Chord opens up new approaches for tackling other distributed problems, such as supporting databases and machine learning for Big Data, and exoscale computations. We intend to further optimize the performance of ChordReduce and extend the middleware to other applications.

TODO:

- 1) Results
- 2) Fix figure captions
- 3) Go thru Dr. Anu's comments again
- 4) new citation for hadoop-bottle

- 5) check over the paragraph below table 1 beginning with: "Our testing rates for churn are an order of magnitude higher than the rates used in the P2P-MapReduce simulation"
- 6) fix the beginning of section III related work "We have identified two papers that focus on combining P2P concepts with MapReduce. Both papers are similar to our research, but differ in crucial ways"

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Dean and S. Ghemawat, "Mapreduce: Simplified Data Processing on Large Clusters," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 107–113, 2008.
- [2] D. Borthakur, "The Hadoop Distributed File System: Architecture and Design," 2007.
- [3] I. Stoica, R. Morris, D. Karger, M. F. Kaashoek, and H. Balakrishnan, "Chord: A Scalable Peer-to-Peer Lookup Service for Internet Applications," *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.*, vol. 31, pp. 149–160, August 2001. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/964723.383071>
- [4] D. P. Anderson, "Boinc: A System for Public-Resource Computing and Storage," in *Grid Computing, 2004. Proceedings. Fifth IEEE/ACM International Workshop on*. IEEE, 2004, pp. 4–10.
- [5] A. L. Beberg, D. L. Ensign, G. Jayachandran, S. Khaliq, and V. S. Pande, "Folding@home: Lessons from Eight Years of Volunteer Distributed Computing," in *Parallel & Distributed Processing, 2009. IPDPS 2009. IEEE International Symposium on*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 1–8.
- [6] K. Shvachko, H. Kuang, S. Radia, and R. Chansler, "The Hadoop Distributed File System," in *Mass Storage Systems and Technologies (MSST), 2010 IEEE 26th Symposium on*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 1–10.
- [7] K. Shvachko, "Scalability of the Hadoop Distributed File System," <http://developer.yahoo.com/blogs/hadoop/scalability-hadoop-distributed-file-system-452.html>.
- [8] F. Marozzo, D. Talia, and P. Trunfio, "P2P-MapReduce: Parallel Data Processing in Dynamic Cloud Environments," *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, vol. 78, no. 5, pp. 1382–1402, 2012.
- [9] L. Gong, "JXTA: A Network Programming Environment," *Internet Computing, IEEE*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 88–95, 2001.
- [10] C. Nocentini, P. Crescenzi, and L. Lanzi, "Performance Evaluation of a Chord-Based JXTA Implementation," in *Advances in P2P Systems, 2009. AP2PS '09. First International Conference on*, 2009, pp. 7–12.
- [11] K. Lee, T. W. Choi, A. Ganguly, D. Wolinsky, P. Boykin, and R. Figueiredo, "Parallel Processing Framework on a P2P System Using Map and Reduce Primitives," in *Parallel and Distributed Processing Workshops and Phd Forum (IPDPSW), 2011 IEEE International Symposium on*, 2011, pp. 1602–1609.
- [12] G. S. Manku, M. Bawa, P. Raghavan *et al.*, "Symphony: Distributed Hashing in a Small World," in *USENIX Symposium on Internet Technologies and Systems*, 2003, p. 10.
- [13] A. Rosen, B. Benshoof, and M. Erwin, "ChordReduce," <https://github.com/BrendanBenshoof/ChordReduce-Experimental>.
- [14] Amazon.com, "Amazon EC2 Instances," <http://aws.amazon.com/ec2/instance-types>.
- [15] H. Shen and C.-Z. Xu, "Locality-Aware and Churn-Resilient Load-Balancing Algorithms in Structured Peer-to-Peer Networks," *Parallel and Distributed Systems, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 849–862, 2007.