Materializations

- In some cases it is possible to achieve a better performance via enforcing materializations of specific subselects
- An abstract example:

```
SELECT * FROM T1 JOIN T2 JOIN T3 JOIN T4 JOIN ...
```

- Assumptions:
 - (T2 JOIN T3 JOIN T4) has a small result set (e.g. due to strong local filter)
 - Optimizer is unable to evaluate (T2 JOIN T3 JOIN T4) first (e.g. OUTER JOIN)
- Pre calculation of (T2 JOIN T3 JOIN T4) by enforcing the materialization of it



• Example (Modified query 2 from Profiling exercise):

- Join order is predetermined due to an OUTER_JOIN:
 - SCAN MARKETS → LEFT JOIN SALES → JOIN SALES_POSITIONS
- SALES_DATE is a strong local filter ~20% → small result set
- Local filter is evaluated after the last join

EXASOL

```
SELECT ma.MARKET_ID, ma.CITY, max(amount) MAX_ARTICLES_SOLD,
    avg(amount) AVG_ARTICLES_SOLD

FROM MARKETS ma
-- left join to retrieve markets without SALES

LEFT JOIN SALES s
    ON ma.MARKET_ID = s.MARKET_ID

JOIN SALES_POSITIONS sp
    ON s.SALES_ID = sp.SALES_ID

WHERE s.SALES_DATE = date '2014-03-17' OR s.SALES_DATE IS NULL

GROUP BY ma.MARKET_ID, ma.CITY;
```

PART_NAME	PART_INFO	OBJECT_NAME	OBJECT_ROWS	OUT_ROWS	DURATION
COMPILE / EXECUTE					2.774
SCAN	on REPLICATED table	MARKETS	4,008	1,002	0.001
OUTER JOIN	GLOBAL	SALES	322,186,828	1,008,777	11.613
JOIN	GLOBAL	SALES_POSITIONS	3,381,550,778	10,596,570	0.285
GROUP BY	GLOBAL on TEMPORARY table	tmp_subselect0	0	1,002	0.312
E X ASOL				10	© 2016 EXASOL AG

Materializations

- Enforcing a materialization of the local SALES_DATE filter would lead to smaller intermediate results
- Fewer rows in the last join
 - ~322 million vs. ~1 million row
- Some statements require a materialized subselect
 - ORDER BY
 - ROWNUM
 - GROUP BY (outer more filters may be included)
 - DISTINCT (might be expensive)



Materialization of local filter on SALES:

- ORDER BY enforces the materialization of the subselect
 - Constant values in ORDER BY clause will avoid the sorting but enforces the materialization
 - Best practice: ORDER BY FALSE



P_NAME	P_INFO	O_NAME	OBJ_ROWS	OUT_ROWS	DURATION
COMPILE / EXECUTE					0.07
SCAN		SALES	322,186,828	1,008,777	0.04
INSERT	on TEMPORARY table	tmp_subselect1	0	1,008,777	0.02
INDEX CREATE	on TEMPORARY table	tmp_subselect1	1,008,777	1,008,777	0.03
SCAN	on REPLICATED table	MARKETS	4,008	1,002	0.00
OUTER JOIN	GLOBAL on TEMPORARY table	tmp_subselect1	1,008,777	1,008,777	0.00
JOIN	GLOBAL	SALES_POSITIONS	3,381,550,778	10,596,570	0.05
GROUP BY	GLOBAL on TEMPORARY table	tmp_subselect2	0	1,002	0.12

ORDER BY requires a materialized table.

After materialization the same join queue is used. But the materialized filter of SALES is used instead of SALES. This avoids a lot of network traffic.

- We replaced an expensive global join by a much cheaper local join
- Additional costs:
 - materialization
 - index creation on a temporary table
- Run time improvement dominates the additional costs
- Attention:

Example was executed in single user mode and the materialization was very small (400 MiB TEMP)



14 © 2016 EXASOL AG

In this case the materialization is very small. Therefor the created overhead is small, too. If a materialization is much bigger, more DBRAM is used to keep the temporary materialization.

It will be necessary to use more resources like NET (replication) and CPU (non persitent index creation), too.