

If the size of tuples is not large or the  $1/P_f$  is too large, then there is no need to implement the SIMC indexing which may need to use more number of page reads when query and implementing.

And we can find that tuple SIMC need to compare most times but because it has more page utilization so it may use less page to read and write.

We can also find that if we use less query attributes in a query then bit-sliced Signatures will be more powerful than page signatures. However the numbers of space bit-sliced Signatures used is determined by expected number of tuples. So which means if the actual tuples is much smaller than expected ,then bit-sliced Signatures will use much more page write/read in sig page read part than others.

And also, if our query has many clear attributes than bit-sliced SIMC will not have much improvement..

Below are testing results.

For a database :create test 100000 8 10000

```
TOPVigossdeMacBook-Pro:9315ass2 topvigoss$ ./create test1 100000 8 10000
TOPVigossdeMacBook-Pro:9315ass2 topvigoss$ ./stats test1
Global Info:
Dynamic:
  #items: tuples: 0 tsigs: 0 psigs: 0 bsigs: 0
  #pages: tuples: 1 tsigs: 1 psigs: 1 bsigs: 1
Static:
  tups #attrs: 8 size: 70 bytes max/page: 58
  sigs bits/attr: 13
  tsigs size: 160 bits (20 bytes) max/page: 204
  psigs size: 8896 bits (1112 bytes) max/page: 3
  bsigs size: 1728 bits (216 bytes) max/page: 18
TOPVigossdeMacBook-Pro:9315ass2 topvigoss$
```

After insert 100000 tuples.

We can see the states of this databases.

```
TOPVigossdeMacBook-Pro:9315ass2 topvigoss$ ./stats test
Global Info:
Dynamic:
  #items: tuples: 100000 tsigs: 100000 psigs: 1725 bsigs: 8896
  #pages: tuples: 1725 tsigs: 491 psigs: 575 bsigs: 495
Static:
  tups #attrs: 8 size: 70 bytes max/page: 58
  sigs bits/attr: 13
  tsigs size: 160 bits (20 bytes) max/page: 204
  psigs size: 8896 bits (1112 bytes) max/page: 3
  bsigs size: 1728 bits (216 bytes) max/page: 18
```

When search for open query:

No use SIMC:

```
Query Stats:
# signatures read: 0
# sig pages read: 0
# tuples examined: 100000
# data pages read: 1725
# false match pages: 0
```

Use tuple SIMC:

```
Query Stats:
# signatures read: 100000
# sig pages read: 491
# tuples examined: 100000
# data pages read: 1725
# false match pages: 0
TOPvigossdeMacBook-Pro:9315ass2 topvigoss$
```

Use page SIMC:

```
# signatures read: 1725
# sig pages read: 575
# tuples examined: 100000
# data pages read: 1725
# false match pages: 0
```

Use bit-sliced SIMC:

```
# signatures read: 0
# sig pages read: 0
# tuples examined: 100000
# data pages read: 1725
# false match pages: 0
TOPvigossdeMacBook-Pro:9315ass2 topvigoss$
```

This is because query(?,?,?) can not get a clear codeword so no signatures are used.

No use SIMC:

When use tuple SIMC:

When use page SIMC:

When use bit-sliced SIMC:

We can easily see that bit-sliced SIMC give a very good results with only  $12+1=13$  pages read.

When search for a query with many solutions:

No SIMC used:

```
Query Stats:
# signatures read:    0
# sig pages read:    0
# tuples examined:   100000
# data pages read:   1725
# false match pages: 1323
TOPvigossdeMacBook-Pro:9315ass2 topvigoss$
```

When tuple SIMC is used:

```
-----
Query Stats:
# signatures read:   100000
# sig pages read:    491
# tuples examined:   23896
# data pages read:   412
# false match pages: 10
TOPvigossdeMacBook-Pro:9315ass2 topvigoss$
```

When page SIMC is used:

```
Query Stats:
# signatures read:   1725
# sig pages read:    575
# tuples examined:   23316
# data pages read:   402
# false match pages: 0
TOPvigossdeMacBook-Pro:9315ass2 topvigoss$
```

When bit-sliced SIMC is used:

```
Query Stats:
# signatures read:    13
# sig pages read:     13
# tuples examined:   23316
# data pages read:   402
# false match pages: 0
TOPvigossdeMacBook-Pro:9315ass2 topvigoss$
```

No SIMC used:

Tuple SIMC used:

Page SIMC used:

[illegible]

[illegible]