DB 2

07 – Expression Evaluation

Summer 2022

Torsten Grust
Universität Tübingen, Germany

1 ¦ Q_6 — Expression Evaluation

For a large class of queries, the **CPU effort to evaluate (complex) expressions** may easily match the time spent for I/O and data access:

```
SELECT t.a * 3 - t.a * 2     AS a,
       t.a - power(10, t.c) AS diff,
       ceil(t.c / log(2))    AS bits
FROM   ternary AS t;
```

Iterate over rows `t`, access required fields (here: `t.a`, `t.c`), evaluate (multiple) expressions per row, construct resulting row.

Using EXPLAIN on Q_6



```
EXPLAIN VERBOSE
  SELECT t.a * 3 - t.a * 2    AS a,
         t.a - power(10, t.c) AS diff,
         ceil(t.c / log(2))   AS bits
  FROM   ternary AS t;
```

```
                                                                    QUERY PLAN
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 Seq Scan on public.ternary t  (cost=0.00..40.00 rows=1000 width=20)
   Output: ((a * 3) - (a * 2)),                                                                                              ←
           ((a)::double precision - power('10'::double precision, c)), ←
           ceil((c / '0.301029995663981'::double precision))                                                                 ←
```

- Expressions have been parenthesized, simplified, and annotated with type casts as required by SQL semantics.

Internal Representations of t.a * 3 – t.a * 2

- DBMSs—just like interpreters and compilers—**transform expressions into internal representations** that facilitate simplification and evaluation:



- Postorder traversal of expression tree to obtain a linearized “program”. Arg slots (•) or stack push/pop.

Threaded Interpretation



PostgreSQL implements a **threaded interpreter** over linearized expressions (middle column of previous slide):



- Note: ip: instruction pointer, opc: operation code.
- Relies on support for *computed goto* (e.g., common in C).

Expression Interpretation Overhead



Overhead of expression interpretation has been found to be **massive** in DBMS (cf. the threaded interpretation vs. machine code for `t.a * 2`).

- Field access and interpretation in *hot query code path*, rediscovers same row structure and follows same opcode pointers for every row processed. Wasteful.
- 💡 Invest in **just-in-time (JIT) compilation** of expression program into machine code once, benefit for all subsequent rows.
  - **NB.** LLVM-based support for JIT compilation of expressions has been added to PostgreSQL since v11.

JIT: Turn Run-time into Compile-time Decisions



- PostgreSQL's interpreter is very generic, prepared to handle corner cases, exceptions, and extensions. Leads to branch-heavy routines in the interpreter's hot code path.
- Expression compilation creates **query-specific code:**



- Access field *a* of a row.
- Interpreter follows **same code path** for all rows, possibly millions of times.
- Generate specific “*a* access code” along the ↘ path.

Expression Compilation: When (Not) to JIT?



- JITing involves code generation, optimization, IR emission (LLVM bitcode), and translation to native code.
- JIT effort adds to the query planning time. Be careful not to penalize queries Q that are cheap to begin with:

Assume runtime of query Q reduced by 20% due to JIT compilation:



2 ⋮ Q_6 — Column-Based Expression Evaluation

```
SELECT t.a * 3 - t.a * 2     AS a,
       t.a - power(10, t.c) AS diff,
       ceil(t.c / log(2))    AS bits
FROM   ternary AS t;
```

MonetDB compiles expressions into sequences of MAL operations. Like data processing, expression evaluation is column-oriented (as opposed to row-by-row).

- We will find that this vector-based evaluation mode fits modern CPU architecture particularly well.

Using EXPLAIN on Q_6



```
sql> EXPLAIN SELECT t.a * 3 - t.a * 2 AS a,
             ceil(t.c / log10(2)) AS bits
             FROM ternary AS t;
 ⋮
ternary :bat[:oid] := sql.tid(sql, "sys", "ternary");
c0      :bat[:dbl] := sql.bind(sql, "sys", "ternary", "c", 0:int);
c                  := algebra.projection(ternary, c0);
e1      :bat[:dbl] := batcalc./(c, 0.3010299956639812:dbl);
e2      :bat[:dbl] := batmath.ceil(e1);                  ← result column 'bits'
a0      :bat[:int] := sql.bind(sql, "sys", "ternary", "a", 0:int);
a                  := algebra.projection(ternary, a0);
e3      :bat[:lng] := batcalc.lng(a);                     ← cast to type lng
e4      :bat[:lng] := batcalc.*(e3, 3:bte);
e5      :bat[:lng] := batcalc.*(e3, 2:bte);
e6      :bat[:lng] := batcalc.-(e4, e5);                ← result column 'a'
 ⋮
```

- MAL ops batcalc.⊗ accept two BATs or one BAT + one scalar (like 2:bte, 3:bte, 0.301…:dbl ≡ log10(2)).

Column-Based "Zip" Semantics

Operators batcalc.⊗ merge the tails of two synchronized BATs using binary operator ⊗, yields a new BAT:

x

head	tail
0@0	x_0
1@0	x_1
2@0	nil
3@0	x_3

→

batcalc.-(x,y)

head	tail
0@0	$x_0 - y_0$
1@0	$x_1 - y_1$
2@0	nil
3@0	$x_3 - y_3$

←

y

head	tail
0@0	y_0
1@0	y_1
2@0	y_2
3@0	y_3

- batcalc.⊗ contains checks for arithmetic exceptions (overflow, divide by 0). Also: nil ⊗ x = x ⊗ nil = nil.

MAL: Sequential Execution vs. Data Flow



1. Order of assignment to temporary result BATs e_i follows postorder traversal of expression tree.
2. Spawn CPU threads to evaluate data-independent subexpressions in // (see MonetDB's dataflow optimizer).

batcalc.⊗: Column-Based Operator Implementations (1)



MonetDB supplies type- and ⊗-specific implementations of MAL operations (code generation via C preprocessor macros):

```
/* batcalc.-(left:bat[:lng], right:bat[:lng]):bat[:lng] */
                                          ↑

int i, j, k;
int nils = 0;

for (i = start, j = start*1, k = start; k < end; i += 1, j += 1, k += 1) {
  /* nil checking */
  if (is_lng_nil(left[i]) || is_lng_nil(right[j])) {
    result[k] = lng_nil;
    nils++;
  } else {
    /* omitted: overflow checking (abort on error or emit nil) */
    result[k] = left[i] - right[j];
  }
}
```

batcalc.⊗: Column-Based Operator Implementations (2)



MonetDB supplies type- and ⊗-specific implementations of MAL operations (code generation via C preprocessor macros):

```
/* batcalc.-(left:bat[:lng], right:lng):bat[:lng] */
                                          ↑

int i, j, k;
int nils = 0;

for (i = start, j = start*0, k = start; k < end; i += 1, j += 0, k += 1) {
  /* nil checking */
  if (is_lng_nil(left[i]) || is_lng_nil(right[j])) {
    result[k] = lng_nil;
    nils++;
  } else {
    /* omitted: overflow checking (abort on error or emit nil) */
    result[k] = left[i] - right[j];
  }
}
```

3 Column-Based Operators vs. Expression Interpretation

Expression evaluation through column-based operator and row-wise interpretation compared:

Column-Based (MonetDB)	Row-Wise (PostgreSQL)
zero degrees of freedom	variable-width rows w/ fields of various types
instruction locality	computed goto, long code paths
optimizable tight loops • loop pipelining • blocking • loop unrolling	complex control flow, code in many functions • unpredictable branches
data parallelism	focus on single row
full materialization	row-by-row result generation

- Compilers **optimize tight code loops** inside MAL operators.
- CPUs offer wide registers and instructions to exploit **data ∥ism** (SIMD: *single instruction*, *multiple data*).

Compiling Tight Loops (cf. MAL Operators)



Inspect Intel® x86 code generated by LLVM's C compiler clang for MonetDB's routine BATcalcsub (batcalc.-), simplified:

```
#define SIZE 1024

void BATcalcsub(int *left, int *right, int *result)
{
  int i, j, k;

  for (i = j = k = 0; k < SIZE; i += 1, j += 1, k += 1) {
      result[k] = left[i] - right[j];
  }
}
```

- Arrays left,right/result represent input/output BATs.

Assembly Code for Simple Tight Loop



Uses clang (options -O2 -fno-vectorize -fno-unroll-loops).

- Register assignment:
  left: %rdi, right: %rsi, result: %rdx, i/j/k: %rax

```
BATcalcsub:
  xorl %eax, %eax              # %rax ←₃₂ 0
loop:
  movl (%rdi,%rax,4), %ecx     # %ecx ←₃₂ mem[%rdi + %rax]
  subl (%rsi,%rax,4), %ecx     # %ecx ←₃₂ %ecx −₃₂ mem[%rsi + %rax]
  movl %ecx, (%rdx,%rax,4)     # mem[%rdx + %rax] ←₃₂ %ecx
  addq $1, %rax
  cmpq $1024, %rax             # 1024 loop iterations
  jne  loop                    # exit if %rax = 1024
  retq
```

- **NB.** One loop exit test per array element computed.

(Explicit) Loop Unrolling



- Manually perform **loop unrolling** to
  1. improve the ratio (*useful work*) / (*loop exit test*),
  2. expose independent work that may be executed in ∥:

```
void BATcalcsub(int *left, int *right, int *result)
{
  int i, j, k;

                                          ↓       ↓       ↓
  for (i = j = k = 0; k < SIZE; i += 4, j += 4, k += 4) {
      result[k  ] = left[i  ] - right[j  ];  ┐
      result[k+1] = left[i+1] - right[j+1];  } independent, execute in
      result[k+2] = left[i+2] - right[j+2];  │ any order or even in ∥
      result[k+3] = left[i+3] - right[j+3];  ┘
  }
}
```

- **NB.** Needs code to handle the case SIZE mod 4 ≠ 0.

Loop Unrolling



Compiler clang (options -O2 -fno-vectorize -funroll-loops) unrolls four loop iterations (easy for CPU to //ize):

```
BATcalcsub:
  xorl %eax, %eax               # i/j/k ←₃₂ 0
loop:
⎢ movl (%rdi,%rax,4), %ecx      # %ecx ←₃₂ left[i]
⎢ subl (%rsi,%rax,4), %ecx      # %ecx ←₃₂ %ecx -₃₂ right[j]
⎢ movl %ecx, (%rdx,%rax,4)      # result[k] ←₃₂ %ecx
⎢ movl 4(%rdi,%rax,4), %ecx     # %ecx ←₃₂ left[i+1]
⎢ subl 4(%rsi,%rax,4), %ecx     # %ecx ←₃₂ %ecx -₃₂ right[j+1]
⎢ movl %ecx, 4(%rdx,%rax,4)     # result[k+1] ←₃₂ %ecx
⎢ movl 8(%rdi,%rax,4), %ecx     # ⋮
⎢ subl 8(%rsi,%rax,4), %ecx
⎢ movl %ecx, 8(%rdx,%rax,4)
⎢ movl 12(%rdi,%rax,4), %ecx
⎢ subl 12(%rsi,%rax,4), %ecx
⎢ movl %ecx, 12(%rdx,%rax,4)
⎢ addq $4, %rax                 # ⎫
⎢ cmpq $1024, %rax              # ⎬ 1024 / 4 = 256 loop iterations
⎣ jne  loop                     # exit if %rax = 1024
  retq
```

Data-Parallelism Through SIMD



- Read/compute/write four array elements (of width 4 × 32 bits = 128 bits) at a time in **data-parallel** fashion.
- Relies on SIMD register and instructions (e.g., Intel® SSE registers %xmm$_i$ and instruction **mov**e **d**ouble **q**uad word)

- ⚠ Requires care if
  - arrays result[] and left[]/right[] overlap in memory,
  - residual array elements (see) are to be processed.

Data-Parallelism Through SIMD (Array Overlap)



Compiler clang (options -O2 -fvectorize) uses SIMD registers and instructions.

- Extra prelude code checks for **array overlap.** If so, jumps to non-vectorized (yet unrolled) version of code.
- Declare function arguments via restrict to inform C compiler that arrays won't overlap:

```
void BATcalcsub(int *restrict left, …, int *restrict result)
{
  int i, j, k;
  ⋮
}
```

Data-Parallelism Through SIMD (Main Loop)



Process 16 elements per iteration (SIMD + 2 loops unrolled, assumes no overlap of arrays result[] and left[]/right[]):

```
  xorl %eax, %eax                          4 × 32 bits = 128 bits wide
loop:                                                 ‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾
  movdqu (%rdi,%rax,4), %xmm0      # %xmm0 ←128 left[i+0...i+3]
  movdqu 16(%rdi,%rax,4), %xmm1    # %xmm1 ←128 left[i+4...i+7]
  movdqu (%rsi,%rax,4), %xmm2      # %xmm2 ←128 right[i+0...i+3]
  psubd %xmm2, %xmm0               # %xmm0 ←128 %xmm0 −128 %xmm2
  movdqu 16(%rsi,%rax,4), %xmm2    # %xmm2 ←128 right[i+4...i+7]
  psubd %xmm2, %xmm1               # %xmm1 ←128 %xmm1 −128 %xmm2
  movdqu %xmm0, (%rdx,%rax,4)      # result[i+0...i+3] ←128 %xmm0                    loop #n
  movdqu %xmm1, 16(%rdx,%rax,4)    # result[i+4...i+7] ←128 %xmm1   ……….……
  movdqu 32(%rdi,%rax,4), %xmm0    # %xmm0 ←128 left[i+8 ...i+11]
  movdqu 48(%rdi,%rax,4), %xmm1    # %xmm1 ←128 left[i+12...i+15]                   loop #n+1
  movdqu 32(%rsi,%rax,4), %xmm2    # %xmm2 ←128 right[i+8...i+11]
  psubd %xmm2, %xmm0               # %xmm0 ←128 %xmm0 −128 %xmm2
  movdqu 48(%rsi,%rax,4), %xmm2    # %xmm2 ←128 right[i+12...i+15]
  psubd %xmm2, %xmm1               # %xmm1 ←128 %xmm1 −128 %xmm2
  movdqu %xmm0, 32(%rdx,%rax,4)    # result[i+8 ...i+11] ←128 %xmm0
  movdqu %xmm1, 48(%rdx,%rax,4)    # result[i+12...i+15] ←128 %xmm1
  addq $16, %rax                   # ⎫
  cmpq $1024, %rax                 # ⎬ 1024 / 16 = 64 iterations
  jne  loop                        # exit if %rax = 1024
  ⋮                                # (non-vectorized code not shown)
```