

Efficient Renaming in Sequence CRDTs

Matthieu Nicolas
matthieu.nicolas@loria.fr
Université de Lorraine, CNRS, Inria,
LORIA, F-54500
Nancy, France

Gérald Oster
gerald.oster@loria.fr
Université de Lorraine, CNRS, Inria,
LORIA, F-54500
Nancy, France

Olivier Perrin
olivier.perrin@loria.fr
Université de Lorraine, CNRS, Inria,
LORIA, F-54500
Nancy, France

Abstract

Keywords CRDTs, real-time collaborative editing, eventual consistency, memory-wise optimisation, performance

1 Introduction

2 Background

2.1 LogootSplit

2.2 Limits

3 Overview

3.1 Proposed approach

We propose a new Sequence Conflict-free Replicated Data Type (CRDT) belonging to the variable-size identifiers approach : *RenamableLogootSplit* (RLS).

This new CRDT associates to LogootSplit a renaming mechanism. The goal of this mechanism is to overcome LogootSplit evergrowing memory overhead. To this end, the mechanism reassigns shorter identifiers to elements and aggregates them into fewer blocks in a fully distributed manner.

We describe the behavior of the mechanism in section 4.

3.2 System Model

TODO: Reprendre la description du system model de PaPoC – Matthieu

4 RenamableLogootSplit

4.1 rename operation

TODO: décrire le comportement de l'opération de renommage – Matthieu

TODO: diriger le lecteur vers le papier pour PaPoC pour la gestion des opés "simples" concurrentes – Matthieu

As no coordination is enforced between nodes, several of them may concurrently rename their respective states. However, the proposed *rename* operation is not commutative with itself. Applying concurrent *rename* operations in different orders to nodes, according to the order in which they each receive the operations, would result in diverging states. Nodes therefore encounter a conflict when dealing with several *rename* operations concurrently issued.

To ensure that they eventually converge, nodes have to solve this conflict. Notice that *rename* operations are system operations : they have no impact on the content of the document and have no user intention attached. Nodes may thus




Figure 1. Renaming the sequence on node A

solve the conflict by designating collegially one *rename* operation with which to proceed. We call the *rename* operation with which nodes continue the *primary* one. Others from the set of concurrent *rename* operations are called *secondary* ones.

In subsection 4.2, we present how nodes can select the *primary rename* operation from a set of *concurrent* ones in a coordination-free manner.

4.2 Breaking tie between concurrent rename operations

We define *priority*, a total order relation between epochs. This relation enables nodes to designate the *primary rename* operation from a set of concurrent ones, but also the current epoch from any set of *rename* operations.

To define the *priority* relation, we may actually choose different strategies. In this work, we use the lexicographical order on the epoch identifiers as the *priority* relation. An epoch identifier is obtained by concatenating the *node id* and *node sequence number* of the author of the *rename* operation to the current epoch identifier at the time.

Other strategies could be proposed to define the *priority* relation. For example, *priority* could rely on metrics embedded in *rename* operations representing the accumulated work

Algorithm 1 Rename identifier

function RENID(*id*, *renamedIds*, *nId*, *nSeq*)

- ▷ *id* is the identifier to rename
- ▷ *renamedIds* is the former state shared by the *rename* op
- ▷ *nId* is *node id* of the node which issued the *rename* op
- ▷ *nSeq* is *node seq* of the node which issued the *rename* op

length ← *renamedIds.length**firstId* ← *renamedIds*[0]*lastId* ← *renamedIds*[*length* − 1]*pos* ← *getPosition*(*firstId*)**if** *id* < *firstId* **then***newFirstId* ← *new Id*(*pos*, *nId*, *nSeq*, 0)**return** *renIdLessThanFirstId*(*id*, *firstId*, *newFirstId*)**else if** *id* ∈ *renamedIds* **then***index* ← *findIndex*(*id*, *renamedIds*)**return** *renIdFromIndex*(*pos*, *nId*, *nSeq*, *index*)**else if** *lastId* < *id* **then***newLastId* ← *new Id*(*pos*, *nId*, *nSeq*, *length* − 1)**return** *renIdGreaterThanLastId*(*id*, *lastId*, *newLastId*)**else****return** *renIdFromPredId*(*id*, *renamedIds*)**end if****end function****function** RENIDFROMPREDID(*id*, *renamedIds*)*index* ← *findIndexOfPred*(*id*, *renamedIds*)*predId* ← *renamedIds*[*index*]*newPredId* ← *new Id*(*pos*, *nId*, *nSeq*, *index*)**if** *predId.length* + 1 < *id.length* **then***prefix* ← *concat*(*predId*, *MIN_TUPLE*)*tail* ← *getTail*(*id*, *prefix.length*)**if** *isPrefix*(*prefix*, *id*) **and** *tail* < *predId* **then****return** *concat*(*newPredId*, *tail*)**end if****end if***succId* ← *renamedIds*[*index* + 1]**if** *succId.length* + 1 < *id.length* **then***offset* ← *getLastOffset*(*succId*) − 1*predOfSuccId* ← *createIdFromBase*(*succId*, *offset*)*prefix* ← *concat*(*predOfSuccId*, *MAX_TUPLE*)*tail* ← *getTail*(*id*, *prefix.length*)**if** *isPrefix*(*prefix*, *id*) **and** *succId* < *tail* **then****return** *concat*(*newPredId*, *tail*)**end if****end if****return** *concat*(*newPredId*, *id*)**end function**

on the document. This topic will be further discussed in subsection 6.2.

4.3 Applying *primary rename* operations

Upon the reception of a *rename* operation, nodes first have to determine if its introduce the new *primary* epoch. To do so, they compare their current epoch to the new one using the *priority* relation. If the new epoch is indeed the new *primary* one, nodes have then to determine if they applied concurrent and conflicting *rename* operations previously. To this end, nodes use the *epoch tree*.

Epochs are introduced by *rename* operations, themselves issued from given epochs. We can thus establish the *parent* relation between epochs. Using this relation, nodes are each able to build the *epoch tree*.

Using the *epoch tree*, nodes are able to determine if their current epoch is the *parent* of the new *primary* one. If that is not the case, it means that they applied one or several concurrent *rename* operations.

In order to switch to the new *primary* epoch, nodes first revert the effects of these concurrent *rename* operations. To establish which operations to revert, nodes identify the Lowest Common Ancestor (LCA) of their current epoch and of the new *primary* one.

4.4 Reverting *rename* operations

Nodes have to revert *rename* operations applied since the LCA epoch between their current epoch and the new primary one, in the reverse order. To do so, nodes use Algorithm 2.

The goals of Algorithm 2 are the following : (i) To revert identifiers generated causally before or concurrently to the reverted *rename* operation to their former value (ii) To assign new ids complying with the intended order to elements inserted causally after the reverted *rename* operation. The Figure 2 illustrates an example of its usage.

This example describes the following scenario : in Figure 2a, node A and node B concurrently issue *rename* operations. In Figure 2b, node A receives node B's *rename* operation. Upon its reception, node A compares its current epoch to the new epoch introduced. As $A < B$, node A deems this new epoch as the new primary one. To switch to this new *primary* epoch, node A has to revert the effect of its *rename* operation first.

To this end, node A uses Algorithm 2 to retrieve fitting counterparts for every identifiers of its current state.

TODO: expliquer que l'on peut simplement inverser le renommage pour les identifiants renommés à partir de leur offset, qui correspond en fait à leur index dans renamedIds – Matthieu

TODO: expliquer que pour les autres identifiants, on peut revert le renommage en retournant l'identifiant tronqué de son préfixe, si cela satisfait la relation d'ordre avec les identifiants prédécesseur et successeur – Matthieu

TODO: expliquer que si ce n'est pas le cas, a recours à des tuples réservés au mécanisme de renommage, MIN_TUPLE

Algorithm 2 Revert rename identifier

function REVRENID(id , $renamedIds$, nId , $nSeq$)
 ▶ id is the identifier to reverse rename
 ▶ $renamedIds$ is the former state shared by the *rename* op
 ▶ nId is node id of the node which issued the *rename* op
 ▶ $nSeq$ is node seq of the node which issued the *rename* op

$length \leftarrow renamedIds.length$
 $firstId \leftarrow renamedIds[0]$
 $lastId \leftarrow renamedIds[length - 1]$
 $pos \leftarrow getPosition(firstId)$

$predOfNewFirstId \leftarrow newId(pos, nId, nSeq, -1)$
 $newLastId \leftarrow newId(pos, nId, nSeq, length - 1)$


if $id < newFirstId$ **then**
 return $revRenIdLessThanNewFirstId(id, firstId, newFirstId)$
else if $isRenamedId(id, pos, nId, nSeq, length)$ **then**
 $index \leftarrow getFirstOffset(id)$
 return $renamedIds[index]$
else if $newLastId < id$ **then**
 return $revRenIdGreaterThanNewLastId(id, lastId)$
else
 $index \leftarrow getFirstOffset(id)$
 return $revRenIdFromPredId(id, renamedIds, index)$
end if
end function

function REVRENIDFROMPREDID(id , $renamedIds$, $index$)
 $predId \leftarrow renamedIds[index]$
 $succId \leftarrow renamedIds[index + 1]$
 $tail \leftarrow getTail(id, 1)$


if $tail < predId$ **then**
 return $concat(predId, MIN_TUPLE, tail)$
else if $succId < tail$ **then**
 $offset \leftarrow getLastOffset(succId) - 1$
 $predOfSuccId \leftarrow createIdFromBase(succId, offset)$
 return $concat(predOfSuccId, MAX_TUPLE, tail)$
else
 return $tail$
end if
end function

et MAX_TUPLE , pour maintenir l'ordre à travers les epochs – Matthieu


TODO: trouver comment illustrer les epochs, et notamment l'epoch courante, au niveau des représentations de la séquence répliquée de la Figure 2 – Matthieu



(a) Node A and node B generating concurrent *rename* operations



(b) Node A reverting the effect of the *rename* operation it applied upon the reception of a new *primary* one



(c) Node A then applying the *primary* *rename* operation on its reverted state

Figure 2. Applying *primary* *rename* operation on node A

4.5 Garbage collection of former states

- Nodes have to store epochs and corresponding *former states* to transform operations from concurrent or previous epochs to the current one
- Epochs and *former states* can thus be garbage collected once they are not needed anymore
- An epoch can be safely garbage collected once
 1. The given epoch e is a leaf and a concurrent and *primary* epoch e' is causally stable
 2. The given epoch e is the root of the epoch tree, has only one child e' and e' is causally stable

5 Evaluation

5.1 Simulations and benchmarks

TODO: Reprendre la description du scénario et de l'implémentation des benchmarks de PaPoC, en modifiant seulement la partie

concernant le bot qui effectue le renommage pour expliquer ici qu'on fait varier nbRenamingBots en fonction de la simulation – Matthieu

5.2 Results

Convergence

- Verified that nodes reach the same final state
- Did not spot any divergence in our results
- While it is an empirical result, not a proof...
- ... it provides some confidence in our algorithms





Figure 3. Evolution of the size of the document

Memory overhead


- Display in Figure 3 the evolution of the size of the document throughout its lifetime
- Compare the obtained results according to the number of *renaming bots*, i.e. the number of bots authorized to issue *rename* operations
- For each diagram, present 4 different data
- Blue dashed line represents the size of the content
- Red line represents the size of the LogootSplit document
- Green dashed-dotted line represents RenamableLogootSplit best-case scenario. In this scenario, nodes assume that *rename* operations become causally stable as soon as nodes received them. Nodes are able to garbage collect metadata introduced by the renaming mechanism, such as the *former states*, instantaneously
- Orange dotted line represents RenamableLogootSplit worst-case scenario. In this scenario, nodes assume that *rename* operations never become causally stable. Nodes have thus to store renaming mechanism metadata indefinitely
- Observe that RenamableLogootSplit is able to dispose of its overhead eventually, since overhead is garbage

collected as *rename* operations become causally stable. And this result is independent of the number of *renaming bots*.

- Observe that RenamableLogootSplit still outperforms LogootSplit in its worst-case scenario while the number *renaming bots* remains low (1 or 2). This result can be explained by the fact that the renaming mechanism enable us to scrap as well the overhead of the data structure used in LogootSplit to represents the sequence.
- But as the number of concurrent *rename* operations increases, the performances of RenamableLogootSplit decreases as the number of *former states* that nodes have to store to transform operations expand
- So a greater number of *renaming bots* may lead to a temporary expanded overhead, but which eventually subsides once causal stability is achieved.
- In subsection 6.1, we discuss that *former states* may be offloaded until causal stability is achieved to address the temporary memory overhead



(a) Local operations



(b) Remote operations

Figure 4. Integration time of standard operations

Integration times of standard operations

- In Figure 4, compare the evolution of integration time of respectively local and remote operations on LogootSplit and RenamableLogootSplit documents
- Orange boxplots correspond to times on LogootSplit documents while blue ones correspond to times on RenamableLogootSplit documents
- Observe that integration times are faster on RenamableLogootSplit, as *rename* operations improve the internal representation of the sequence
- In Figure 4b, also measure the integration times of remote operations from previous epochs, displayed in white, and of operations from concurrent epochs, displayed in red
- Observe a negligible overhead for operations from previous epochs compared to remote operations from the same epochs, as nodes have to rename them beforehand. But still outperforms LogootSplit
- Observe an additional overhead for operations from concurrent epochs, as nodes have to reverse the effect of the concurrent epoch first. Achieve performances comparable to LogootSplit ones in this worst-case scenario




Figure 5. Integration time of rename operations

Integration time of rename operation

- In figure Figure 5, display integration times of the different kinds of *rename* operations
- Main result is that *rename* operations are generally expensive compared to other operations. Local *rename* operations, in blue, takes hundred of milliseconds while remote ones, in orange, may reach seconds if delayed for too long. Should design the strategy to trigger *rename* operations according to this result to prevent a negative impact on the user experience
- Another interesting result is that, while *winning rename* operations are expensive to integrate, *losing* ones are cheap. Can thus significantly reduce computations

by integrating concurrent *rename* operations in correct order. Will discuss this topic in subsection 6.3

6 Discussion

6.1 Offloading on disk unused *former states*

- *Former states* are only needed to transform operations from previous or concurrent epochs
- May receive these kind of operations in 2 cases : *rename* operations are being issued or nodes (re)joined the collaboration
- Between these events, *former states* won't actually be needed
- Can offload *former states* on disk to reduce the memory overhead until causal stability is achieved, without impacting much performances

6.2 Designing more effective *priority* relation

- While simple and ensuring convergence, the *priority* relation designed and used in this paper introduces a significant computational overhead in some cases
- For example a single node, disjoined from the collaboration for a long time, may force every other nodes to revert *rename* operations they issued meanwhile because of its own primary *rename* operation
- Should define a *priority* which aims to reduce the global amount of computations of the system, while still ensuring convergence
- To this end, could integrate some metrics representing the work done beforehand in *rename* operations
- And build a new *priority* relation based on these metrics

6.3 Postponing transition to new epoch in case of high concurrency

- Primary remote *rename* operations are expensive to integrate as nodes have to browse and rename their whole current state in the process
- It can introduce a significant computational overhead in some cases
- For example a node may receive concurrent *rename* operations in the reverse order to the one set by the *priority* relation
- The node would then consider each operation as the primary one and rename its state in a successive manner
- On the other hand, secondary remote *rename* operations are cheap to integrate as nodes simply add to their state a reference to the corresponding *former state*
- To reduce the likelihood and the negative impact of the scenario described previously, we can decompose the integration of *rename* operations into two parts in case of concurrency detection

- Nodes first process *rename* operations as secondary ones. It enables nodes to integrate remote *insert* and *remove* operations, even from concurrent epochs, by transforming them
- Then once nodes obtain a given amount of confidence that one *rename* operation is the primary one, proceed to the renaming of their states
- This strategy introduces a slight overhead for each *insert* or *remove* operation received during this period, but reduces the probability of erroneously integrating *rename* operations as primary ones

7 Related work

7.1 The core-nebula approach

7.2 The LSEQ approach

8 Conclusions and future work

A Algorithms

Algorithm 3 Remaining functions to rename identifier

```

function RENIDFROMINDEX(pos, nId, nSeq, index)
  return newId(pos, nId, nSeq, index)
end function

function RENIDLESSTHANFIRSTID(id, firstId, newFirstId)
  offset  $\leftarrow$  getLastOffset(firstId) - 1
  predOfFirstId  $\leftarrow$  createIdFromBase(firstId, offset)
  prefix  $\leftarrow$  concat(predOfFirstId, MAX_TUPLE)
  predNewFirstId  $\leftarrow$  createIdFromBase(newFirstId, -1)
  if isPrefix(prefix, id) then
    tail  $\leftarrow$  getTail(id, prefix.length)
    return concat(predNewFirstId, tail)
  else if id < newFirstId then
    return id
  else
    return concat(predNewFirstId, id)
  end if
end function

function RENIDGREATERTHANLASTID(id, lastId, newLastId)
  prefix  $\leftarrow$  concat(lastId, MIN_TUPLE)
  if isPrefix(prefix, id) then
    tail  $\leftarrow$  getTail(id, prefix.length)
    return tail
  else if newLastId < id then
    return id
  else
     $\triangleright$  lastId < id < newLastId
    return concat(newLastId, id)
  end if
end function

```

Algorithm 4 Remaining functions to revert identifier renaming

```

function REVRENIDLESSTHANNEW-
  FIRSTID(id, firstId, newFirstId)
  predNewFirstId  $\leftarrow$  createIdFromBase(newFirstId, -1)
  if predNewFirstId < id then
    tail  $\leftarrow$  getTail(id, 1)
    if tail < firstId then
      return tail
    else
      offset  $\leftarrow$  getLastOffset(firstId)
      predFirstId  $\leftarrow$  createIdFromBase(firstId, offset)
      return concat(predFirstId, MAX_TUPLE, tail)
    end if
  else
    return id
  end if
end function

function REVRENIDGREATERTHANNEWLASTID(id, lastId)
  if id < lastId then
    return concat(lastId, MIN_TUPLE, id)
  else
    return id
  end if
end function

```

References