5. Exercise

Timo Bergerbusch 344408 Thomas Näveke 311392 Shu Xing 381176

17.12.2017

Exercise 5.1

Important numbers:

B:
$$\frac{20\,000\,000\,\text{Records}}{40\,\frac{\text{Records}}{\text{Page}}} = 500\,000\,\text{Pages}$$

R: $40\frac{\text{Records}}{\text{Page}}$

1.a) $\sigma_{ID=500}$

Answer: Use path A3 for this Equality Selection.

Explanation:

Sorted: $Dlog_2B \approx 19D$

Clustered B^+ tree: $D(1 + log_G 0.15B)$

Hash index: 2D < 19D

If A2 is cheapest, then $D(1 + log_G 0.15B) < 2D \Rightarrow log_G 75000 < 1 \Rightarrow G > 75000$, unpractical!

1.b) $\sigma_{ID \neq 500}$

Answer: Use path A1 for this scan of relation

Explanation:

type	formula	cost
sorted		500000D
B^+ tree	0.15BD + 1.5BD	825000D
		20062500D

1.c) $\sigma_{ID>500 \land ID<1500}$

Answer: A2 for range selection

Explanation:

Sorted: $\overline{D(log_2B + \#matchingPages)}$

Clustered B^+ tree: $D(log_G 0.15B + \#matching Pages)$

Hash index: $BD = 500\,000D$, obviously larger than the other two.

If cost(A2) < cost(A1), then $log_G 0.15B$) $< log_2 B \approx 19 \Rightarrow G > 75\,000^{\frac{1}{19}} \approx 1.8 \Rightarrow G \geq 2$. So usually A2 is cheaper than A1.

2

Nest: 200 bytes/record, 200 tuples Egg: 10 bytes/record, 5000 tuples

EggInNest: 50 bytes/record, 100 000 tuples

2000 bytes/page, 7 buffer pages, cost(an index access)=2 I/Os

2.a)

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Nest: } \frac{2000bytes/page}{200bytes/record} = 10 \text{ records/page} \Rightarrow \frac{200records}{10records/page} = 20 \text{ pages} \\ &\text{Egg: } \frac{2000bytes/page}{10bytes/record} = 200 \text{ records/page} \Rightarrow \frac{5000records}{200records/page} = 25 \text{ pages} \\ &\text{EggInNest: } \frac{2000bytes/page}{50bytes/record} = 40 \text{ records/page} \Rightarrow \frac{100\,000records}{40records/page} = 2500 \text{ pages} \end{aligned}$$

2.b) i.

Costs for using block-nested loop join:

M=25 I/Os, N=2500I/Os, B=7

Costs=
$$M + \lceil \frac{M}{B-2} \rceil * N = 25 + \lceil \frac{25}{7-2} \rceil * 2500 = 12525 \text{ I/Os}$$

2.b) ii.

Costs for using index-nested loop join with a clustered hash index:

There exists a hash index on eid on Egg. \Rightarrow Loop of Egg is the inner loop.

M=2500 I/Os, N=25 I/Os

 $\label{eq:costs} \begin{aligned} &\text{Costs=}M + (tuplesOfOutLoop*CostOfFindingMatchingInnerTuples) = 2500 + 100\,000 \times \\ &2 = 202500 \text{ I/Os} \end{aligned}$

2.b) iii.

Both relations are sorted on join colum. \Rightarrow The Sort-Merge Join is the best with costs = M+N = 2500 + 25 = 2525 I/Os

Exercise 5.2

1.

Split the computing into two parts:

• Finding the first suitable records

- 1. through the stated average size and load we retrieve $0.15 \cdot B$ data entries
- 2. the height of such a tree then is given by $log_G 0.15 \cdot B$
- 3. Since every one has to be read we multiply it by D
- $\Rightarrow D \cdot (log_G 0.15 \cdot B)$
- find first following non-suitable record

We then continue reading the index structure until we encounter a record that is not suitable. Through the clustering we know that there are no suitable records following. So we read the number of suitable records = #matchingPages many records

- $\Rightarrow D \cdot \#matchingPages$
- $\Rightarrow D \cdot (log_G 0.15 \cdot B) + D \cdot \#matchingPages = D \cdot (log_G 0.15 \cdot B + \#matchingPages)$

2.

- read the page of the hash-group(bucket), which contains all entries that satisfy the equality $\Rightarrow D$
- identify and retrieve the data page containing the record $\Rightarrow D$

$$\Rightarrow D + D = 2D$$

3.

- the costs of finding the data entry $D \cdot (\log_G 0.15 \cdot B)$
- the costs of retrieving the data page containing the record D
- delete the record in data page and modify the index page, and write them out 2D
- $\Rightarrow D \cdot (\log_G 0.15 \cdot B) + D + 2D = D \cdot (3 + \log_G 0.15 \cdot B)$

Exercise 5.3

• Regarding Q1:

Equality Selection based on its primary key sno:

type	formula	cost
	$\frac{1}{2}BD$	500D
	$D \cdot \log_2 B$	9.97D
Clustered Tree Index	$D \cdot (1 + \log_G 0.15B)$	2.09D
Unclustered Tree Index	$D \cdot (1 + \log_G 0.15B)$	2.09D
Unclustered Hash Index		2D

 \Rightarrow for Q1 an unclustered hash index on sno would be the best option. A(n) (un)clustered tree index would only be very slightly less efficient.

• Regarding Q2:

Range Selection based on the salary:

Obviously a tree index is the most efficient for such queries. Also having a clustered tree index would be more efficient than an unclustered tree index, since otherwise <u>each</u> suitable

records would cost 1 page I/O. A clustered tree index can read the records continuously which results in less page I/Os.

So a clustered tree index would be the best choice, with the estimated costs are D(1.1 + #matchingPages).

• Regarding Q3:

In order to compute the aggregate, we can use a tree index with the search key (dno,marstat), then can do an index-only scan, with the estimated costs 150D.