

# Lecture 14: Access Methods & Operators

# Pace & Lecture content

- We are slowing down:
  - In response to feedback from some that they like this pace better!
  - Due to **great** questions! *Makes us seriously happy!*
  - The details are more **fun!** *Makes one of us seriously happy.*
- We may cut some topics listed (maybe not).
  - We have a lot of (we think) good material ☹ but...
  - We'd prefer depth and happiness to breadth.
- Please refresh lectures before (changes are minor)
  - Cannot tell you how much time we spend tweaking... it's sad really...

# Project #2 Hint

- You may want to do *Trigger activity* for project 2.
  - We've noticed those who do it have less trouble with project!
  - Seems like we're good here ☺ Exciting for us!
- Definitely use piazza actively: students have been giving great answers
  - Hats are back ordered! (well not really)

# Today's Lecture

1. B+ Trees
2. Nested Loop Joins

# 1. B+ Trees


# What you will learn about in this section

1. B+ Trees: Basics
2. B+ Trees: Design & Cost
3. Clustered Indexes

# B+ Trees

- Search trees
  - B does not mean binary!
- Idea in B Trees:
  - make 1 node = 1 physical page
  - Balanced, height adjusted tree (not the B either)
- Idea in B+ Trees:
  - Make leaves into a linked list (for range queries)

# B+ Tree Basics




Parameter  $d$  = the degree

Each *non-leaf* (“interior”)  
*node* has  $\geq d$  and  $\leq 2d$  *keys*\*

\*except for root node, which can  
have between 2 and  $2d$  keys


# B+ Tree Basics



The  $n$  keys in a node define  $n+1$  ranges

# B+ Tree Basics


Non-leaf or *internal* node



For each range, in a *non-leaf* node, there is a **pointer** to another node with keys in that range


# B+ Tree Basics

Non-leaf or *internal* node



Leaf nodes also have between  $d$  and  $2d$  keys, and are different in that:


# B+ Tree Basics



Leaf nodes also have between  $d$  and  $2d$  keys, and are different in that:

Their key slots contain pointers to data records

# B+ Tree Basics




Leaf nodes also have between  $d$  and  $2d$  keys, and are different in that:

Their key slots contain pointers to data records

They contain a pointer to the next leaf node as well, *for faster sequential traversal*

# B+ Tree Basics



Note that the pointers at the leaf level will be to the actual data records (rows).

We might truncate these for simpler display (as before)...

# Some finer points of B+ Trees

# Searching a B+ Tree

- For exact key values:
  - Start at the root
  - Proceed down, to the leaf
- For range queries:
  - As above
  - *Then sequential traversal*

```
SELECT name  
FROM people  
WHERE age = 25
```

```
SELECT name  
FROM people  
WHERE 20 <= age  
      AND age <= 30
```

# B+ Tree Exact Search Animation


K = 30?

30 < 80

30 in [20,60)

30 in [30,40)

To the data!



# B+ Tree Range Search Animation


K in [30,85]?

30 < 80

30 in [20,60)

30 in [30,40)

To the data!



# B+ Tree Design

- How large is  $d$ ?
- Example:
  - Key size = 4 bytes
  - Pointer size = 8 bytes
  - Block size = 4096 bytes
- We want each *node* to fit on a single *block/page*
  - $2d \times 4 + (2d+1) \times 8 \leq 4096 \rightarrow d \leq 170$

NB: Oracle allows 64K blocks  
 $\rightarrow d \leq 2666$

# B+ Tree: High Fanout = Smaller & Lower IO

- As compared to e.g. binary search trees, B+ Trees have **high fanout** ( $= 2d$ )
- This means that the **depth of the tree is small** → getting to any element requires very few IO operations!
  - Also can often store most or all of the B+ Tree in main memory!
- A TiB =  $2^{40}$  Bytes. What is the height of a B+ Tree that indexes it (with 64K pages)?
  - $(2 * 2666)^h = 2^{40} \rightarrow h = 4$

The fanout is defined as the maximum number of pointers to child nodes per node

The known universe contains  $\sim 10^{80}$  particles... what is the height of a B+ Tree that indexes these?

# B+ Trees in Practice

- Typical order:  $d=100$ . Typical fill-factor: 67%.
  - average fanout = 133
- Typical capacities:
  - Height 4:  $133^4 = 312,900,700$  records
  - Height 3:  $133^3 = 2,352,637$  records
- Top levels of tree sit *in the buffer pool*:
  - Level 1 = 1 page = 8 Kbytes
  - Level 2 = 133 pages = 1 Mbyte
  - Level 3 = 17,689 pages = 133 MBytes

**Fill-factor** is the percent of available slots in the B+ Tree that are filled; is usually  $< 1$  to leave slack for (quicker) insertions

Typically, only pay for one IO!

# Simple Cost Model for Search

- Let:
  - $F$  = fanout
  - $N$  = the total number of records
  - $P$  = # of records per page
  - fill-factor = 2/3
    - $\rightarrow 1.5N$  is effective # of records B+ Tree needs to have room for
    - $\rightarrow 1.5N/P$  is effective # of **pages** B+ needs to have room for
      - Remember, disk access is by page!
  - $L_B$  = # of levels of the B+ Tree in main memory
- For exact search:  $\log_F \frac{1.5N}{P} - L_B + 1$

Only pay for reading from B+ Tree nodes on disk (plus reading the actual record *page*)

# Simple Cost Model for Search

- Let:
  - $F$  = fanout
  - $N$  = the total number of records
  - $P$  = # of records per page
  - fill-factor = 2/3
    - $\rightarrow 1.5N$  is effective # of records B+ Tree needs to have room for
    - $\rightarrow 1.5N/P$  is effective # of **pages** B+ needs to have room for
      - Remember, disk access is by page!
  - $L_B$  = # of levels of the B+ Tree in main memory
- For searching a range  $R$ :  $\log_F \frac{1.5N}{P} - L_B + R$

Only pay for reading from B+ Tree nodes on disk (plus reading the actual record *page*)

# Fast Insertions & Self-Balancing

- We won't go into specifics of B+ Tree insertion algorithm, but has several attractive qualities:
  - **~ Same cost as exact search**
  - ***Self-balancing:*** B+ Tree remains **balanced** (with respect to height) even after insert


B+ Trees also (relatively) fast for single insertions!

*However, can become bottleneck if many insertions (if fill-factor slack is used up...)*

# Clustered Indexes

An index is **clustered** if the underlying data is ordered in the same way as the index's data entries.


# Clustered vs. Unclustered Index



Index Entries

Data Records

Clustered



Unclustered

# Clustered vs. Unclustered Index

- Recall that for a disk with block access, **sequential IO is much faster than random IO**
- For exact search, no difference between clustered / unclustered
- For range search over R values: difference between **1 random IO + R sequential IO, and R random IO:**
  - A random IO costs ~ 10ms (sequential much much faster)
  - For R = 100,000 records- **difference between ~10ms and ~17min!**

## Summary [From Lecture 13 too...]

- We covered an algorithm + some optimizations for sorting larger-than-memory files efficiently
  - An *IO aware* algorithm!
- We create **indexes** over tables in order to support *fast (exact and range) search* and *insertion* over *multiple search keys*
- **B+ Trees** are one index data structure which support very fast exact and range search & insertion via *high fanout*
  - *Clustered vs. unclustered* makes a big difference for range queries too

## 2. Nested Loop Joins

# What you will learn about in this section

1. RECAP: Joins
2. Nested Loop Join (NLJ)
3. Block Nested Loop Join (BNLJ)
4. Index Nested Loop Join (INLJ)
5. ACTIVITY: Sequential Flooding

# RECAP: Joins

# Joins: Example


 $R \bowtie S$ 

```
SELECT R.A, B, C, D  
FROM   R, S  
WHERE  R.A = S.A
```

Example: Returns all pairs of tuples  $r \in R, s \in S$  such that  $r.A = s.A$

R	A	B	C
1	0	1	
2	3	4	
2	5	2	
3	1	1	

S	A	D
3	7	
2	2	
2	3	



A	B	C	D
2	3	4	2

# Joins: Example


 $R \bowtie S$ 

```
SELECT R.A, B, C, D  
FROM   R, S  
WHERE  R.A = S.A
```

Example: Returns all pairs of tuples  $r \in R, s \in S$  such that  $r.A = s.A$

R	A	B	C
1	0	1	
2	3	4	
2	5	2	
3	1	1	

S	A	D
3	7	
2	2	
2	3	



A	B	C	D
2	3	4	2
2	3	4	3

# Joins: Example


 $R \bowtie S$ 

```
SELECT R.A, B, C, D  
FROM   R, S  
WHERE  R.A = S.A
```

Example: Returns all pairs of tuples  $r \in R, s \in S$  such that  $r.A = s.A$

R	A	B	C
1	0	1	
2	3	4	
2	5	2	
3	1	1	

S	A	D
3	7	
2	2	
2	3	



	A	B	C	D
2	3	4	2	
2	3	4	3	
2	5	2	2	

# Joins: Example


 $R \bowtie S$ 

```
SELECT R.A, B, C, D  
FROM   R, S  
WHERE  R.A = S.A
```

Example: Returns all pairs of tuples  $r \in R, s \in S$  such that  $r.A = s.A$

R	A	B	C
1	0	1	
2	3	4	
2	5	2	
3	1	1	

S	A	D
3	7	
2	2	
2	3	



	A	B	C	D
2	3	4	2	
2	3	4	3	
2	5	2	2	
2	5	2	3	

# Joins: Example


 $R \bowtie S$ 

```
SELECT R.A, B, C, D  
FROM   R, S  
WHERE  R.A = S.A
```

Example: Returns all pairs of tuples  $r \in R, s \in S$  such that  $r.A = s.A$

R	A	B	C
1	0	1	
2	3	4	
2	5	2	
3	1	1	

S	A	D
3	7	
2	2	
2	3	




	A	B	C	D
2	3	4	2	
2	3	4	3	
2	5	2	2	
2	5	2	3	
3	1	1	7	

# Semantically: A Subset of the Cross Product

 $R \bowtie S$ 

```
SELECT R.A, B, C, D
FROM   R, S
WHERE  R.A = S.A
```

Example: Returns all pairs of tuples  $r \in R, s \in S$  such that  $r.A = s.A$



Can we actually implement a join in this way?

# Notes

- We write  $\mathbf{R} \bowtie \mathbf{S}$  to mean *join R and S by returning all tuple pairs where **all shared attributes** are equal*
- We write  $\mathbf{R} \bowtie \mathbf{S}$  **on A** to mean *join R and S by returning all tuple pairs where **attribute(s) A** are equal*
- For simplicity, we'll consider joins on **two tables** and with **equality constraints** ("equijoins")

However joins *can* merge > 2 tables, and some algorithms do support non-equality constraints!

# Nested Loop Joins

# Notes

- We are again considering “IO aware” algorithms:  
***care about disk IO***
- Given a relation R, let:
  - $T(R)$  = # of tuples in R
  - $P(R)$  = # of pages in R
- Note also that we omit ceilings in calculations...  
good exercise to put back in!

Recall that we read / write  
entire pages with disk IO

# Nested Loop Join (NLJ)

```
Compute  $R \bowtie S$  on  $A$ :  
for r in R:  
    for s in S:  
        if r[A] == s[A]:  
            yield (r,s)
```

# Nested Loop Join (NLJ)

Compute  $R \bowtie S$  on  $A$ :

```
for r in R:  
    for s in S:  
        if r[A] == s[A]:  
            yield (r,s)
```

Cost:

$P(R)$

**1. Loop over the tuples in  $R$**

Note that our IO cost is based on the number of *pages* loaded, not the number of tuples!

# Nested Loop Join (NLJ)

```
Compute  $R \bowtie S$  on  $A$ :  
for r in R:  
    for s in S:  
        if r[A] == s[A]:  
            yield (r,s)
```

Cost:

$$P(R) + T(R)*P(S)$$

1. Loop over the tuples in  $R$
2. For every tuple in  $R$ , loop over all the tuples in  $S$

Have to read *all of S* from disk for *every tuple in R!*

# Nested Loop Join (NLJ)

```
Compute  $R \bowtie S$  on  $A$ :  
for r in R:  
    for s in S:  
        if r[A] == s[A]:  
            yield (r,s)
```

Cost:

$$P(R) + T(R)*P(S)$$

1. Loop over the tuples in R
2. For every tuple in R, loop over all the tuples in S
- 3. Check against join conditions**

Note that NLJ can handle things other than equality constraints... just check in the *if* statement!

# Nested Loop Join (NLJ)

```
Compute  $R \bowtie S$  on  $A$ :  
for r in R:  
    for s in S:  
        if r[A] == s[A]:  
            yield (r, s)
```

What would  $OUT$  be if our join condition is trivial (if TRUE)?

$OUT$  could be bigger than  $P(R)*P(S)$ ... but usually not that bad

Cost:

$$P(R) + T(R)*P(S) + OUT$$

1. Loop over the tuples in R
2. For every tuple in R, loop over all the tuples in S
3. Check against join conditions
4. Write out (to page, then when page full, to disk)

# Nested Loop Join (NLJ)

```
Compute  $R \bowtie S$  on  $A$ :  
for r in R:  
    for s in S:  
        if r[A] == s[A]:  
            yield (r,s)
```

Cost:

$$P(R) + T(R)*P(S) + OUT$$

What if  $R$  ("outer") and  $S$  ("inner") switched?



$$P(S) + T(S)*P(R) + OUT$$

Outer vs. inner selection makes a huge difference-  
DBMS needs to know which relation is smaller!

# IO-Aware Approach

# Block Nested Loop Join (BNLJ)

Compute  $R \bowtie S$  on  $A$ :

```
for each  $B-1$  pages  $pr$  of  $R$ :  
    for page  $ps$  of  $S$ :  
        for each tuple  $r$  in  $pr$ :  
            for each tuple  $s$  in  $ps$ :  
                if  $r[A] == s[A]$ :  
                    yield  $(r, s)$ 
```

Given  $B+1$  pages of memory

Cost:

$P(R)$

1. Load in  $B-1$  pages of  $R$  at a time (leaving 1 page each free for  $S$  & output)

*Note: There could be some speedup here due to the fact that we're reading in multiple pages sequentially however we'll ignore this here!*

# Block Nested Loop Join (BNLJ)

Compute  $R \bowtie S$  on  $A$ :

for each  $B-1$  pages  $pr$  of  $R$ :

for page  $ps$  of  $S$ :

for each tuple  $r$  in  $pr$ :

for each tuple  $s$  in  $ps$ :

if  $r[A] == s[A]$ :

yield  $(r, s)$

Given  $B+1$  pages of memory

Cost:

$$P(R) + \frac{P(R)}{B - 1} P(S)$$

1. Load in  $B-1$  pages of  $R$  at a time (leaving 1 page each free for  $S$  & output)
2. **For each  $(B-1)$ -page segment of  $R$ , load each page of  $S$**

Note: Faster to iterate over the *smaller* relation first!

# Block Nested Loop Join (BNLJ)

Compute  $R \bowtie S$  on  $A$ :

```
for each  $B-1$  pages  $pr$  of  $R$ :
    for page  $ps$  of  $S$ :
        for each tuple  $r$  in  $pr$ :
            for each tuple  $s$  in  $ps$ :
                if  $r[A] == s[A]$ :
                    yield  $(r, s)$ 
```

Given  $B+1$  pages of memory

Cost:

$$P(R) + \frac{P(R)}{B - 1} P(S)$$

1. Load in  $B-1$  pages of  $R$  at a time (leaving 1 page each free for  $S$  & output)
2. For each  $(B-1)$ -page segment of  $R$ , load each page of  $S$
3. **Check against the join conditions**

BNLJ can also handle non-equality constraints

# Block Nested Loop Join (BNLJ)

Compute  $R \bowtie S$  on  $A$ :

```
for each  $B-1$  pages  $pr$  of  $R$ :
    for page  $ps$  of  $S$ :
        for each tuple  $r$  in  $pr$ :
            for each tuple  $s$  in  $ps$ :
                if  $r[A] == s[A]$ :
                    yield  $(r, s)$ 
```

Again,  $OUT$  could be bigger than  $P(R)*P(S)...$  but usually not that bad

Given  $B+1$  pages of memory

Cost:

$$P(R) + \frac{P(R)}{B-1} P(S) + OUT$$

1. Load in  $B-1$  pages of  $R$  at a time (leaving 1 page each free for  $S$  & output)
2. For each  $(B-1)$ -page segment of  $R$ , load each page of  $S$
3. Check against the join conditions
4. Write out

# BNLJ vs. NLJ: Benefits of IO Aware

- In BNLJ, by loading larger chunks of R, we minimize the number of full *disk reads* of S
  - We only read all of S from disk for ***every (B-1)-page segment of R!***
  - Still the full cross-product, but more done only *in memory*

NLJ

$$P(R) + T(R)*P(S) + OUT$$



BNLJ

$$P(R) + \frac{P(R)}{B-1} P(S) + OUT$$

BNLJ is faster by  $\frac{(B-1)T(R)}{P(R)}$  !

# BNLJ vs. NLJ: Benefits of IO Aware

- Example:
  - R: 500 pages
  - S: 1000 pages
  - 100 tuples / page
  - We have 12 pages of memory ( $B = 11$ )
- NLJ: Cost =  $500 + 50,000 * 1000 = 50 \text{ Million IOs} \approx \underline{140 \text{ hours}}$
- BNLJ: Cost =  $500 + \frac{500 * 1000}{10} = 50 \text{ Thousand IOs} \approx \underline{0.14 \text{ hours}}$

*Ignoring OUT here...*

A very real difference from a small  
change in the algorithm!

# Smarter than Cross-Products

# Smarter than Cross-Products: From Quadratic to Nearly Linear

- All joins that compute the ***full cross-product*** have some **quadratic** term

- For example we saw:

$$\text{NLJ } P(R) + \textcolor{red}{T(R)P(S)} + \text{OUT}$$

$$\text{BNLJ } P(R) + \frac{\textcolor{red}{P(R)}}{B-1} \textcolor{red}{P(S)} + \text{OUT}$$

- Now we'll see some (nearly) linear joins:
  - $\sim O(P(R) + P(S) + \text{OUT})$ , where again **OUT** could be quadratic but is usually better

We get this gain by ***taking advantage of structure***- moving to equality constraints (“equijoin”) only!

# Index Nested Loop Join (INLJ)

Cost:

Compute  $R \bowtie S$  on  $A$ :

Given index  $\text{idx}$  on  $S.A$ :

```
for r in R:  
    s in idx(r[A]):  
        yield r, s
```

$$P(R) + T(R)*L + OUT$$

where  $L$  is the IO cost to access all the distinct values in the index; assuming these fit on one page,  $L \sim 3$  is good est.

→ We can use an **index** (e.g. B+ Tree) to *avoid doing the full cross-product!*

[Activity-14.ipynb](#)

# Lecture 15: Joins- A Cage Match

# Today's Lecture

1. Sort-Merge Join (SMJ)
2. Hash Join (HJ)
3. The Cage Match: SMJ vs. HJ

# 1. Sort-Merge Join (SMJ)



# What you will learn about in this section

1. Sort-Merge Join
2. “Backup” & Total Cost
3. Optimizations

# Sort Merge Join (SMJ): Basic Procedure

To compute  $R \bowtie S$  on  $A$ :

1. Sort  $R, S$  on  $A$  using ***external merge sort***
2. ***Scan*** sorted files and “merge”
3. [May need to “backup”- see next subsection]


Note that we are only considering equality constraints here

Note that if  $R, S$  are already sorted on  $A$ , SMJ will be awesome!

# SMJ Example: $R \bowtie S$ on $A$ with 3 page buffer


- For simplicity: Let each page be **one tuple**, and let the first value be A

We show the file HEAD, which is the next value to be read!




# SMJ Example: $R \bowtie S$ on $A$ with 3 page buffer

1. Sort the relations  $R, S$  on the join key (first value)




# SMJ Example: $R \bowtie S$ on $A$ with 3 page buffer

2. Scan and “merge” on join key!




# SMJ Example: $R \bowtie S$ on $A$ with 3 page buffer

2. Scan and “merge” on join key!




# SMJ Example: $R \bowtie S$ on $A$ with 3 page buffer

2. Scan and “merge” on join key!



# SMJ Example: $R \bowtie S$ on $A$ with 3 page buffer


2. Done!



What happens with duplicate join keys?


# Multiple tuples with Same Join Key: “Backup”

1. Start with sorted relations, and begin scan / merge...




# Multiple tuples with Same Join Key: “Backup”

1. Start with sorted relations, and begin scan / merge...




# Multiple tuples with Same Join Key: “Backup”

1. Start with sorted relations, and begin scan / merge...



# Multiple tuples with Same Join Key: “Backup”

1. Start with sorted relations, and begin scan / merge...



# Backup

- At best, no backup → scan takes  $O(P(R) + P(S))$  reads
  - For ex: if no duplicate values in join attribute
- At worst (e.g. full backup each time), scan takes  $O(P(R) * P(S))$  reads
- Often not that bad, plus we can:
  - Leave more data in buffer (for larger buffers)
  - Can “zig-zag” (see animation)

# SMJ: Total cost

- Cost of SMJ is **cost of sorting R and S...**
- Plus the **cost of scanning**:  $\sim P(R) + P(S)$ 
  - Because of *backup*: in worst case  $P(R)*P(S)$ ; but this would be very unlikely
- Plus the **cost of writing out**:  $\sim P(R) + P(S)$  but in worst case  $> P(R)*P(S)$

$$\sim \text{Sort}(P(R)) + \text{Sort}(P(S)) + P(R) + P(S) + \text{OUT}$$

$$\text{Recall: Sort}(N) = 2N \left( \left\lceil \log_B \frac{N}{B+1} \right\rceil + 1 \right) \sim 6N$$

# SMJ vs. BNLJ: Steel Cage Match

- If we have 100 buffer pages,  $P(R) = 1000$  pages and  $P(S) = 500$  pages:
  - Sort both in two passes:  $2 * 2 * 1000 + 2 * 2 * 500 = \mathbf{6000 IOs}$
  - Merge phase  $1000 + 500 = 1500$  IOs
  - = 7500 IOs

What is BNLJ?

- $500 + 1000 * 500 / 99 = \mathbf{\underline{5550 IOs}}$
- But, if we have 35 buffer pages?
  - Sort Merge has same behavior (still 2 passes)
  - BNLJ?  $\sim \mathbf{\underline{15,000 IOs!}}$



SMJ is ~ linear vs. BNLJ is quadratic...

# A Simple Optimization: Merges Merged!


Given  $B+1$  buffer pages

- SMJ is composed of a ***sort phase*** and a ***merge phase***
- During the ***sort phase***, we run passes of external merge sort on R and S
  - Suppose at some point, R and S have  $\leq B$  (sorted) runs in total
    - We could do two  $B/2$ -way merges at this point, complete the sort phase, and start the merge phase...
    - OR, we could combine them: do one  $B$ -way merge and complete the join!

# Un-Optimized SMJ

Given  $B+1$  buffer pages

## Sort Phase (Ext. Merge Sort)



## Merge / Join Phase

Joined output  
file created!


# Simple SMJ Optimization

Given  $B+1$  buffer pages

Sort Phase  
(Ext. Merge Sort)

$\leq B$  total runs

Merge / Join Phase



Joined output  
file created!

# Simple SMJ Optimization

Given  $B+1$  buffer pages

- Now, on this last pass, we only do  $P(R) + P(S)$  IOs to complete the join!
- If we can initially split R and S into **B total runs each of length  $\leq B+1$** , then we only need  **$3(P(R) + P(S)) + OUT$**  for SMJ!
  - 2 R/W per page to sort runs in memory, 1 R per page to B-way merge / join!
- How much memory for this to happen?
  - $\frac{P(R)+P(S)}{2B} \leq B + 1 \Rightarrow \sim P(R) + P(S) \leq 2B^2 \Rightarrow \max\{P(R), P(S)\} \leq B^2$

If the larger of R,S has  $\leq B^2$  pages, then SMJ costs  
 **$3(P(R)+P(S)) + OUT$** !

# Takeaway points from SMJ

If input already sorted on join key, skip the sorts.

- SMJ is basically linear.
- Nasty but unlikely case: Many duplicate join keys.

SMJ needs to sort **both** relations

- If  $\max \{ P(R), P(S) \} < B^2$  then cost is  $3(P(R)+P(S)) + OUT$

# 4. Hash Join (HJ)



# What you will learn about in this section

1. Hash Join
2. Memory requirements

# Recall: Hashing

- **Magic of hashing:**
  - A hash function maps  $h_B$  maps into  $[0, B-1]$
  - And maps nearly uniformly
- A hash **collision** is when  $x \neq y$  but  $h_B(x) = h_B(y)$ 
  - Note however that it will never occur that  $x = y$  but  $h_B(x) \neq h_B(y)$
- We hash on an attribute  $A$ , so our hash function is  $h_B(t)$  has the form  $h_B(t.A)$ .
  - **Collisions** may be more frequent.

# Recall: Mad Hash Collisions



Say something here to justify this slide's existence? [TODO]

# Hash Join: High-level procedure

To compute  $R \bowtie S$  on  $A$ :


Note again that we are only considering equality constraints here

1. **Partition Phase:** Using one (shared) hash function  $h_B$ , partition  $R$  and  $S$  into  $B$  buckets
2. **Matching Phase:** Take pairs of buckets whose tuples have the same values for  $h$ , and join these
  1. Use BNLJ here; or hash again → either way, operating on small partitions so fast!

We *decompose* the problem using  $h_B$ , then complete the join


# Hash Join: High-level procedure

**1. Partition Phase:** Using one (shared) hash function  $h_B$ , partition R and S into  $B$  buckets




# Hash Join: High-level procedure

**2. Matching Phase:** Take pairs of buckets whose tuples have the same values for  $h_B$ , and join these



# Hash Join: High-level procedure

**2. Matching Phase:** Take pairs of buckets whose tuples have the same values for  $h_B$ , and join these



# Hash Join Phase 1: Partitioning

**Goal:** For each relation, partition relation into **buckets** such that if  $h_B(t.A) = h_B(t'.A)$  they are in the same bucket

Given  $B+1$  buffer pages, we partition into  $B$  buckets:

- We use  $B$  buffer pages for output (one for each bucket), and 1 for input
  - The “dual” of sorting.
  - For each tuple  $t$  in input, copy to buffer page for  $h_B(t.A)$
  - When page fills up, flush to disk.

# How big are the resulting buckets?

Given  $B+1$  buffer pages

- Given **N input pages, we partition into B buckets:**
  - → Ideally our buckets are each of size  $\sim N/B$  pages
- What happens if there are **hash collisions?**
  - Buckets could be  $> N/B$
  - **We'll do several passes...**
- What happens if there are **duplicate join keys?**
  - Nothing we can do here... could have some **skew** in size of the buckets

# How big do we want the resulting buckets?

- Ideally, our buckets would be of size  $\leq B - 1$  pages
  - 1 for input page, 1 for output page,  $B-1$  for each bucket
- Recall: If we want to join a bucket from R and one from S, we can do BNLJ in linear time if for *one of them (wlog say R)*,  $P(R) \leq B - 1$ !
  - And more generally, being able to fit bucket in memory is advantageous
- We can keep partitioning buckets that are  $> B-1$  pages, until they are  $\leq B - 1$  pages
  - Using a new hash key which will split them...

Given  $B+1$  buffer pages

Recall for BNLJ:  


$$P(R) + \frac{P(R)P(S)}{B - 1}$$

We'll call each of these a "pass" again...

# Hash Join Phase 1: Partitioning

Given  $B+1 = 3$  buffer pages

We partition into  $B = 2$  buckets **using hash function  $h_2$**  so that we can have one buffer page for each partition (and one for input)




For simplicity, we'll look at partitioning one of the two relations- we just do the same for the other relation!

Recall: our goal will be to get  $B = 2$  buckets of size  $\leq B-1 \rightarrow 1$  page each

# Hash Join Phase 1: Partitioning

Given  $B+1 = 3$  buffer pages


1. We read pages from R into the “input” page of the buffer...



# Hash Join Phase 1: Partitioning

Given  $B+1 = 3$  buffer pages


2. Then we use **hash function  $h_2$**  to sort into the buckets, which each have one page in the buffer



# Hash Join Phase 1: Partitioning

Given  $B+1 = 3$  buffer pages


2. Then we use **hash function  $h_2$**  to sort into the buckets, which each have one page in the buffer



# Hash Join Phase 1: Partitioning

Given  $B+1 = 3$  buffer pages


3. We repeat until the buffer bucket pages are full...



# Hash Join Phase 1: Partitioning

Given  $B+1 = 3$  buffer pages


3. We repeat until the buffer bucket pages are full...



# Hash Join Phase 1: Partitioning

Given  $B+1 = 3$  buffer pages


3. We repeat until the buffer bucket pages are full...



# Hash Join Phase 1: Partitioning

Given  $B+1 = 3$  buffer pages


3. We repeat until the buffer bucket pages are full... then flush to disk



# Hash Join Phase 1: Partitioning

Given  $B+1 = 3$  buffer pages



3. We repeat until the buffer bucket pages are full... then flush to disk



# Hash Join Phase 1: Partitioning

Given  $B+1 = 3$  buffer pages


Note that collisions can occur!



# Hash Join Phase 1: Partitioning

Given  $B+1 = 3$  buffer pages


Finish this pass...



# Hash Join Phase 1: Partitioning

Given  $B+1 = 3$  buffer pages


Finish this pass...



# Hash Join Phase 1: Partitioning

Given  $B+1 = 3$  buffer pages


Finish this pass...



# Hash Join Phase 1: Partitioning


Given  $B+1 = 3$  buffer pages

Finish this pass...



# Hash Join Phase 1: Partitioning

Given  $B+1 = 3$  buffer pages




We wanted buckets of size  $B-1 = 1$ ... *however we got larger ones due to:*

(1) Duplicate join keys

(2) Hash collisions

# Hash Join Phase 1: Partitioning

Given  $B+1 = 3$  buffer pages



To take care of larger buckets caused by (2) hash collisions, we can just do another pass!


What hash function should we use?

Do another pass with a different hash function,  $h'_2$ , ideally such that:

$$h'_2(3) \neq h'_2(5)$$

# Hash Join Phase 1: Partitioning

Given  $B+1 = 3$  buffer pages



To take care of larger buckets caused by (2) hash collisions, we can just do another pass!


What hash function should we use?

Do another pass with a different hash function,  $h'_2$ , ideally such that:

$$h'_2(3) \neq h'_2(5)$$

# Hash Join Phase 1: Partitioning

Given  $B+1 = 3$  buffer pages




What about duplicate join keys?  
Unfortunately this is a problem... but  
usually not a huge one.

We call this unevenness  
in the bucket size skew

Now that we have partitioned R and S...

# Hash Join Phase 2: Matching

- Now, we just join pairs of buckets from R and S that have the same hash value to complete the join!




# Hash Join Phase 2: Matching

- Note that since  $x = y \rightarrow h(x) = h(y)$ , we only need to consider pairs of buckets (one from R, one from S) that have the same hash function value
- If our buckets are  $\sim B - 1$  pages, can join each such pair using BNLJ; recall (with  $P(R) = B-1$ ):


$$\text{BNLJ Cost: } P(R) + \frac{P(R)P(S)}{B-1} = P(R) + \frac{(B-1)P(S)}{B-1} = P(R) + P(S)$$

Joining the pairs of buckets is linear!  
(As long as smaller bucket  $\leq B-1$  pages)

# Hash Join Phase 2: Matching



# Hash Join Phase 2: Matching




$R \bowtie S \text{ on } A$

To perform the join, we ideally just need to explore the dark blue regions

= the tuples with same values of the join key A


# Hash Join Phase 2: Matching



$R \bowtie S \text{ on } A$

With a join algorithm like BNLJ that doesn't take advantage of equijoin structure, we'd have to explore this ***whole grid!***

# Hash Join Phase 2: Matching



$R \bowtie S \text{ on } A$


With HJ, we only explore the *blue* regions

= the tuples with same values of  $h(A)$ !

We can apply BNLJ to each of these regions

# Hash Join Phase 2: Matching

R.A  
hashed  
values



$R \bowtie S \text{ on } A$

An alternative to  
applying BNLJ:

We could also hash  
again, and keep doing  
passes in memory to  
reduce further!

# How much memory do we need for HJ?

- Given:
  - A fixed input size for R and S (M and N pages resp.) WLOG: Assume M <= N
  - B+1 buffer pages
- Suppose (reasonably) that we can partition into B buckets in 2 passes:
  - For R, we get B buckets of size  $\sim M/B$
  - To join these buckets in linear time, we need these buckets to fit in B-1 pages, so we have:

$$B - 1 \geq \frac{M}{B} \Rightarrow \sim B^2 \geq M$$

Quadratic relationship  
between *smaller*  
*relation's* size & memory!



# Hash Join Summary

- *Given enough memory* (and letting R,S have size M,N resp.):
  - **Partitioning** requires reading + writing each page of R,S
    - $\rightarrow 2(M+N)$  IOs
  - **Matching** (with BNLJ) requires reading each page of R,S
    - $\rightarrow M+N$  IOs
  - **Writing out results** could be as bad as  $M*N$ ... but probably closer to  $M+N$

HJ takes  $\sim 3(M+N) + OUT$  IOs!

### 3. The Cage Match

# Sort-Merge v. Hash Join



- ***Given enough memory***, both SMJ and HJ have performance:

$$\sim 3(M+N) + OUT$$



- ***"Enough" memory*** =

- SMJ:  $B^2 > \max\{M,N\}$

- HJ:  $B^2 > \min\{M,N\}$

Hash Join superior if relation sizes *differ greatly*. Why?

# Further Comparisons of Hash and Sort Joins

- Hash Joins are highly parallelizable.



- Sort-Merge less sensitive to data skew and result is sorted



# Summary

- Saw IO-aware join algorithms
  - Massive difference
- Memory sizes key in hash versus sort join
  - Hash Join = Little dog (depends on smaller relation)
- Skew is also a major factor