# Big Data Management Lab 2

Denis Shadrin, Aleksandr Smolin

Table 1: Query Execution Times per Model (seconds)

Model	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
M1 (References)	87.83	15.79	47.01	9.50
M2 (Person embeds Company)	12.68	6.30	50.93	76.44
M3 (Company embeds Persons)	6.04	1.25	6.54	17.09

### Setup

The benchmark uses a dataset of 500,000 companies and 5,000,000 persons. All data is loaded into a local MongoDB instance (mongodb://localhost:27017) in database lab1\_db. Key indexes created to accelerate queries:

- companies\_ref: indexes on name, founded, and a text index on name for pattern searches.
- persons\_ref: indexes on company\_id (foreign key), birth\_date, age, last\_name, and a compound index on (first\_name, last\_name).
- persons\_emb: indexes on embedded fields company.\_id, birth\_date, age, compound (first\_name, last\_name), and company.name.
- companies\_emb: indexes on name, founded, embedded employees.last\_name, employees.birth\_date, and a text index on name.

## Answers to Questions

1. Order for Q1 (best to worst): M3 < M2 < M1.

Explanation: Q1 concatenates names and looks up company per person; in M3 employee-company pairs are stored together, so no lookup is needed. M2 still requires nested project on embedded docs, and M1 incurs the most overhead with a lookup per document.

2. Order for Q2 (best to worst): M3 < M2 < M1.

Explanation: M3 is fastest because it reads only 500 K parent documents and computes array sizes in-memory. M2 is next, benefitting from pre-embedded company IDs and a single grouping pass. M1 is slowest due to thousands of individual \$lookup operations across the large persons collection.

3. Order for Q3 (worst to best): M2 > M1 > M3.

Explanation: Q3 updates all ages for birth dates before 1988. M2 must update each embedded document individually across the persons\_emb collection, making it slowest. M1 updates are faster since they update a single field in persons\_ref. M3 uses an array filter to update only matching subdocuments within larger documents, resulting in the fewest writes and fastest execution.

#### 4. Order for Q4 (worst to best): M2 > M3 > M1.

Explanation: Q4 appends Company to names. In M2 this update must traverse and rewrite every embedded company.name for all person docs (5M writes), making it the slowest. M3 requires updating each top-level company document once (500K writes), faster but still more work than M1, which updates only 500K company docs without touching nested arrays.

#### 5. Conclusions:

- Embedding (denormalization) yields significant read/query performance gains when relationships are read frequently (as seen in Q1 and Q2).
- References (normalization) can simplify updates on a large number of small documents (M1's Q4 is fastest) and avoids document growth issues.
- Updates that affect nested data (Q3, Q4) perform best when the data is located in a single document (M3) or when the operation scope is minimized.
- Thus, denormalization favors read-heavy workloads, while normalization may be advantageous for write-heavy or update-heavy workloads.