
Software Development for Information Systems (2019 – 2020)

**Antonis Klironomos
Chrysostomos Rampidis
Fotis Ektoras Tavoularis**

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Code Description	4
2.1	Description of job scheduler and jobs (class JobScheduler abstract class Job)	4
3	Code Description	4
3.1	Description of job scheduler and jobs (class JobScheduler abstract class Job)	4
4	Description of intermediate result (class IntermediateArray)	5
5	Time Statistics	6
5.0.1	Small Sized Input	6
5.0.2	Medium Sized Input	7
6	Time Results Conclusions	8
7	Parallelization Observations	8
8	Version Control Observations	8
9	Unit Testing	9
10	Conclusion	9

1. Introduction

The following study was executed as part of the course on software development for information systems in the *Notional and Kapodistrian University of Athens*. The aim of this study was to create a subset of a database that manages data entirely in the main memory. The whole task was split in three parts. In the first part we implemented a Sort Merge Join Algorithm, in the second one we performed a query analysis, similar to the one used in the *SIGMOD 2018* competition, while in the last part we implemented CPU personalization and a query optimizer. The project is hosted in GitHub (<https://github.com/hectortav/Project2020>) and contains a Makefile for compilation and a bash script (testProgram.sh) to easily test the program. To run the executable, produced by the Makefile, called "final", you can use one or more of the following flags to provide cli arguments:

- -qr: Each query is scheduled as a single Job and runs in parallel with the other Jobs.
- -ro: If "-pb" argument is not provided and if current shift of hash function is even, the reorder task of the "overflowed" bucket is scheduled as a single Job and runs in parallel with the other Jobs.
- -pb: If "-ro" argument is provided, the reorder task of each "overflowed" bucket is scheduled as a single Job and runs in parallel with the other Jobs.
- -qs: Each quicksort task is scheduled as a single Job and runs in parallel with the other Jobs.
- -jn: If "-jnthreads" argument is not provided, each job is responsible for joining areas that have the same prefix.
- -jnthreads: if "-jn" argument is provided, the array involved in each join is split evenly according to the thread pool's size and the join of each of its parts with the other array is scheduled as a single Job and runs in parallel with the other Jobs.
- -pj: The result array is split evenly according to the thread pool's size and the calculation of the sums of each of its parts is scheduled as a single Job and runs in parallel with the other Jobs.
- -ft: Each time a filter is handled, the current array of row ids is split evenly according to the thread pool's size and the filtering of each of its parts is scheduled as a single Job and runs in parallel with the other Jobs.
- -all: Equivalent to the following combination of arguments: -qr -ro -qs -jn -pj -ft
- -n <No threads>: Size of the thread pool to be created by the scheduler.
- -optimize: Join enumeration is used to reorder join predicates. Note: If this argument is not provided, join predicates are not reordered but filter predicates are relocated before the join predicates.
- -h: Displays a help message which contains a short description of each argument.

2. Code Description

2.1. *Description of job scheduler and jobs (class JobScheduler abstract class Job)*

- JobScheduler consists of a queue (JobQueue) in which any kind of Job (: abstract class) is inserted.
- When the JobScheduler gets initialized, a thread pool is created, the size of which is defined by the user.
- When a new Job (with a new unique id) is inserted into the queue, an available thread or the first thread that will be available handles the Job.
- Job insertion and obtainment is handled with mutual exclusion in order to avoid race conditions.
- If the Job is a Radix-sort Job (for parallel Radix-sort) or a Quicksort Job (for parallel Quicksort), jobsCounter[queryIndex] is incremented by 1 when the Job is inserted into the queue. This is helping the parent thread in knowing when to proceed in joining the results of the 2 relations' reordering. (queryIndex is the index/id of the current query and it is used for the case of parallel run of queries)
- When any Job is completed, jobsCounter[queryIndex] is decremented by 1. If jobsCounter[queryIndex] equals to 0, a condition variable is signaled which indicates that all the jobs of the current part of the program are done, so the parent thread can continue its execution.
- When the JobScheduler gets destroyed, it creates ExitJobs (with id=-1), the count of which is equal to the thread pool's size. When a thread handles an ExitJob, it exits immediately.

3. Code Description

3.1. *Description of job scheduler and jobs (class JobScheduler abstract class Job)*

- IntermediateArray consists of the row ids of each array (of the predicate) that took part in previous joins. Each column is identified by the corresponding predicate array's id.
- After the first join, an IntermediateArray is created having as contents the 2 columns that resulted from the join.
- After each consecutive join, which involves a column (with row ids) of the IntermediateArray and a column (with row ids) of a first-time-used predicate array, a new IntermediateArray is created. This newly created IntermediateArray has row count equal to the last join result's row count and column count equal to the previous IntermediateArray's column count plus 1. Its contents are the joined row ids taken from the previous IntermediateArray and the joined row ids of the firstly used predicate array.
- A join between 2 arrays that have already been involved in a previous join,

is handled as inner-join/self-join of the current `IntermediateArray`.

4. Description of intermediate result (class `IntermediateArray`)

We implemented and tested two different methods for sorting buckets during the first and second part. One of them was using recursion while the other one was using a loop to break the buckets into smaller ones when needed. After thorough testing we decided to use the recursive one since we managed to achieve better execution times and convolution while we also managed to keep each thread work on a different memory part at any time, reducing the need for semaphores which would slow the execution further since each thread would have to wait to access the memory.

Another part of the execution that we tried to parallelize was the copy from one tuple to another during each call of the `Reorder` function (`tuplereorder_parallel @ functions.cpp`), but we finally decided not to keep the change since it significantly slowed the program because all the extra threads that would be used to execute the copy could be used more efficiently by another function that is waiting in the scheduler.

To adapt `Join` for running on a parallel processing system, we tried several different implementations. First, we tried the one described in class, that is to join areas that have the same prefix. Then, we tried merging some of these areas together so that each new area cluster is assigned to a thread. Finally, we tried to split the relation in equal parts so that each part is assigned to a thread. We noticed that the third method that kept the job count at a minimum while at the same time accomplished a balanced load between threads, produced a better result concerning time and processor usage.

We noticed that we had great time improvements when we used smaller and continues memory allocations. For example by turning histogram and psum from 2D arrays to 1D we managed to cut the execution time to 60% of what we had with the model described in class. The reasoning behind this great improvement is that a big part of the array can be kept in cache and we don't have to worry about loading times that take a long time.

Another observation was the difference between the small and medium inputs. We noticed that the multi threading was better exploited with the medium sized input, where we saw greater time and CPU usage improvements. The explanation is that the time that it takes to split the jobs and wait for an available thread is better justified when the inputs are greater and the time relation of the thread organization processes to the time of the rest of the processes tend to zero.

While running the program through a profiler, we noticed that partitioning during predicate optimization, consumed 37% of the overall time. That means there are many data in a small number of buckets. That way we do not have the optimal outcome we could accomplish with an other optimization policy.

Another observation we made is that the list functions (e.g. `insert`) con-

sume 17% of the time. If we had another data structure that would not require constant checks and processes to allocate new memory blocks we would achieve better times with probably an allocation of unneeded memory as a negative aspect.

5. Time Statistics

The following table contains the program runtime measurements, CPU and memory usage with various parameters:

5.0.1. *Small Sized Input*

	1 thread (serial)	2 threads	4 threads	8 threads	16 threads	32 threads	64 threads
No predicate optimization	0.775	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Predicate optimization	1.111	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
(No predicate optimization) Parallel queries	N/A	0.856	0.662	0.645	0.671	0.671	0.727
(No predicate optimization) Run the following in parallel (Radix-sort, Quicksort, Join, Filters, Projection)	N/A	0.841	0.837	0.856	0.890	0.914	0.906
(No predicate optimization) Everything runs in parallel (Queries, Radix-sort, Quicksort, Join, Filters, Projection)	N/A	0.889	0.806	0.744	0.719	0.737	0.785
(Predicate optimization) Parallel queries	N/A	1.124	1.016	1.017	0.999	1.061	0.998
(Predicate optimization) Run the following in parallel (Radix-sort, Quicksort, Join, Filters, Projection)	N/A	1.050	1.016	0.976	0.983	0.974	0.978
(Predicate optimization) Everything runs in parallel (Queries, Radix-sort, Quicksort, Join, Filters, Projection)	N/A	1.234	0.895	0.832	0.775	0.822	0.854

Table 1.

Table 2. Time in seconds

5.0.2. *Medium Sized Input*

	1 thread (serial)	2 threads	4 threads	8 threads	16 threads	32 threads	64 threads
No predicate optimization	47.211	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Predicate optimization	48.637	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
(No predicate optimization) Parallel queries	N/A	44.903	24.862	20.573	20.471	20.844	21.023
(No predicate optimization) Run the following in parallel (Radix-sort, Quicksort, Join, Filters, Projection)	N/A	41.879	38.320	37.520	38.142	36.670	38.874
(No predicate optimization) Everything runs in parallel (Queries, Radix-sort, Quicksort, Join, Filters, Projection)	N/A	47.957	35.500	29.447	20.235	20.767	22.356
(Predicate optimization) Parallel queries	N/A	45.596	23.769	20.072	20.433	20.597	20.876
(Predicate optimization) Run the following in parallel (Radix-sort, Quicksort, Join, Filters, Projection)	N/A	40.381	37.549	36.599	36.317	36.327	36.604
(Predicate optimization) Everything runs in parallel (Queries, Radix-sort, Quicksort, Join, Filters, Projection)	N/A	47.481	35.455	28.007	18.521	19.425	21.666

Table 3.

Table 4. Time in seconds

6. Time Results Conclusions

- Without the “-optimize” flag the program runs without query optimization but with the filters of each query being placed first. This is a reason why sometimes the program runs quicker without the “-optimize” flag.
- When the small dataset is given as input, the size of the data is so small that the overhead of Join Enumeration adds a small delay to the program compared to its execution without the “-optimize” flag.
- When the medium dataset is given as input, the size of the data is bigger, so Join Enumeration increases the speed of the program.
- Parallelism increases the speed of the program significantly because the execution load is split so that each thread is handling a different Job at each given moment.
- When the program’s thread pool has a size which is larger than the maximum number of threads that the system can provide, there is only a small or no amount of increase at the program’s speed compared to using a smaller thread pool.

7. Parallelization Observations

At the third and last part of the project, parallelization was added to the program. The effect this transition had on the program is immediately apparent when looking at the overall execution times. Adding CPU parallelization led to a decline of 60% concerning execution time and a increase of 70% concerning CPU usage which means computer resources are better utilized and the overall outcome is maximized.

8. Version Control Observations

During the whole project we used git as a version control system. With git we managed to track bugs that emerged during development and then easily solve them. Git also helped our team to share code and communicate better that led to better organization and management. Finally, a git aspect we found greatly useful was branching since each team member could work in separate features without causing problems and interference.

9. Unit Testing

To test the execution of our program we used unit testing and especially Cunit. We tried to make unit tests for every function regardless of the size or simplicity. Some of the functions tested are the following:

- randomIndex
- swap
- hashFunction
- makeparts
- splitpreds
- optimizepredicates
- predsplittotermes
- sortBucket
- histcreateTest
- psumcreateTest
- tuplesReorderTest
- InputArray::filterRowIds
- InputArray::extractColumnFromRowIds
- IntermediateArray::populate
- IntermediateArray::findColumnIndexByInputArrayId
- IntermediateArray::findColumnIndexByPredicateArrayId
- IntermediateArray::selfJoin

Overall we concluded that unit testing is an easy way to test and validate the solidity of a big project, that would otherwise require many hours of manual testing. Also we found that creating unit tests before the project is a valid way to ensure the smooth development of a program as well as keeping the team in track and necessitate the usage of a common API.

10. Conclusion

During this assignment we used various technologies and researched a plethora of ideas and theories. We appreciated concepts like parallel programming, unit testing, version control and of course software development for information systems. Parallel programming is a useful asset today since all systems have multiple real and virtual CPU cores that are not often utilized correctly. Unit testing is a respectful way to ensure that programs & algorithms are valid and ready for production and version control is an easy way to track bugs and work with teams. Information systems and databases are the core of today's computing and leaving in an age where data are abundant, we must explore new and more efficient ways to store, find and index them. Last but not least, we learned the importance of pre-planning, estimating possible obstacles and chances during development of such last projects.