

## 6.824 2020 Lecture 15: Spark

Resilient Distributed Datasets: A Fault-Tolerant Abstraction for  
In-Memory Cluster Computing Zaharia et al., NSDI 2012

why are we looking at Spark?

- widely-used for datacenter computations
- generalizes MapReduce into dataflow
- supports iterative applications better than MapReduce
- successful research: ACM doctoral thesis award

three main topics:

- programming model
- execution strategy
- fault tolerance

let's look at page-rank

here's SparkPageRank.scala from the Spark source repository  
like the code in Section 3.2.2, with more detail

```

1    val lines = spark.read.textFile("in").rdd
2    val links1 = lines.map{ s =>
3      val parts = s.split("\\s+")
4      (parts(0), parts(1))
5    }
6    val links2 = links1.distinct()
7    val links3 = links2.groupByKey()
8    val links4 = links3.cache()
9    var ranks = links4.mapValues(v => 1.0)
10
11   for (i <- 1 to 10) {
12     val jj = links4.join(ranks)
13     val contribs = jj.values.flatMap{
14       case (urls, rank) =>
15         urls.map(url => (url, rank / urls.size))
16     }
17     ranks = contribs.reduceByKey(_ + _).mapValues(0.15 + 0.85 * _)
18   }
19
20   val output = ranks.collect()
21   output.foreach(tup => println(s"${tup._1} has rank:  ${tup._2} ."))

```

page-rank input has one line per link, extracted from a big web crawl  
from-url to-url  
the input is vast!

page-rank output is the "importance" of each page  
based on whether other important pages point to it  
really models estimated probability that someone will visit each page  
user model:

- 85% chance of following a link from current page
- 15% chance of visiting a random page

page-rank algorithm

- iterative, essentially simulates multiple rounds of users clicking links
- ranks (probabilities) gradually converge
- page-rank would be awkward and slow in MapReduce

my example input -- file "in":

```

u1 u3
u1 u1
u2 u3
u2 u2
u3 u1

```

I'll run page-rank in Spark (local machine, not a cluster):

```
./bin/run-example SparkPageRank in 10
u2 has rank: 0.2610116705534049 .
u3 has rank: 0.9999999999999998 .
u1 has rank: 1.7389883294465944 .
```

apparently u1 is the most important page.

let's run some of the page-rank code in the Scala interpreter

```
./bin/spark-shell

val lines = spark.read.textFile("in").rdd
-- what is lines? does it contain the content of file "in"?
lines.collect()
-- lines yields a list of strings, one per line of input
-- if we run lines.collect() again, it re-reads file "in"
val links1 = lines.map{ s => val parts = s.split("\\s+"); (parts(0), parts(1)) }
links1.collect()
-- map, split, tuple -- acts on each line in turn
-- parses each string "x y" into tuple ( "x", "y" )
val links2 = links1.distinct()
-- distinct() sorts or hashes to bring duplicates together
val links3 = links2.groupByKey()
-- groupByKey() sorts or hashes to bring instances of each key together
val links4 = links3.cache()
-- cache() == persist in memory
var ranks = links4.mapValues(v => 1.0)

-- now for first loop iteration
val jj = links4.join(ranks)
-- the join brings each page's link list and current rank together
val contribs = jj.values.flatMap{ case (urls, rank) => urls.map(url => (url, rank / urls.size)) }
-- for each link, the "from" page's rank divided by number of its links
ranks = contribs.reduceByKey(_ + _).mapValues(0.15 + 0.85 * _)
-- sum up the links that lead to each page

-- second loop iteration
val jj2 = links4.join(ranks)
-- join() brings together equal keys; must sort or hash
val contribs2 = jj2.values.flatMap{ case (urls, rank) => urls.map(url => (url, rank / urls.size)) }
}

ranks = contribs2.reduceByKey(_ + _).mapValues(0.15 + 0.85 * _)
-- reduceByKey() brings together equal keys

-- the loop &c just creates a lineage graph.
-- it does not do any real work.

val output = ranks.collect()
-- collect() is an action.
-- it causes the whole computation to execute!
output.foreach(tup => println(s"${tup._1} has rank: ${tup._2} ."))

until the final collect(), this code just creates a lineage graph
it does not process the data
```

what does the lineage graph look like?

Figure 3

it's a graph of transform stages -- a data-flow graph

it's a complete recipe for the computation

note that the loop added to the graph -- there is not actually a cycle

there's a *\*new\** ranks/contribs for each loop iteration

for multi-step computation, this programming model is more convenient than MapReduce

the Scala code runs in the "driver" machine of Figure 2  
 the driver constructs a lineage graph  
 the driver compiles Java bytecodes and sends them to worker machines  
 the driver then manages execution and data movement

what does the execution look like?

[diagram: driver, partitioned input file, workers]  
 \* input in HDFS (like GFS)  
 \* input data files are already "partitioned" over many storage servers  
 first 1,000,000 lines in one partition, next lines in another, &c.  
 \* more partitions than machines, for load balance  
 \* each worker machine takes a partition, applies lineage graph in order  
 \* when computation on different partitions is independent ("narrow"):  
 no inter-machine communication required after first read  
 a worker applies series of transformations to input stream

this is already more efficient than MapReduce

data is forwarded directly from one transformation to the next  
 MR would need multiple Map+Reduces  
 with expensive store to GFS, then re-read, between each

what about distinct()? groupByKey()? join()? reduceByKey()?

these need to look at data from \*all\* partitions, not just one  
 because all records with a given key must be considered together  
 these are the paper's "wide" dependencies (as opposed to "narrow")

how are wide dependencies implemented?

[diagram]  
 a lot like Map intermediate output in MapReduce  
 the driver knows where the wide dependencies are  
 e.g. between the map() and the distinct() in page-rank  
 upstream transformation, downstream transformation  
 the data must be "shuffled" into new partitions  
 e.g. bring all of a given key together  
 after the upstream transformation:  
 split output up by shuffle criterion (typically some key)  
 arrange into buckets in memory, one per downstream partition  
 before the downstream transformation:  
 (wait until upstream transformation completes -- driver manages this)  
 each worker fetches its bucket from each upstream worker  
 now the data is partitioned in a different way  
 wide is expensive!  
 all data is moved across the network  
 it's a barrier -- all workers must wait until all are done

what if data is re-used?

e.g. links4 in our page-rank  
 by default, must be re-computed, e.g. re-read from input file  
 persist() and cache() cause links to be saved in memory for re-use

re-using persisted data is another big advantage over MapReduce

Spark can optimized based on its view of the whole lineage graph

stream records, one at a time, though sequence of narrow transformations  
 increases locality, good for CPU data caches  
 avoids having to store entire partition of records in memory  
 notice when shuffles aren't needed b/c inputs already partitioned in the same way  
 e.g. links4.join(ranks)

what about fault tolerance?

what if one machine crashes?  
 its memory and computation state are lost  
 driver re-runs transformations on crashed machine's partitions on other machines  
 usually each machine is responsible for many partitions  
 so load can be spread

- thus re-computation is pretty fast
- for narrow dependencies, only lost partitions have to be re-executed

what about failures when there are wide dependencies?

- re-computing one failed partition requires information from *\*all\** partitions
- so *\*all\** partitions may need to re-execute from the start!
- even though they didn't fail
- Spark supports checkpoints to HDFS (like GFS) to cope with this
- driver only has to recompute along lineage from latest checkpoint
- for page-rank, perhaps checkpoint ranks every 10th iteration

limitations?

- geared up for batch processing of bulk data
- all records treated the same way
- transformations are "functional" -- turn input into output
- no notion of modifying data in place

summary

- Spark improves expressivity and performance vs MapReduce
- giving the framework a view of the complete dataflow is helpful
- performance optimizations
- failure recovery
- what were the keys to performance?
- leave data in memory between transformations, vs write to GFS then read
- re-use of data in memory (e.g. links in page-rank)
- Spark very successful, widely used