



Assignment of master's thesis

Title: Object-relational mapping for database access in JavaScript
Student: Bc. Ladislav Louka
Supervisor: Ing. Jan Matoušek
Study program: Informatics
Branch / specialization: Web Engineering
Department: Department of Software Engineering
Validity: until the end of summer semester 2023/2024

Instructions

Object-relational mapping (ORM) libraries enable to naturally connect objects written in a given programming language with their representation stored in a database. There are lots of such libraries for JavaScript (JS) and TypeScript (TS), but each comes with its own set of compromises. Explore and describe available open-source frameworks, provide example implementations of application showcasing their advantages and downsides. In the benchmark application test primarily feature richness of framework, efficiency, type support for TypeScript and ability for relational data fetching. Discuss good and best practices for use with each library and what project they fit in.

Guidelines:

- 1) Research existing JS and TS libraries and explore their problems and benefits by gathering users' experiences.
- 2) Design a benchmark database and example application, implement the application in each framework.
- 3) Describe and test the frameworks with a focus on their functionality, efficiency of database usage, speed and usability.
- 4) Provide outcomes of the tests, analyze their results. Describe which framework has an advantage in each situation.
- 5) Recall on gathered experience, discuss findings, propose improvements and continuations.



**FACULTY
OF INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY
CTU IN PRAGUE**

Master's thesis

Object-relational mapping for database access in JavaScript

Bc. Ladislav Louka

Department of Software Engineering

Supervisor: Ing. Jan Matoušek

May 3, 2023

Acknowledgements

I want to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Ing. Jan Matoušek, for his guidance and expertise throughout the development of this thesis. His ideas helped me to explore new avenues for expansion, significantly enhancing the quality of my work.

My heartfelt thanks also go to Lucie Procházková for her constant encouragement and invaluable assistance in editing the thesis. Her keen eye and attention to detail greatly enhanced the clarity and coherence of the final document.

I would also like to thank Ackee for generously providing a working environment and the flexibility to utilize their facilities. Their support enabled me to focus on my research and complete this thesis on time.

Finally, I thank my friends, family, and colleagues for their continuous support and encouragement throughout my academic journey.

Declaration

I hereby declare that the presented thesis is my own work and that I have cited all sources of information in accordance with the Guideline for adhering to ethical principles when elaborating an academic final thesis.

I acknowledge that my thesis is subject to the rights and obligations stipulated by the Act No. 121/2000 Coll., the Copyright Act, as amended. In accordance with Article 46 (6) of the Act, I hereby grant a nonexclusive authorization (license) to utilize this thesis, including any and all computer programs incorporated therein or attached thereto and all corresponding documentation (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Work”), to any and all persons that wish to utilize the Work. Such persons are entitled to use the Work in any way (including for-profit purposes) that does not detract from its value. This authorization is not limited in terms of time, location and quantity.

In Prague on May 3, 2023

.....

Czech Technical University in Prague

Faculty of Information Technology

© 2023 Ladislav Louka. All rights reserved.

This thesis is school work as defined by Copyright Act of the Czech Republic. It has been submitted at Czech Technical University in Prague, Faculty of Information Technology. The thesis is protected by the Copyright Act and its usage without author's permission is prohibited (with exceptions defined by the Copyright Act).

Citation of this thesis

Louka, Ladislav. *Object-relational mapping for database access in JavaScript*. Master's thesis. Czech Technical University in Prague, Faculty of Information Technology, 2023.

Abstract

In this thesis, we investigate the role of Object Relational Mapping (ORM) and query builder packages in JavaScript, focusing on the support of TypeScript. The study aims to compare various packages, assessing their flexibility and performance overhead to facilitate an informed decision-making process for developers. Such comparison is important due to modern applications' proliferation of database access.

Keywords SQL, ORM, Object-relational mapping, Query builder, JavaScript, TypeScript

Abstrakt

Tato práce se zabývá balíčky a frameworky pro objektově relační mapování a tvorbu SQL dotazů pro JavaScript, se zaměřením na podporu jazyka TypeScript. Cílem práce je porovnat podporu jazyka, schopnosti jednotlivých balíčků a jejich výkon. Práce poskytuje vývojářům informace, které jim pomohou při výběru vhodného balíčku pro jejich aplikaci.

Klíčová slova SQL, ORM, Objektově-relační mapování, Query builder, JavaScript, TypeScript

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Introduction | 3 |
| 1 Preliminaries | 7 |
| 2 Framework selection | 21 |
| 2.1 Typescript support | 21 |
| 2.2 Popularity and Support | 22 |
| 2.3 Exclusion criteria | 23 |
| 3 Ranking and Grading of the Frameworks | 25 |
| 3.1 Quantifiable Criteria | 25 |
| 3.1.1 TypeScript Support | 25 |
| 3.1.2 Database Compatibility | 26 |
| 3.1.3 Flexibility and Performance | 26 |
| 3.1.4 ECMAScript and CommonJS compatibility | 27 |
| 3.1.5 Licence | 27 |
| 3.2 Package Properties Criteria | 28 |
| 3.2.1 Popularity | 28 |
| 3.2.2 Support | 28 |
| 3.2.3 Dependencies | 29 |
| 3.2.4 Documentation Quality | 29 |
| 4 Benchmark database schema design | 31 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 4.1 | Cat Entity | 31 |
| 4.2 | House and Toy House Entities | 32 |
| 4.3 | Toy and Toys Producer Entity | 33 |
| 5 | Benchmark Framework Design | 35 |
| 5.1 | Test Suite and Schema Separation | 35 |
| 5.2 | Database management | 36 |
| 5.3 | Test type and Error Handling | 36 |
| 5.4 | Multi-Framework support | 37 |
| 5.5 | Reporters - Output options | 38 |
| 6 | Benchmark implementation | 39 |
| 6.1 | BenchmarkRunner | 39 |
| 6.2 | BenchmarkSuite | 41 |
| 6.3 | Reporters | 41 |
| 6.4 | Benchmarks | 42 |
| 6.4.1 | MVP Benchmark | 43 |
| 6.4.2 | Entity Traversal Benchmark | 43 |
| 6.4.3 | Edge Cases Benchmark | 44 |
| 6.4.4 | Special SQL Actions Benchmark | 45 |
| 6.4.5 | Bulk Operations Benchmark | 46 |
| 7 | Individual packages | 49 |
| 7.1 | pgTyped | 49 |
| 7.2 | @databases/pg | 51 |
| 7.3 | Zapatos | 54 |
| 7.4 | Knex.js | 56 |
| 7.5 | Kysely | 59 |
| 7.6 | MikroORM | 61 |
| 7.7 | Prisma ORM | 64 |
| 7.8 | TypeORM | 66 |
| 7.9 | Objection.js | 69 |
| 7.10 | Sequelize | 71 |
| 7.11 | Disqualified frameworks | 74 |
| 7.11.1 | RDB | 74 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 7.11.2 Bookshelf.js | 76 |
| 7.11.3 Waterline | 76 |
| 8 Observations | 79 |
| 8.1 Package Information | 80 |
| 8.2 Flexibility Assessment | 81 |
| 8.3 Latency benchmark results | 82 |
| Conclusion | 89 |
| Bibliography | 91 |
| A Appendix | 105 |
| B Structure of attachments | 115 |

List of Figures

| | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| 1.1 | Active pattern class diagram | 18 |
| 1.2 | Data Mapper class diagram | 20 |
| 4.1 | Schema of benchmark database | 32 |
| 6.1 | Simplified schema of the Benchmark class architecture | 40 |
| 6.2 | ConsoleReporter example result - partial screenshot | 42 |
| 8.1 | getColorLatency Results | 84 |
| 8.2 | countCatsByColor Results | 85 |
| 8.3 | getToysAvailableToCat Results | 86 |
| 8.4 | JSON Column handling Results | 87 |
| 8.5 | BulkInsert Results | 88 |
| A.1 | HTMLReporter result - partial screenshot | 106 |
| A.2 | JSON Where query Results | 107 |
| A.3 | Transactional operations Results | 108 |
| A.4 | Pattern Matching (likeQuery) Results | 109 |
| A.5 | Case insensitive pattern (ilikeQuery) Results | 110 |
| A.6 | BulkDelete Results | 111 |
| A.7 | BulkUpdate Results | 112 |
| A.8 | Pagination Results | 113 |
| A.9 | Maximum value query Results | 114 |

List of Tables

| | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 8.1 | Runtime package information in test environment | 80 |
| 8.2 | Entity Traversal Benchmark implementation methods | 82 |
| 8.3 | Special SQL Actions Benchmark implementation methods | 83 |
| 8.4 | Edge Cases Benchmark implementation methods | 83 |
| 8.5 | BulkOperations Benchmark implementation methods | 84 |
| A.1 | Popularity and homepages of packages | 105 |

Acronyms

API Application Programming Interface

BSD Berkeley Software Distribution

CLI Command Line Interface

HTML Hypertext Markup Language

I/O Input / Output

JSON JavaScript Object Notation

MVC Model - View - Controller

OOP Object-Oriented Programming

ORM Object relational mapping

QB Query builder

RDBMS Relational Database Management System

SQL Structured Query Language

XML Extensible Markup Language

Introduction

In the modern world, data have become an essential aspect of almost every field. From e-commerce to healthcare, education to finance, data is everywhere and plays a critical role in decision-making processes. The advent of Web 2.0 [1], which brought the concept of user-generated content, was largely supported by connecting the Web to databases. Social media platforms, for example, rely heavily on data to provide personalized recommendations, targeted advertising, and other features that keep users engaged. Even applications not working with the internet often need significant data storage and, as a result, the ability to manage and manipulate data has become a critical skill for developers and organisations alike.

Relational databases such as SQL Server and PostgreSQL are by far the most popular type of databases for data storage used in business-level applications. These databases use the relational data model, which is based on tables with rows and columns, to store and manipulate data.

Object-oriented programming languages and languages incorporating parts of the paradigm, such as Java, Python, Ruby, and JavaScript, have gained popularity [2] due to their ability to create complex software systems that can handle large amounts of data efficiently. Object-oriented programming (OOP) is a programming paradigm that represents concepts as “objects” that have attributes (data) and behaviours (methods). This makes it easier to write, maintain, and reuse code, which is essential when working with large-scale software systems.

Despite the popularity of object-oriented programming languages, there is often a disparity between OOP languages and the relational data model used by many databases. OOP languages are designed to work with objects, whereas relational databases are designed to work with relations. This can make it challenging for developers to work with databases using OOP languages.

Object-Relational Mapping (ORM) has become a popular solution for developers who need to connect object-oriented programming languages with relational databases [3]. ORM allows developers to work with relational databases using object-oriented programming languages, eliminating the need to write complex SQL queries. By abstracting away the details of the underlying database, ORM allows developers to focus on the application logic and reduces the amount of boilerplate code that needs to be written. This makes it easier for developers to work with databases and reduces the potential for errors.

The thesis aims to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the most popular ORM packages and SQL query builders for Typescript. This analysis will provide an objective measurement of their relative strengths and weaknesses in terms of functionality, type support, performance, and package quality. Also included are noncomparative examples of syntax and usage examples of the packages, to illustrate strengths and weaknesses and to showcase the functionality of the modules. By evaluating each package's performance in these key areas, the thesis aims to provide a comprehensive comparison that will be useful to developers who are looking for the best ORM or SQL query builder package for their Typescript project.

While there are existing comparisons, most of them are created from the point of a biased actor, usually a competitive or alternative solution developer [4] [5]. This thesis aims to provide an independent view.

The thesis is organized into eight comprehensive chapters that guide the reader through comparing and benchmarking various frameworks. Chapter 1 sets the foundation by defining the terminology used throughout the thesis and providing context for each term. Chapter 2 focuses on determining the essential attributes for a framework to be considered for inclusion in the comparison. Chapter 3 then discusses the criteria used to compare and rank the

packages, from directly calculated comparisons to more qualitative aspects like TypeScript support level and documentation quality.

Chapters 4 through 8 delve into the practical aspects of the thesis, with Chapter 4 introducing the features of the Cat database, which serves as the basis for testing the features and performance of the packages. Chapter 5 outlines the design of the benchmark framework and highlights the crucial features for implementation. Chapter 6 covers the actualization of this design into a functional benchmarking tool. Chapter 7 presents an in-depth analysis of individual packages, noting any problems or interesting findings encountered during the implementation of testing tasks. Finally, Chapter 8 synthesizes the results of the benchmarking process, comparing and contextualizing the findings from both flexibility and performance testing.

Preliminaries

In this chapter, we will establish a solid foundation for the rest of the thesis by introducing the key concepts and definitions used later in the work.

Object-Relational Mapping

Object-relational mapping is a way to access relational data in an object-centred programming language [6]. The primary purpose is manipulating data without switching concepts from object-oriented paradigms to the relational representation of data in which most databases operate. The scope of this translation layer can (as shown later in this work) vary. Different people define packages as ORMs while providing diverse levels of functionality [7].

At its base level, ORM provides an intermediary layer between applications' OOP model and database which is usually relational (but can be graph or document focused). The layer allows the developer to work with objects in the code, while the package translates it into a relational structure when saved to the database. These packages are often used on projects that are heavily connected to a database model, as ORMs are most beneficial when using a database is commonplace. When used only occasionally, it usually brings too expansive a setup to translate into gains in code readability and maintenance costs compared to executing premade SQL queries [3].

In addition to the basic functionality of translating between different styles of data representation, ORMs often include functionality such as connection pooling, support for read-only data replications, caching, or database migra-

tions. When using such modules, developers can avoid writing boilerplate code that is typically required.

SQL Query Builder

SQL query builder is derived from its function to create SQL queries and OOP pattern, which it implements, called “builder”. Object-oriented programming design patterns are reusable solutions commonly encountered during software development in OOP languages. There is no single authority on how these patterns are defined, nor a comprehensive list of these patterns, as every author prioritises different patterns and functionalities [8].

The Builder pattern is one such pattern, providing API for the complex creation process of objects. This pattern is one of the 23 defined in “Design Patterns” by Erich Gamma, Richard Helm, Ralph Johnson, and John Vlissides [9], which has been highly influential in software engineering. Its purpose is to separate the creation of an object from its representation, allowing for the separation of parts that initially were parts of one construction method into several.

SQL Query is made up of several clauses, which each serve distinct functions. For example, the **SELECT** clause specifies which columns are to be retrieved, and the **FROM** clause specifies which table or tables the columns should be [10]. Once the builder pattern is applied to the SQL query, each of these clauses (or even smaller fragments) can be created by calling the Builder’s methods, creating a programmatic way to create SQL queries. The Builder also allows developers to abstract minor differences between different SQL implementations.

As the ability to create queries based on multiple criteria is one of the basic functionalities of ORMs, they are almost always built on top of a query builder. These can be available standalone or fully integrated into the ORM package. Often, query builders are sufficient for the purposes of database access in most applications, so they were included in the comparison. While they certainly lack feature sets and, compared to ORMs, query builders usually require SQL knowledge, they can be easier to set up and maintain while also being faster and allowing fine-tuned adjustments to a query.

PostgreSQL

One of the most popular database engines today, PostgreSQL, is an open-source object-relational database management system. Originally developed under the name Postgres [11] (short for Post-Ingres) as a new generation after a successful relational database called Ingres, it was first released under this name in 1989. After several years of development at the University of California at Berkeley, the name was changed to focus on SQL compliance. The whole project moved to open-source, community-focused development in 1996. Currently, the project is maintained by The PostgreSQL Global Development Group, and releases and source code are provided under an open-source BSD-style licence free of charge [12].

PostgreSQL is, at the time of writing, one of the most popular SQL databases available, owing its widespread adoption to its reliability and high scalability while supporting most of the SQL standard and being fully ACID compliant [13]. ACID is an acronym for Atomicity, Consistency, Isolation, and Durability, which are four fundamental tenets specifying properties for reliability and consistency of transactions.

Some of the features that often make PostgreSQL stand out amongst other RDBMS are its support for many different and advanced data types [14] out of the box, such as the ability to natively store JSON objects and arrays, XML data or geometric types. With extensibility being a significant focus, a lot of functionality can be installed or optionally enabled, further improving the reach and applicability.

There are extensive implementations of the API for many programming languages, including C [15], Python [16], Java [17], and JavaScript [18]. PostgreSQL also offers extensive documentation of both its API and internal functionality, which supports its growth and popularity.

Lazy loading

Lazy loading is a technique for optimizing data retrieval to increase application performance [8, p. 200]. It is a strategy consisting of only loading data when it is needed rather than all at once, therefore reducing the initial load in

exchange for the need to do additional loading later. Lazy loading is usually achieved by breaking down larger datasets into smaller ones and loading each one only when necessary. Such practice is commonplace in web development, as asset sizes (such as images or JavaScript) have only grown in the evolution of the web.

Some of the most common implementations of Lazy Loading come in the way of only loading low-quality images unless the user is focused on them or splitting code into multiple files, which are fetched when necessary, providing quick first page-load time at the cost of adding additional requests [19].

When talking about ORMs and database access, lazy loading usually takes place as replacing data retrieval from an object with a call to retrieve the data from the database. In other words, the data of the database object does not need to be loaded when the object representation or its part is created in the program.

Eager loading

Eager loading is the programming practice of loading all the required data at once, optimizing the number of requests that must be made to retrieve everything [20]. This is done with the expectation that one expensive request will minimize the amount of additional data that would need to be sent between the two parties. This can lead to faster load times and improved application performance.

It is usually achieved by sending a singular request and caching the data in memory, even though it might only be needed later. There are obvious downsides to this, such as higher memory usage or often loading more data than is necessary. The concept of eager loading is antithetical to the lazy loading approach, and that is on purpose. Each approach prefers a different focus, and thus each is fit for different usage; lazy loading is practical when a first look or first results matter the most, and eager loading is when the focus is on one large result, which would be slowed down by too many small requests, which would need to be made for the total result.

In the context of object-relational mapping frameworks, we are most likely to encounter eager loading when fetching related entities. This way, when

there is an expectation for data about the currently approached entity, the ORM can optimize the query so that the data are already loaded in memory when it is requested later.

Circular dependence

A common problem in software development, circular dependency occurs when two or more parts of code depend on each other, making it impossible to resolve their dependence onto a dependency graph. Such a graph must conform to limits set out for tree graphs and, therefore, cannot contain a loop. Due to the way how modules are loaded in Node.js [21], such a problem would lead to a deadlock and is therefore resolved by trying to run the modules in a specific order. However, such an approach is only sometimes feasible, so other solutions must be used. The issue of circular dependency is also present in the compilation because, while TypeScript does allow asynchronous references of types between files using `import type` term [22], if we need to import not only the type but also the value, TypeScript will not be able to resolve the type, and the compilation will fail. There are many solutions to this problem, the most common being dependency injection or lazy loading.

In ORMs and database representation in OOP languages, this problem is generally connected to the bidirectional nature of relations, as its explicit representation will inevitably create circular dependency [23]. Therefore, for most schema definitions, there needs to be a functionality built in that allows users to define bidirectional relations without sacrificing type safety or encountering a deadlock with importing modules.

Database transaction

Transaction isolation is a concept used in database management to represent a unit of work. The transaction is typically a series of one or more database operations that are supposed to be completed on the all-or-nothing principle. In addition to performing database queries atomically, the transaction also needs to provide additional functionality, such as coordination of reads and handling operations in a reliable and recoverable manner.

As database transactions are the base for the basic functionalities of modern RDBMS [24], their handling is essential when considering the ORM framework. Often an operation can only be performed when the previous one succeeded or has to be made strictly in order without another operation having access to the data in between [13]. This can be achieved only through the database transaction, and support for them is necessary for many use cases.

Database connection pool

A database connection pool is a component that collects and manages several database connections and allocates them to individual requests to the database. It works by creating either a fixed number of connections at the beginning or scaling up the number of connections based on usage. In this way, querying the database does not have to wait for the connection to be established, and the request can be routed through the database connection pool to the currently unused connection [25]. Additionally, due to having multiple connections, multithreaded and asynchronous applications can coordinate connections to the database. Single connection applications can be stalled while waiting for a single otherwise non-blocking request, while others could be served by the database. Such connections must be coordinated with transaction management, as the transaction is inherently connected with the connection that spawned it.

Read replica

A read replica is a special kind of database instance, a read-only instance of the database presenting additional query points for the applications accessing the database without having to resolve consistency between instances. Some databases support multiple fully functional instances, however concurrent writes to alternative machines could produce an inconsistent state in the database. With a read-only replica, consistency is not threatened; the only negative is the possibility that the connections will receive a state that is delayed when the replica is not synced to the latest consistent state of the primary instance [26].

Creation and usage of read replicas can significantly speed up application performance as database queries are no longer constrained by single hardware instance, which usually bottlenecks query speed. Duplicating the data over two instances can double disk read speeds; if different physical devices are used, slow scans over data can run independently and finish faster.

JavaScript

A high-level dynamically typed programming language developed in the mid-1990s at Netscape Communications Corporation to add dynamic content to web pages. Initially called Mocha, it was later renamed multiple times to finally settle on JavaScript to use the (at the time very high) popularity of Java [27].

Before JavaScript, websites were almost always purely static documents that were displayed in web browsers (such as Netscape at the time or Google Chrome or Firefox currently). The logic for any web application had to be handled purely on the server side. With the introduction of JavaScript, web pages were able to be more interactive and dynamic. While initially designed to be used when writing HTML documents and executed by web browsers, it outgrew its client-side roots and conquered large parts of the server-side development and even mobile app and desktop application environments. The advantage of JavaScript is that it can be a completely full-stack language which provides exact parity of logic between client and server and allows for significant code portability.

Until the last few years, JavaScript had an exclusive reign over interactive web content, which made it one of the most used programming languages in the world [2]. With multiple deficiencies known and unfixable without massive problems with incompatibility, multiple additions which build atop JavaScript and even whole languages which compile into JavaScript were developed. Some complied languages are, for example, CoffeeScript [28], Dart [29] or TypeScript [30]. These languages exist to provide additional features and functionality that are not easily or at all possible in pure JavaScript.

ECMAScript

Soon after the introduction of JavaScript, it became apparent that establishing standards would be a necessary step for compatibility between implementations in different web browsers. Following this consensus, ECMA (originally an acronym for European Computer Manufacturers until 1994 [31]) International standards association meeting was held, and the first edition of the document specifying the new standard specification was adopted in June 1997.

The specification, coded under the name ECMA-262 [32], is a comprehensive document that has gone over several versions over the years and specifies the syntax, semantics, and behaviour of the language. There is also an extensive description of data types, operators, flow control structures, built-in objects, and API.

ECMAScript is currently used primarily for client-side scripting, with primary implementations being those used in web browsers, such as SpiderMonkey (Firefox) [33], V8 (Google Chrome, Opera) [34] and JavaScriptCore (Safari) [35]. Increasingly with new revisions of the standard, even server-side applications and services have started migrating to ECMAScript from other standards (primarily CommonJS), but many constructs are not directly compatible or translatable.

CommonJS

One of the alternative specifications which reflected missing functionality in ECMAScript for server use is CommonJS. Created to establish conventions on modularization for JavaScript outside the web browser, it has also standardized several APIs and internal features [36].

Started in 2009 by an engineer at Mozilla, the project was initially called ServerJS, with its flagship feature being the synchronous loading of modules. This means that once a module is imported, its exported components are immediately available to be used [37]. This simplifies working with modules and was necessary for the expansion of JS code into server-side development and is used widely today.

Since its conception, gripes with the ECMAScript specifications were largely fixed with further iterations, making it also usable in server-side development. Popular packages, including those exclusively used in server development, have migrated their codebase to ECMAScript.

TypeScript

A statically typed language built on top of the JavaScript foundation, TypeScript was developed by Microsoft Corporation with the focus on allowing developers to catch errors at compile time before the problem is encountered during runtime, which usually requires extensive testing. TypeScript code is written in enhanced syntax and then compiled into regular JavaScript, with several standards supported, including CommonJS and ECMAScript [22].

TypeScript was designed to address several shortcomings that have been present in the ecosystem for a long time, especially when creating large-scale applications. JavaScript applications are very flexible with their dynamic and loosely typed nature and prototype usage, but with flexibility comes a large surface area for errors and mistakes.

Today, TypeScript is widely used for web development and JavaScript server-side development. Most popular frameworks provide at least partial support for TypeScript, and some (such as Angular and React) have even switched to it as the recommended language. TypeScript has support in many JavaScript-integrated development environments, such as Microsoft's Visual Studio Code [38] or JetBrains WebStorm [39]. With solid typing comes the ability for more substantial and consistent code completion, guaranteed automated refactoring, and error checking.

Other projects have tried to fix the same issues as TypeScript fixes. For example, Dart [29], which is developed by Google, works in the same way, although it abstracts further from the traditional JavaScript syntax. It is also compiled into standard ECMAScript syntax. However, it never gained the same traction, and its focus was changed from alternative to JavaScript to the primary language for development in the multi-platform framework Flutter.

Node.js

Node.js is an open-source, cross-platform JavaScript based on the V8 engine, which was originally developed by Google for Google Chrome. It is designed to allow for server-side usage of JavaScript, with focus on network applications [40]. Released by Ryan Dahl in 2009 [41], it has since become standard for server-side JavaScript development, especially web applications. The framework has gained popularity thanks to its alternative execution model, which separates it from traditional server-side languages. Instead of spawning different threads or workers for connections, it works with a non-blocking asynchronous I/O model, where many concurrent connections can be handled with only a small overhead [42].

This is achieved through asynchronous programming, where multiple tasks can be executed concurrently without blocking the main execution. Node.js supports asynchronous programming through the concepts of callbacks and promises. Callbacks are functions passed as arguments that are executed in finished or failed states, ensuring that logic can be applied sequentially after the asynchronous operation is finished. Promises provide a more structured and object-focused way to handle asynchronous operations and have become the preferred way. a promise is a representation of value which might not be available yet, containing a status variable and reference for the result once achieved, allowing for code execution while the operation status is updated in the background. When the value of the promise is necessary, the promise can be checked or awaited by using the `async/await` constructs [43].

While Node.js is currently the most dominant, there are other alternatives available with their own approaches and focuses. The most popular one is Deno, also developed by Ryan Dahl, with the intention to address some of the security and design issues of Node.js. Deno, for example, contains extensive tools and utilities within its standard library or uses better sandboxing between modules as supported by V8, the engine on which both it and Node.js run [44].

npm

One of the key benefits of the Node.js ecosystem is the large number of third-party packages that can be incorporated into projects. For example, many popular web frameworks, such as Koa or Express.js, are built for Node.

Originally an acronym for Node Package Manager [45], the three-letter name has been retroactively stripped of such meaning [46]. The first release was published in 2010, and it has since become the default Node.js package manager. Npm consists of a command line client, which is also called npm, and an online database of packages called the npm registry, which is hosted at www.npmjs.com.

Although npm is the default package manager, alternatives that were created with different focuses and compromises exist, for example, yarn [47], although they usually don't provide their own registry.

JSON


JavaScript object notation (JSON) is a lightweight data-interchange format that is widely used in web development. Introduced as an alternative to the complex XML format that was previously used, it is based on a subset of JavaScript representation of values. It consists of key-value pairs in objects, arrays, and primitive types. One of the main benefits is its simplicity and readability for humans, which makes it useful for places where data could need to be interpreted by both humans and machines.

JSON has been standardised in the ECMA-404 [48] document by Ecma International. The document specifies syntax and semantics, ensuring its reliability, consistency, and portability throughout systems and applications.

Unit of Work

Unit of Work is a software design pattern used most commonly in ORMs and similar frameworks to manage persistence and consistency between application and database state. The pattern is used to group all database operations relating to a single transaction or process and only execute the final state,

Figure 1.1: Active pattern class diagram, recreated from [8, Fowler]



ensuring they can be performed atomically without requiring lengthy and expensive locking of database rows or tables or risking deadlocks through database transactions [8, p. 184].

The main idea is to track changes across the object in memory, and instead of committing every change into the database, only the last state change is executed. This can be applied not only across one object instance but also across whole swathes of objects. While atomicity is undoubtedly necessary on many occasions, and unit of work on the ORM side can significantly reduce the number of requests to the database, it can also lead to inconsistency when multiple applications access the database and data which are currently loaded in memory on one machine are modified by a different one.

Active record

The Active Record pattern is a design pattern defined by Martin Fowler in his book “Patterns of Enterprise Application Architecture” [8, p. 160] and is commonly used to represent database records in an application.

The goal of the pattern is to encapsulate logic for interacting with the database table into a single object. Each instance of the object represents a single record, and modifications made on it are then usually flushed with a method call into the database. The base class also provides static methods for CRUD (create, read, update, delete) operations and possibly additional business logic.

The main benefit of the Active Record pattern is a simple and intuitive

interface for objects and tables. Modifications of the object can be made right on the data in languages, which allow setters and getters on attributes, and static methods provide a simple gateway to work with the table. Diagram of the pattern can be seen in Figure 1.1.

Limitations of the pattern come in the tight coupling between the application and database logic, as the object instance is inherently tied to the database representation. This makes it harder to test the implementation and often requires additional abstraction or mocking. Additionally, the pattern does not easily allow for the management of relations, so a database schema with complex relations might not be able to represent the data easily.


Data mapper

The Data Mapper pattern, as described by Martin Fowler in his seminal work on enterprise application architectures, provides a clear separation between domain models and their underlying data storage. This approach enables developers to create complex and expressive domain models without being constrained by the relational database schema or various storage options. By decoupling in-memory representations from the data storage mechanisms, the Data Mapper pattern promotes a clean separation of concerns and enhanced flexibility in application design [8, p. 165].

Distinguished from the Active Record pattern, the Data Mapper pattern ensures that business logic and data access responsibilities remain separate. In this approach, a single entity represents the table or collection, while distinct entities represent individual records as seen in Figure 1.2. The Data Mapper serves as a data access layer that performs operations on the data storage representation without creating any direct bindings between in-memory objects and the database. This responsibility is solely managed by the Data Mapper, which takes care of any objects that utilize it.

By limiting the responsibilities class must service and ensure that it is not accountable for multiple unrelated tasks, the single responsibility principle aims to create more straightforward and more maintainable classes. Consequently, the Data Mapper pattern contributes to a more robust and modular software architecture that is easier to develop, maintain, and extend.

Figure 1.2: Data Mapper class diagram, recreated from [8]



However, the Data Mapper pattern has its own set of drawbacks. One notable downside is the increased complexity introduced by the additional layer of abstraction. This added complexity could lead to a steeper learning curve for developers unfamiliar with the pattern, as well as the potential for increased development time [49].

Framework selection

Selecting the optimal framework for any project can be difficult, with many parameters and options to consider, and quite often, there are better options than the most popular. The JavaScript ecosystem is rich in choice, as throughout the years, many developers and companies have tried to create packages in their own image. Mainly due to this plethora of choices, there is a need for an overview which would present advantages and disadvantages. However, only some frameworks can be reviewed; therefore, at least essential criteria need to be established.

The selected packages were selected for their support of TypeScript, with varying levels of compatibility, which will be shown in further detail later. Additional criteria considered were popularity and support as separate factors, leading to the inclusion of widely-used packages with currently limited support and development and lesser-known packages with solid support.

2.1 Typescript support

The primary selection criterion for the packages was TypeScript compatibility. Each package had to have at least a basic functionality working and typed, requiring only reasonable effort to integrate. The degree of support varies among the packages, and their level was also compared, but the base level was necessary to be considered.

The functionality considered essential is not easy to define either, but as the level of type support varied, the minimum settled on was package and

connection setup and simple querying. The package had to have connection options typed, at least for primary usage, as listing all options for all connections is not necessary for most uses. Querying and updating database records is the most common activity for which ORMs and connection builders will be used, so the types they provide are some of the most useful. The result of a simple non-joined query on one table should be able to return exact and correct types, and an update of the record should also at least suggest the attributes which can be changed.

The quality of the typings provided by the package will be a subject of benchmarking. However, the packages included in this comparison had to advertise at least basic functionality.

The quality of the typings provided by the package will also be a subject of benchmarking. However, the packages included in this comparison had to advertise at least basic functionality. Even packages with community-provided typings were considered for implementation. However, only one package - Waterline was found with at least basic quality typings provided in such a way, and it was not sufficient for implementation, as explained in subsection 7.11.3.

2.2 Popularity and Support

Popularity was inherently a factor in the selection of packages; if the package was known more, its likelihood of being found was smaller. We researched popularity in several ways; the primary source was searching by name and keyword ORM on the npm repository [50]. Secondary sources were articles on ORM and database access in Node.js [51], [52]. The npm repository provides statistics about the packages listed on it, the most prominent being weekly downloads. The statistic is good for basic orientation but is not a great indicator of the exact number of users, as users can download the package multiple times, most packages are cached by third parties, which automatically download a version when it is released and many more ways, which skew the number. Additional input for popularity was the number of issues and stars the project currently holds on GitHub.

Support is a secondary attribute that is highly linked to popularity. Although all packages reviewed are open-source, only maintainers can merge

code into the main branch or release versions onto the registry. If they are no longer active, the project effectively stops. While they can be released under a new name if the licence permits such a thing, no packages missing implementation into the benchmark have forks that would relieve the issues encountered. High-quality support is crucial for addressing issues, incorporating new features and compatibility with changes in underlying technologies.

2.3 Exclusion criteria

Although some packages were initially selected for comparison, thanks to fitting the previous criteria, problems encountered during their implementation into the benchmarks needed to be better to allow for meaningful comparison. They are still introduced in section 7.11, and the issues explained; however, they will only be included in comparisons outside the basic summary.

The one condition that could disqualify a package was the ability to function inside the TypeScript project. That means having up-to-date type definitions and functionality for package configuration with the test database. Even alternative type definition would be considered if, for example, a change in TypeScript behaviour would require a redefinition of types.

If the issue of such deficiency lies in required dependencies, it's exacerbated, as changing to a newer version could break the package's functionality. In cases where such problems are encountered, derivative distributions of the framework were explored, but unless they are distributed through the npm repository, they were not tested.

Ranking and Grading of the Frameworks

This chapter outlines and explains the criteria for evaluating ORM and SQL query builder packages chosen for the comparison. These criteria will be the core points which will be considered, but other specific notes will be made about each package. The main criteria were the level of TypeScript support, range of compatible database management systems, popularity, support, documentation quality, dependency count, and performance in different scenarios.

3.1 Quantifiable Criteria

The main section of the evaluation criteria focuses on technical aspects of the frameworks, specifically their usage of TypeScript, support for different databases, and difficulty composing queries. As these qualities are quantifiable, they were given the highest priority in comparing the packages.

3.1.1 TypeScript Support

The quality and extent of TypeScript support vary among the packages, with some offering better integration and type safety without the need for casts. In contrast, others only provide basic typing or require result type definitions to be written into each request, which amounts to the same behaviour as if the result was cast. Such functionality often comes when the package initially

written for JavaScript is not rewritten in TypeScript, only provided with a `types` file for compatibility. The file specifies call signatures, but cannot provide other assurances, that TypeScript native code has.

3.1.2 Database Compatibility

Wide database compatibility is necessary when working with a large project that may encompass many services or when choosing a toolchain for a team working with dynamic technology stack, as the one database may not satisfy all the needs the team might have, and building experience with multiple frameworks could be considered unnecessary spending. Providing a unified API over multiple databases can be one of the benefits of query builders or object-relational mapping frameworks.

3.1.3 Flexibility and Performance

Flexibility and performance are crucial in a database access framework. Suppose the package would restrict the ability to access the data, requiring round-about ways to deal with basic operations. In that case, there are better ways to simplify development, just as if the framework creates excessively suboptimal queries or adds excessive overhead. One of the requirements for a comprehensive ORM framework is the ability to support many use cases and represent and work with many different data models. If ORM doesn't support possible use cases or cannot represent commonly used database design patterns, it is lacking in some ways compared to one that does.

Performance is often secondary when choosing an ORM framework, as quite often, even frameworks adding significant overhead and creating suboptimal queries are usually not noticeably slowing down the application. As the application grows, the performance can become significantly more critical, and the resources needed can be more expensive to scale. a high-performing package can support this growth by maintaining efficacy under load and effectively using its available resources.

Performance was measured by comparing the request execution time to other implementations. Benchmarking this way provides information about the amount of overhead the framework requires to function and if the connec-

tion pool is correctly initialized, connections are assigned optimally, and data are retrieved in a proper form. The benchmark executes the run repeatedly to eliminate any inconsistency from a single run.

3.1.4 ECMAScript and CommonJS compatibility

There are two different primary standards for JavaScript syntax, ECMAScript and CommonJS. They primarily differ in how the inclusion of modules is written and the mechanism of the module import. While CommonJS was dominant in the server backend space for a long time, however, ECMAScript modules are becoming significantly more popular, with support added in Node.js, TypeScript and many popular packages.

Combining packages from both ecosystems can still lead to problems. The best way to support all possible combinations is to provide both types of dependency declarations.

3.1.5 Licence

As developers consider integrating packages into their projects, it is crucial to consider and understand the significance of licences governing their use. Open-source software is often regarded as a valuable resource, offering a large amount of reusable code and often the best solution. However, it is essential to understand that open-source does not necessarily equate to unregulated use. Licences still dictate the terms under which the package and its code can be employed, modified and redistributed. Therefore, developers must examine the licences of potential packages to ensure their intended use aligns with the terms granted.

The most permissive licences allow for usage, modification and redistribution with at most a requirement to credit the original author/authors and don't require the licensee to maintain the same licence in derivative works. Examples of such permissive licences are *MIT License* [53] or *Apache License 2.0* [54]. These are generally preferable for projects that demand flexibility in their use of the software.

While still free, the opposite side to the permissive licences are copyleft licences, which impose more stringent requirements on the usage, especially

modifications and redistributions of the software. The primary example of such a licence is *GNU General Public License* [55], which requires derived works to be distributed under the same licence.

Since copyleft or other provisions might limit the usability of libraries such as ORMs for many projects, it is necessary to include the licence as a grading criterion.

3.2 Package Properties Criteria

However, technical criteria are only some that should be considered when selecting a framework. Many of these factors are interconnected; often, success in one is either caused by or preceded by doing well in others. For example, while the popularity of the package can show the reliability and usability of the package, it also often results in more issues being reported, and more users are more likely to create community resources supplying or improving official documentation.

3.2.1 Popularity

Popularity measures usage, as indicated by package downloads, the number of issues, and the number of users on GitHub who have shown interest in the repository. While all imperfect measures for absolute popularity, they help compare popularity between packages by their relative difference. In the case that the package usage requires multiple dependencies to be installed, for example command line interface for development and runtime dependency, the highest number is listed.

3.2.2 Support

The number of resolved and still open issues can be used to show popularity and support of the project. With such a metric, support can be measured; however, more important than that are the patterns of behaviour which maintainers have shown previously. If the release schedule is predictable, bugs and security issues are fixed quickly, hesitant adopters can be assured that this pattern will continue, and the framework is a safe investment. On the contrary,

a project which is officially or probably no longer supported can be assumed to be a wrong choice, as it cannot react to newly found errors and problems with dependencies and might be unusable due to changes with TypeScript or Node.js runtime.

3.2.3 Dependencies

As dependencies require maintenance due to their changes and vulnerable versions, their amount should also be manageable. Otherwise, it might increase the maintenance cost for the package and application size. Even though data storage is less critical than previously, having a more storage-conscious package is still beneficial.

3.2.4 Documentation Quality

Documentation quality is critical for new adoption and onboarding for working with the framework. It also cannot be measured with reasonable objectivity. Perceived quality depends on language understanding and users' previous experience with the programming language and similar frameworks. Evaluation of documentation will therefore summarize clarity, extensiveness and whether features such as JSDoc annotations [56] which can be parsed by IDEs are used to contain or link to the documentation.

The following chapters aim to provide a comprehensive and in-depth analysis of packages compared by evaluating each package by these comprehensive criteria with additional added when.

Benchmark database schema design

This chapter describes the database used for performance testing of the ORM and query builder packages. The database is designed around imaginary data collection about cats, their home domiciles and toys found within these houses, and the toys' manufacturers. The database comprises six main entities - `cat`, `cat colours`, `colour hex codes`, `houses`, `toys` and `toy producers`.

The design of the database was guided by the aim to represent many different relational architectures and different commonly used data types. The schema was created to represent different cardinality between entities, foreign key usage and partiality. The data stored inside the schema was also selected only to test data parsing ability rather than fit logical use.

The database was filled with testing data, designed with diversity and amount to allow for flexibility testing and for highly inefficient queries to be evident. However, the data in the database is insufficient to overfill the database buffers and test for excessive operation complexity, only to detect inefficiency in the query. This is one area which can be explored in further work.

4.1 Cat Entity

The `cat` entity instances represent individual cats which we want to monitor. Each has a unique identifier, name and date of birth, all of which are nullable

except for the identifier. This entity aims to represent the basic database table and to verify the correct handling of the data type from Postgres, as JavaScript Date time represents a moment, including time [57]. In contrast, the database entry would only contain the date [58]. Additionally, the `cat` entity uses big integer data type, and handling numbers beyond the standard range allocated in JavaScript is tested. The `cat colour` and `colour hex code` are two entities that represent the cat colour by its name and by its hex code. The entities are intentionally split in this way to use identifying relation [59] - the primary key of the hex colour entity is also a foreign key referencing the id of the cat colour entity.

4.2 House and Toy House Entities

The `house` entity represents domiciles where the cats spend time at their behest. The relation must account for ambitious cats using several houses as their homes. The main aim is to test the difficulty of implementing and using simple many-to-many relations. The only attribute that provides new data




Figure 4.1: Schema of benchmark database

type or behaviour is the simple `has_dog` attribute, specified as a Boolean. It is one of several attributes that test the frameworks' ability to correctly type and convert the data recovered from the database.

The houses can be equipped with many toys for the cats to use. The relation between houses and toys is modelled through a decomposition table which contains attributes representing the number of the same toy in the house. While the primary keys are the identifiers of the house and toy, the decomposition with the amount, rather than several records with an additional identifier, is designed to test the ability to insert a record if it does not exist or update the value referencing its previous state. If more toys are purchased, the owner of the house does not suddenly throw out all toys they already had; they will add them to their current pile. This operation is often called *upsert* - a combination of update and insert, and some database engines, such as CockroachDB [60], implement it explicitly under this name. PostgreSQL achieves it using the `ON CONFLICT` statement in `INSERT` query [61]. It also tests the handling of composite primary keys, a standard paradigm in many databases.

4.3 Toy and Toys Producer Entity

The `toy` entity purpose in testing is in numeric data type used in `price` attribute and usage of additional column attributes such as `CHECK` constraints or `DEFAULT` values in the column [62]. Column `naughty` is focused on commonly problematic strings in software development, such as special Unicode characters, emojis and other issues that could come up in handling data from the database, especially if the encoding is not correctly handled. Toys producers host the `JSON` columns to test if it is possible to use advanced `JSON` traversal and query operators provided in PostgreSQL [63] (and their equivalents in other database management systems).

Benchmark Framework Design

The benchmarking process was designed to compare the performance of various ORM and SQL query builder packages. As such, it was important to ensure that the benchmarking framework was developed in the same environment as the packages themselves. To achieve this, the framework was implemented in TypeScript, the same language used by the packages being tested.

The benchmarking framework had to be designed to accommodate errors that could occur during development and testing of the packages. Additionally, it has to support testing of multiple database schemas and allow for results to be exported in a variety of formats for further analysis. The resulting benchmarking framework provides a robust and comprehensive means of comparing database access packages.

5.1 Test Suite and Schema Separation

The benchmarking framework was designed to support separation of tests into multiple test suites, a common practice with JavaScript test frameworks such as Jest [64] or Mocha [65]. Test suite separation allows for organization of tests by subject and contains specifications about the database schema and data expected to be executed. Input and output parameters must be typed to test TypeScript support, and the framework should provide sufficient functionality to avoid the need for casting.

The tests are expected to be run simultaneously with snapshots of the database schema and should not interfere with data used by another test suite. As a deliberate choice, this limits the scope of each test's modifications over the database and data. However, it eliminates the need to reset the database to the original state after each test suite, reducing the time it takes to run the benchmark. Even so, such functionality should still be supported, as the framework has to allow for wider range of tests than is expected for implementation.

5.2 Database management

As the framework operates strictly over a database instance, the framework must be able to perform maintenance operations. These include initializing the database with its schema, seeding the database with test data and later tearing down the schema and replacing it with a different one, depending on which the test suite requires.

5.3 Test type and Error Handling

The framework needs to support multiple tests to ensure the validity of any results it produces. If performance is measured, multiple runs can reduce the impact of statistical anomalies, which can occur due to the innumerable possible external events.

Along with performance, the correctness of both query types, resulting runtime types, and the result value are essential. As types are only visible before compilation, and with typed test suite definitions TypeScript compiler would not compile the code. Due to this restriction, even incorrect types from the packages will need to be cast into their expected value. However, even just the need for such modification means the package is insufficiently supporting type definitions.

Resulting runtime types and values are validated using the node module `node:assert` [66], which provides assertion functions. It is provided to function with testing frameworks such as mocha, which do not offer verification functions. Included are even deep equality checking functions. The main ad-

vantage, however, comes from being included in the Node.js standard library, meaning that no additional package has to be included.

Returning an incorrect result is one of many ways the benchmark test can be failed; the package can return an unexpected error, or the test is impossible to perform. Both are fail-states, which the benchmark suite must account for with error handling. One choice during the design process was that a single failure would mark the real test as failed, even though other iterations succeeded. If the package caused the issue, that means the package is not reliable enough and such problem needs to be marked. If the failure is caused by external issue, for example database error, the test run can be repeated after triage.

5.4 Multi-Framework support

The benchmarking bootstrap is designed for sequential testing of multiple packages. This design, rather than separate execution, allows for comprehensive comparison under the same conditions, ensuring accurate results. As managing the dependencies could prove problematic if packages had different dependencies required, npm workspaces [67] were selected as a project structure. That way, top-level dependencies of the framework can be separated from the individual implementations.

As each framework is initialized through its initialization method, abstraction over the package itself must be created. The initialization also has to account for delayed connection pool creation. Some packages only start the connection once the first request is sent to limit the number of open connections for the database. The database has a limited amount of connections it can support, which is one way to optimize its usage. The benchmark database can easily handle the limited connections between the benchmarking framework and the individual connections; however, it should still contain a method for closing the connection and destroying the context so subsequent frameworks can access the same amount of resources.

5.5 Reporters - Output options

An integral part of the design was the inclusion of reporters. Reporters provide an interface and implementation of multiple output options, enabling the results to be saved and shown in various formats. Standard test frameworks utilize reporters to make code coverage or detailed error stack inspectable. The reporters can interpret the data in different formats with a benchmarking framework. The reporter interface has to be designed to be extensible, in order to allow for the easy addition of other output options or data interpretations in the future.

Benchmark implementation

The design of the benchmark overhead leads directly to its implementation. The benchmark functionality, written in TypeScript, involves two main components: the **BenchmarkRunner** and **BenchmarkSuite** classes. The classes work together to manage the ordering of tests, database administration, and execution of test suites, as well as handling packages, test suites, and reporters. The simplified class schema is shown in Figure 6.1.

6.1 BenchmarkRunner


The **BenchmarkRunner** class is responsible for managing the benchmark's overall execution. It holds information about the test suites, ORMs and query builder packages being tested, and the reporters. The class has responsibility for database administration while also ordering and executing the test suites on their respective database schemas.

Database administration tasks include setting up and tearing down example databases used in testing. Tests are currently written only for the database examined in Chapter 4, therefore this functionality is only used to initialize the database and to preserve a consistent state. In order to perform these tasks, **BenchmarkRunner** maintains its database connection using the default **pg** module.

The benchmark runner is also responsible for ordering, initialization and execution of individual packages and tests. Each package is declared using a unified interface, which defines initialization and destruction methods for

6. BENCHMARK IMPLEMENTATION

Figure 6.1: Simplified schema of the Benchmark class architecture



efficient memory usage, implemented test suites and package name. The order of execution is guided by the database schema selected, the package, and individual test suites. If any suites are not implemented in the individual package declaration, the reporters are notified, and the tests can be marked as not implemented in the report.

6.2 BenchmarkSuite

As the name suggests, **BenchmarkSuite** represents each test suit of the benchmark. It covers the specification of each test, including validation function, name, parameters and options for running the test. This design ensures type safety for running the tests as they implement the interface defined for the suite. The options include which tests should be performed or how many loops to execute for repeated tests. Class methods implement individual types of tests, error handling for individual runs and measuring the execution time of each test run.

Two implemented test workflows, validity test and latency test; validity test runs each implementation once, tests if the value is equal to reference in both value and the runtime type, and returns test result. The latency test executes the tests in a loop, intending to show if the framework can create well-crafted queries while not adding significant overhead.

6.3 Reporters

As the output of the benchmarks is meant to be interpreted by humans, the measured data needs to be transformed into a human-readable format. Test objects contain vital information, but the benchmark output consists of thousands of such objects; therefore, they must be converted into valuable data. Two reporters were implemented for this benchmarking framework, with an interface for further reporters.

Console Reporter

The primary reporter for use in development intends to provide simple benchmark results in table form. While running the benchmark, it allows for quick

assessment of any errors and monitors the progress of the run. Illustrating test status using emoticons and separating test suite, implementation, and test type helps with any expansion of the framework with new tests of packages.

Figure 6.2: ConsoleReporter example result - partial screenshot

| Result | Test | Implementation | Type | Time |
|--------|-------------------------|----------------|----------|----------|
| ✓ | upsertToysToHouse | PrismaORM | Validity | 14.831ms |
| ✓ | JSONColumn | PrismaORM | Validity | 3.4426ms |
| ✓ | JSONWhere | PrismaORM | Validity | 3.7240ms |
| ✓ | transactionalOperations | PrismaORM | Validity | 16.378ms |
| ✓ | likeQuery | PrismaORM | Validity | 9.1224ms |
| ✓ | ilikeQuery | PrismaORM | Validity | 7.5661ms |

| Result | Test | Implementation | Type | Time |
|--------|-------------------------|----------------|---------|----------|
| ✓ | JSONColumn | PrismaORM | Latency | 1017.5ms |
| ✓ | JSONWhere | PrismaORM | Latency | 980.40ms |
| ✓ | transactionalOperations | PrismaORM | Latency | 739.32ms |
| ✓ | likeQuery | PrismaORM | Latency | 1761.2ms |
| ✓ | ilikeQuery | PrismaORM | Latency | 2233.4ms |

HTML Reporter

The HTML reporter is the primary source for any data analysis of the benchmark run. It consists of a template file and the reporter. The reporter receives data from the benchmark using the unified API, parses it, and inserts it into the template file as a JSON string once the benchmark is finished. Along with the data, cascading style sheets are also inserted, as they are written in **Sass** language [68], which must be compiled before the HTML file viewer uses them. After the template is completed, the file is saved separately, and graphs are created on runtime using JavaScript.

While the data could be served dynamically, this separate file allows for multiple runs to be saved and be independent of the server which would provide the data. The JSON is available and can be inspected if further analysis is needed. Example of resulting web page is included in the appendix as Figure A.1.

6.4 Benchmarks

This section will list and describe all the benchmarks developed to compare individual packages. In addition to comparing performance, the requirements

for implementation are comparison, as an easily implemented framework is better than one that's difficult to, provided they otherwise have feature parity.

6.4.1 MVP Benchmark

This test suite was only implemented under the *Knex.js* package as its purpose is to test the functionality of the benchmarking framework and does not test any database functionality. It is proof of concept for correct validation and exception handling tests for the benchmark suite and runner implementation. It consists of a small number of tests, including a fully passing test, a test expecting **Skipped** exception, which is used for marking tests which are not implemented, tests whose results are mismatched in value or runtime type, and a test that throws generic error on execution. Additionally, MVPBench examines if test configurations are working as they should be, testing both validity and latency settings.

6.4.2 Entity Traversal Benchmark

One of the generally provided functionalities of ORMs is the ability to define entities and their relations. This benchmark aims to test the ability to use these defined relations to find objects using these connections. The first test of the suit focuses on finding a cat's colour in hex by traversing two relations, one of which is identifying. The framework starts with the cat's ID and needs to fetch the `color_hex` instance through its connection to the `cat_color` instance. Thanks to the relation design, there is a guarantee that only one result will be returned at any time. The second test counts cats by their colour hex code, traversing the relations from the first test in the opposite direction. Instead of selecting, the test counts the cats, testing if the query difficulty changes if we use aggregate functions instead of basic **SELECT** query. The third test in this benchmark selects all toys available to a cat, primarily focusing on the format of the returned data and how well the decomposition table can be accessed or avoided. The decomposition table exists because of the M:N relation between toys and houses, but the additional amount attribute is not used.

6.4.3 Edge Cases Benchmark

The edge cases benchmark aims to evaluate database adapter performance in specific situations that may not be commonly encountered but can potentially cause problems. The two tests in this benchmark focus on data type conversion and parameter handling.

BigIntColumn test examines the data type conversion for the `BigInteger` type in PostgreSQL. JavaScript's `Number` type can lose precision when handling large integers since the maximum safe integer for `Number` is $2^{53} - 1$ [69], while PostgreSQL's `bigint` type can store numbers up to $2^{63} - 1$ [70]. Although the `BigInt` primitive [71], which can store integers with arbitrary precision, was introduced in ECMAScript 2020 (ES11) [32] and has been implemented in Node.js since 2018 [71], not all frameworks handle this type correctly. The frameworks can either cast the value to `Number`, losing precision and failing the test, or return the value as a string or, ideally, as a `BigInt` primitive.

SQLInjection test assesses the framework's basic handling of parameters. One of the main reasons for using a database access package over a basic driver is to improve security against SQL injection attacks. The code will return all records if the parameter is sent as part of the SQL query. If the package incorrectly escapes the query, it will result in no results returned. Only the correct handling of arguments will return the specific Cat with the fascinating name a `"' or true --"`. It is important to note that this test does not evaluate whether the package is entirely vulnerable to SQL injection attacks but rather if the basic handling of arguments is not vulnerable.

In order to test the ability to use aggregate functions over a relation, the *maxQuery* test examines the package's ability to query the relation's maximal value. The test is run over the Toy entity, with the highest price being searched for. In addition to aggregate function usage, this also tests the ability to parse `DECIMAL` type and work with it in terms of JavaScript type `Number`, which is more accurately reflected with PostgreSQL type `DOUBLE`.

6.4.4 Special SQL Actions Benchmark

The Special SQL Actions benchmark evaluates the performance of frameworks in scenarios that go beyond basic querying, focusing on unique ways of interacting with the database. This benchmark comprises several tests, each targeting different aspects of database interactions.

The *upsertToysToHouse* test examines whether the package contains an upsert operation method and assesses its flexibility, such as the ability to differentiate between the insertion and update objects, as well as the capacity to reference the updated value. The test uses a CatDatabase schema that includes a decomposition table called ToysHouse, which stores references between houses and toys and the quantity of each toy type in the house.

The suite also contains tests which evaluate the handling of JSON columns in the database. The *JSONColumn* test checks the ability to parse JSON values from the database, while the *JSONWhere* test focuses on querying based on the value of an object key inside the JSON column. PostgreSQL provides two ways to query the value: extraction operator `->>` for simple comparisons or `@>` operator for more complex comparisons with JSONB datatype [63], which are useful for developers using SQL, but the abstraction of ORM might obstruct the access to these methods.

The *transactionalOperations* test investigates how individual packages handle transactions, assessing the full range of operations available for reverting changes to the data.

Lastly, the *likeQuery* test examines the methods each framework uses for pattern-matching queries, evaluating basic search functionality in the database by searching for a part of a house address. As case insensitivity differs in implementation between database engines and the ILIKE term support is not universal, test *ilikeQuery* also tests the ability of packages to use the functionality provided by database engines. The query can use either PostgreSQL native ILIKE term, parsing the request and creating SIMILAR TO condition, or a different pattern matching function.

By understanding how different frameworks handle these particular SQL actions, developers can make informed decisions when selecting a database adapter that aligns with their project's unique requirements. The benchmark

ensures that developers are aware of each package’s various capabilities and limitations, enabling them to choose the most suitable solution for their specific use cases.

6.4.5 Bulk Operations Benchmark

The benchmark for bulk operation focuses on the usage limitations for more extensive operations and large amounts of data. With ORM abstracting through the Active Record pattern, more extensive scale analytics and data manipulation operations can be obscured and inefficient. The limitations might come from something other than the abstraction but also from interaction with the driver and optimization of large-scale operations.

The *BulkInsert* test observes the existence of bulk insert, its realization and the handling of PostgreSQL query limits. The SQL dialect uses `Int16` type to represent parameters, meaning that, at most, each query can contain 32767 binding parameters [72]. The test tries to create 30000 instances of a House entity, where each instance would, in a primitive insert, result in 3 bindings (id, house address and dog values). As this would breach the limits, the `node-postgres` (pg) driver for Node.js would throw the error *bind message has 90000 parameter formats but 0 parameters* [73]. Two popular solutions to this problem exist: chunking the creation into multiple requests or using the array `UNNEST` function, which supplies each type of parameter in an array, resulting in only as many parameters as columns are inserted. The packages are ranked based on the existence of the function to create explicit bulk insertion. Only if the native function does not exist do we resort to chunking the data before using the insertion method. Out of all the options, the `UNNEST` method is the fastest way to execute such a request, so packages relying on it will have a significant speed advantage.

The *BulkDelete* test questions the ability to access data representation through abstraction, as the operation consists of deleting all values in the database and filling in the condition. Poorly executed implementation of ORM could obscure access, leaving the developers to query and delete the fitting objects. *BulkUpdate* tests the same paradigm but with updates, where only records meeting specific criteria are to be updated, while other values are

untouched. Finally, the pagination test is focused on repeated querying and the feature richness of the framework. The test imagines a list of entities users want to browse by pages. If the package has an integrated pagination function, it should be used; if the feature is missing resorting to function calls to use SQL terms of `LIMIT` and `OFFSET` is chosen.

Individual packages

In the following chapters, we will discuss each package in detail, highlighting its essential characteristics and the results it produced when tested using the custom-designed benchmarking framework. This comparative analysis will enable us to evaluate the packages objectively and provide valuable insights for developers seeking the most suitable ORM or query builder for their TypeScript projects. The results for each package will be examined in the context of the package, with a simplified summary in Chapter 8.

7.1 pgTyped

PgTyped, primarily developed by Adel Salakh [74], is an open-source package that, while not technically an ORM or query builder, offers unique functionality for TypeScript developers. It analyzes SQL queries written by developers and, through database introspection, creates typed helper methods for executing those queries. The final usage is shown in Listing 1. This package is designed specifically for TypeScript, resulting in excellent typing but occasionally leading to complex errors, a common issue with other highly typed language-based packages like Kysely.

The package is compatible only with PostgreSQL, as each database requires its own parser and introspection process. PgTyped uses the *pg* connection package, which is only compatible with PostgreSQL. It provides complete SQL flexibility with minimal overhead, allowing developers to use it without limitations that come with pure SQL queries. However, it lacks the abstraction

typically found in ORM or query builder packages, making direct comparisons challenging.

PgTyped supports both ESM and CommonJS dependency initialization, ensuring excellent compatibility at the expense of a slightly larger package size. It is released under the MIT license, a highly permissive option. Its popularity ranks relatively low, with its main package, `@pgtyped/cli` receiving only about 10,000 downloads weekly [75]. On GitHub, it has more stars but still falls within the lowest third of the packages compared.

```
// -- File: EntityTraversal.sql
/* @name countCatsByColor */
SELECT
  COUNT(*)
FROM cat
  JOIN cat_color ON cat_color.id = cat.cat_color_id
  JOIN color_hex ON color_hex.id = cat_color.id
WHERE
  color_hex.hex_code = :hexCode;

// -- File: EntityTraversal.ts
import {
  countCatsByColor,
} from './EntityTraversal.queries'

return countCatsByColor
  .run({ hexCode }, getClient())
  .then(result => Number(result[0].count))
```

Listing 1: Usage of pgTyped

The package is well-supported, with regular version releases and active issue resolution. Most long-lasting issues are feature requests rather than bug reports. As the package is divided into development and runtime components, the CLI package can afford more dependencies than combined packages. The runtime dependency has only three direct dependencies: the widely-used `chalk` and `debug` packages, and the parser dependency, which adds `antlr4ts` for ANTLR 4 (ANother Tool for Language Recognition) grammar functionality in TypeScript/JavaScript [76].

The documentation is brief [77], providing examples and a quick start guide that covers the essentials for using the package. While the generated types lack method information, the original query is included in the Javadoc annotation, making it easily accessible during development. PgTyped is a unique and flexible package for TypeScript developers working with PostgreSQL. However, it may provide a different abstraction level for those seeking a traditional ORM or query builder solution.

Performance in benchmarks

In line with expectations, the pgTyped package outperformed all other packages examined in the study. Most pgTyped operations are executed before or during compile time, yielding performance metrics comparable to those achieved using the plain *pg* driver. While the package does not offer explicit support for parsing esoteric primitive types such as Decimal or Big Integer, which would result in their return as strings (akin to the *pg* driver's approach). The package does provide a specific type for JSON and JSONB columns. However, as these types must be sufficiently generic, this limits their overall value.

As is typical with intricate TypeScript interfaces, the errors frequently encountered when using pgTyped can be challenging to interpret and offer limited guidance regarding type hinting. Despite this, the package proves advantageous in error detection.

It is important to note that the pgTyped package solely supports single-command queries. Consequently, each query had to be separated during the transaction tests, with the commands for initiating and rolling back transactions explicitly written as SQL code. This limitation warrants consideration when selecting a package for implementation within a context.

7.2 @databases/pg

The @databases/pg package is developed by Lindsay Forbes, a prominent contributor to the Node.js ecosystem with hundreds of published packages. The package offers a simple interface for CRUD operations on individual tables in TypeScript. The package's typed interface is derived from schema definitions

```
return db
  .query(
    sql`SELECT
      COUNT(*) as count
    FROM
      cat
    JOIN cat_color ON cat_color.id = cat.cat_color_id
    JOIN color_hex ON color_hex.id = cat_color.id
    WHERE ${dbTables
      .color_hex(db)
      .conditionToSql({ hex_code: hexCode }, 'color_hex')}`
  ).then(r => Number(r[0].count))
```

Listing 2: countCatsByColor solution in @databases/pg showing where condition composition

in interfaces, which can be generated using the @databases/pg-schema-cli [78] package. However, the package lacks support for table joining, making it suitable only for basic queries. Complex queries require a combination of templated SQL and conditions written using module functions with types.

Though not as feature-rich as a typical ORM, the package simplifies basic querying more than a standard query builder. It is exported as an ES module and was initially licensed under GPLv3 but is now published under the MIT License. The @databases project supports multiple databases via modular drivers, with official support for PostgreSQL, MySQL, SQLite, and Expo/WebSQL [79]. Postgres has the most advanced support, with additional databases supported through modular drivers.

The package has 517 stars on GitHub and 26,613 weekly downloads which makes it the fourth least downloaded and the second least known on GitHub [80]. The project is actively developed and comprises numerous subpackages, with new databases being added and bugs frequently addressed. The package depends solely on internal modules or widely used packages, for example **assert-never** and **cuid**, along with the **pg** driver as a dependency.

While the documentation quality could be better, offering basic information, a quick-start guide, and examples, there is no inline documentation requiring developers to consult the online documentation. Database migrations

can be managed and executed using the `@databases/pg-migrations` package, supporting both `.sql` and `.ts` formats. However, no interface is provided for TypeScript migrations, necessitating custom scripts, and no schema modification methods are included in the package.

`@databases/pg` is a package that simplifies basic querying in TypeScript by providing a straightforward interface for CRUD operations. Although it lacks the extensive functionality of a traditional ORM, it offers compatibility with multiple databases and has an active development community. However, the absence of inline documentation and limited support for complex queries and migrations may require developers to rely on additional resources and tools.

Performance in benchmarks

As anticipated, packages with minimal abstraction, such as `@databases/pg`, tend to exhibit superior performance in latency tests. Notably, this package is among the few capable of automatically converting Big Integer values to their corresponding JavaScript type.

The benchmarks depended a lot on queries which were at least majorly manually written as shown in Listing 2, only providing shortcut methods for basic operations, helpers for parameter insertion and parsers for basic where binary comparisons.

Nevertheless, the `insertOrUpdate` method [79], meant for upsert operations, has a limitation, as it cannot differentiate between objects designated for updates and those for inserts. This constraint poses challenges for operations such as value incrementation or decrementation.

While `@databases/pg` does offer support for transactions, the package lacks an API for managing these transactions. Instead, it only provides the functionality to encapsulate operations within a transactional context. This aspect should be considered when evaluating the suitability of this package for particular applications.

The package does not support integrated pagination, which is not unusual. However, it also does not support `OFFSET` usage in its primary query interface, which forced the usage of plain SQL for the composition of the query.

7.3 Zapatos

The Zapatos package, developed by George MacKerron, is designed to provide type safety for database querying in TypeScript, specifically for PostgreSQL through the `pg` driver. It generates a TypeScript schema of the database via introspection, offering methods for basic CRUD operations that are instantly typed and function as shortcuts for generic queries. Additionally, it features tagged templates for writing arbitrary SQL [81].

Unlike `pgTyped`, which analyses queries and generates types, Zapatos disallows the inclusion of any value which was not specified in the manually types. This approach can lead to issues if the type is not defined correctly initially, potentially resulting in an unreliable type and is less explicit way to cast the result. Despite this limitation, the package supports lateral joins, enabling the return of nested objects, a feature typically not found in packages with such low abstraction levels. However, as with other TypeScript-dependent packages, Zapatos can generate compilation errors that are difficult to parse.

Released under the MIT license, the package uses ESM module dependencies and has 14,933 weekly downloads and 980 GitHub stars, ranking it third least downloaded and starred. It is regularly updated, and none of the reported issues in the repository significantly limit its use. The package has no runtime dependencies, only development dependencies.

While the documentation quality is generally good, it is brief but covers most of the necessary information for getting started, although lacking in detail. Similarly, the annotations for types provide only brief information, insufficient for guiding development on their own.

In summary, Zapatos is a package that provides type safety for database querying with PostgreSQL, offering typed CRUD operations and tagged templates for SQL. Although it takes a different approach to type generation than `pgTyped`, it supports lateral joins which result in nested objects which are natural way of representing data in OOP. The package has concise but sufficient documentation for most users [82]. However, the package's limitations include possible type inaccuracies due to developer error and challenging compilation errors.

Performance in benchmarks

In the performance evaluation, the Zapatos package proved notable, as it was, for example, among the few packages that permitted the utilization of distinct objects for updates and inserts during **upsert** operations without requiring a usage of raw SQL query. This package generally exhibited low latency in explicitly written queries and shortcut functions, typically only surpassed by `pgTyped` or `@database/pg`, which both employ a more rudimentary representation of the SQL language.

However, a significant problem was encountered during the Big Integer data type test, implementation of which in Zapatos is shown in Listing 3. The identifier's value was altered due to its conversion to a number before being returned. This issue was resolved by employing an explicit SQL query instead of the shortcut function `db.selectExactlyOne`. This unexpected result is particularly striking, given that the framework conducts introspection over the database, correctly identifying the schema as `int8`. Nevertheless, the shortcut function converts the column value into a JavaScript number runtime type, which, according to the specification, is represented by C++ double (`float64`) or equivalent [69]. Although both PostgreSQL and JavaScript use the same number of bytes to represent the value, the PostgreSQL type can accommodate a significantly more extensive range of integer values, as it utilizes decimal precision [70].

It was necessary to compose numerous queries using explicit SQL (as depicted in the final comparison table), including transaction rollbacks. The framework only performs this task autonomously if the transaction encounters an error (and subsequently rethrows the error).

A unique feature of the Zapatos package is its support for lateral joins, which the framework advocates. This approach generates nested objects that align more naturally with the object-oriented programming paradigm.

Initially, due to limitations with other frameworks, the TypeScript compilation was done with the `StrictNullChecks` option disabled. This conflicted with the way Zapatos does its type checking. This option is one of the most common problems with out-of-date type definitions, so Zapatos is not suitable for projects that have to keep this option disabled due to other dependencies.

```
// Value incorrectly converted into a number
// Also see the specification of accessible
// and selected values as template types for the sql
db
  .selectExactlyOne('cat',
    { cat_name: name },
    { columns: ['id'] })
  .run(pgPool)
  .then(data => BigInt(data?.id ?? 0))

// Correct value returned as string
db.sql<
  schema.cat.SQL,
  schema.cat.Selectable[]
>`SELECT * FROM ${'cat'}
  WHERE ${'cat_name'} = ${db.param(name)}`
  .run(pgPool)
  .then(rows => BigInt(rows[0].id ?? 0))
```

Listing 3: Zapatos number precision loss

7.4 Knex.js

Knex.js is a highly popular and versatile query builder in the JavaScript and TypeScript ecosystem, with a substantial following of 1,346,100 weekly downloads and 17,419 stars on GitHub. Initially developed by Tim Griesser [83], it has since grown to involve numerous contributors actively participating in its maintenance and development. Its popularity statistics may be skewed, as the package is used in various ORMs, such as Bookshelf.js and Objection.js, contributing to its download count.

One of the key strengths of Knex.js is its broad support for a wide range of databases, including but not limited to PostgreSQL, Oracle Database, CockroachDB, and Amazon Redshift. This flexibility extends to accommodating multiple drivers for databases like PostgreSQL and MySQL, where several popular drivers exist. With this extensive compatibility, Knex.js caters to a diverse audience of developers working with different databases and drivers [84].


```
// Knex query creation and request
await knexInstance
  .select<Array<{ toy_name: string }>>('toy.toy_name')
  .from('toy')
  .join('toy_house', 'toy_house.toy_id', 'toy.id')
  .join('house_cat', 'house_cat.house_id', 'toy_house.house_id')
  .where('house_cat.cat_id', '=', id)

-- Resulting SQL
SELECT
  toy.toy_name
FROM
  toy
JOIN toy_house ON toy_house.toy_id = toy.id
JOIN house_cat ON house_cat.house_id = toy_house.id
WHERE
  house_cat.cat_id = $1;
```

Listing 4: Knex query composition compared to resulting SQL

Knex.js offers non-abstracted function-based query building, representing each SQL term with a function call. This approach allows developers to construct queries in a granular and modular manner. This all while keeping the syntax quite reminiscent of SQL syntax as shown by comparison in Listing 4. The package also supports type templating and table definitions, which can be autogenerated using the `knex-types` [85] package, further streamlining the development process.

However, Knex.js faces limitations in type guarantees due to its benevolent implementation in JavaScript and having separately written types. These constraints result in type support not extending to more advanced features, such as join suggestions or multi-table joins, potentially limiting the package’s utility in more complex scenarios. Additionally, when the `.first()` method is called, Knex.js does not automatically assume that the query is fetching single and not multiple objects, leaving the typing responsibility to the developer.

Compatibility-wise, Knex.js is built to work seamlessly with both ES module and CommonJS syntax, ensuring its usefulness across various development environments. The package is licensed under the MIT Licence.

Although Knex.js benefits from active support for its basic functionality, the vast range of databases it supports inevitably leads to a considerable upkeep. Consequently, many bugs remain unaddressed for extended periods, potentially impacting developers who rely on the package for their projects.

Regarding documentation, Knex.js stands out with high-quality online resources, guiding users through setup and usage. As with many other packages in this comparison, the documentation is created using `vitepress` package and has excellent readability and searchability. However, the package does not have annotated types or function calls, which may result in developers needing to refer back to the online documentation more frequently than desired.

The package has several dependencies, mostly utility packages, such as `colorette` for styling command line output or `lodash` for collection and advanced data structures manipulation. While Knex is inflating the download numbers of these packages by a significant amount, they are also popular and supported on their own accord. None seem to have any outstanding or long-lasting issues.

Performance in benchmarks

The package evaluation demonstrated the ability to formulate queries for the benchmarks as flexibly as the SQL language. However, a notable limitation was its inability to accommodate operators with the `?` character [86]. This issue arises due to the package's utilization of `?` as a parameter replacement character. Consequently, this poses challenges for PostgreSQL when checking key existence in JSONB data types and even generates complications in Oracle databases when conducting regex comparisons, as documented in issue #3112 [87] on the Knex GitHub repository. Despite its persistence since at least 2019, no resolution for this issue appears imminent.

Regarding type checking, the typing offered by Knex.js is insufficient for TypeScript projects at best. Consequently, calls to the package are almost equivalent to manually composing the query. Furthermore, many methods are specific to the database engine and offer minimal abstraction, necessitating frequent consultation of the package's high-quality documentation.

7.5 Kysely

Kysely is a relatively young query builder in the TypeScript ecosystem, aiming to replace Knex.js by offering the same query composition power while providing superior type support for query composition and results. Although its development only began in earnest in 2021, the package has gained traction since 2022, as it matured and continues to be actively developed.

Compared to Knex.js, Kysely supports fewer database engines and SQL dialects out-of-the-box, with native support for MySQL, PostgreSQL, and SQLite. However, third-party drivers are available for several other (albeit more exotic) databases [88]. One of the driving forces behind Kysely's creation was Knex.js's excessive permissiveness, which limited its type support capabilities [89]. Kysely addresses this issue while retaining the strengths of query composition. Though the order of operations in Kysely may sometimes differ from SQL, this does not commonly pose a significant problem. The syntax is shown in Listing 5.

```
// Query for selecting toy id and the producer id,  
// for toys with price over 10000  
// and not produced by producer with id = 1  
  
// Note the order of methods,  
// leftJoin has to come before select and where,  
// if values are selected or queried from the table joined  
await kyselyInstance  
  .selectFrom('toy')  
  .leftJoin('toys_producer',  
    'toy.toys_producer_id',  
    'toys_producer.id')  
  .select(['toy.id', 'toys_producer.id'])  
  .where(({ or, not, cmpr }) =>  
    or([  
      not(cmpr('toys_producer.id', '=', 1)),  
      cmpr('toy.price', '>', 10000),  
    ])  
  ).executeTakeFirstOrThrow()
```

Listing 5: Example of Kysely syntax

Its excellent type guarantees make it an attractive choice, especially compared to more expressive packages. Kysely can also be further enhanced with Model classes through the third-party package *kysely-orm*. However, due to its limited usage and lack of updates reflecting the latest Kysely API changes, it was not considered for comparison here. To generate type definitions, developers can use introspection with the *kysely-codegen* package [90] or an alternative schema specification via *prisma-kysely* [91]. Kysely also provides in built support for database migrations, although it lacks the CLI that other packages, like Knex.js provide.

Distributed with both CommonJS and EcmaScript dependency specifications, Kysely is compatible with both dialects and is licensed under the MIT Licence. Despite its youth, the package has already amassed over 53,000 weekly downloads on npm and over 4,600 stars on GitHub [89]. Most issues reported are enhancement suggestions, however due to the package’s young age, the relative age and amount of issues is different.

Kysely’s active development has led to frequent updates and enhancements, such as improved documentation published during the writing of this thesis. While the web document may be brief compared to more established packages like Knex, it covers all essential information. The package’s type annotations provide excellent documentation, explanations, and multiple usage examples and are the best example of function annotation in all packages considered in this comparison. With zero dependencies apart from peer dependencies for database drivers, Kysely is a lightweight and efficient solution.

In summary, Kysely is a promising query builder in the TypeScript ecosystem, seeking to surpass Knex.js with its superior type support and powerful query composition capabilities. Although it currently supports fewer database engines and SQL dialects, its performance and type guarantees make it an attractive choice for developers. Its active development, compatibility with various dependency specifications, and high-quality documentation contribute to Kysely’s growing appeal within the TypeScript community.

Performance in benchmarks

Regarding performance, the Kysely package consistently outperformed or at least matched Knex, which boasts a comparatively rich set of features for a query builder. While Kysely does not offer parsing for types such as Big Integer, its handling remains consistent with that of the pg driver. Like many other packages, Kysely lacks support for explicit transaction control, above encapsulation into one. However, this is at least supplemented with raw SQL queries inside the encapsulation. This will however result in additional call of `COMMIT` or `ROLLBACK` at the end of the encapsulation, even though the transaction was finished manually, and such behaviour is usually reserved for ORMs which abstract the database access further than common query builders.

Another advantage of Kysely is its utilization of tagged strings, akin to the approach employed by `@databases/pg` when composing raw SQL queries. This method proves more comprehensible than the combination of bindings and function calls implemented by Knex. Consequently, the Kysely package offers an appealing balance of performance and usability, making it a viable option for various database management tasks.

7.6 MikroORM

MikroORM, a project developed by Martin Adámek, has emerged as an ORM solution that offers both versatility and ease of use. With a focus on implicit transactions using the Unit of Work pattern, MikroORM offers native support for NoSQL databases, specifically MongoDB, alongside support for traditional relational databases such as MySQL, MariaDB, PostgreSQL, and SQLite [92]. At the time of writing, MikroORM has garnered decent attention, with 189,128 weekly downloads and 5,777 stars on GitHub [93] [94].

The internal architecture of MikroORM for relational databases is powered by Knex, a popular SQL query builder library, which allows developers to access the underlying query builder with type support provided by MikroORM's definitions. Users can therefore utilize the full power of knex while benefiting from the additional features and abstractions MikroORM provides. Database

```
@Entity()
export class CatColor {
  @PrimaryKey()
  id!: number

  @Property({ length: 256 })
  colorName!: string

  @OneToMany({ entity: () => Cat, mappedBy: 'catColor' })
  cats = new Collection<Cat>(this)

  @OneToOne({ entity: () => ColorHex, mappedBy: 'id' })
  colorHex?: ColorHex
}
```

Listing 6: Cat color entity represented in MikroORM schema

models are represented using classes with decorators, making creating relationships between entities intuitive through explicit `@OneToOne`, `@OneToMany`, and `@ManyToMany` decorators that translate seamlessly from the conceptual schema of the database as represented in Listing 6. Furthermore, MikroORM offers an `EntityGenerator` package that allows developers to generate these definitions based on an existing database schema automatically.

Regarding TypeScript compatibility, MikroORM supports compiled TypeScript and native TypeScript execution using `ts-node`. However, it does not support alternative runtimes like Deno due to various limitations, including dependencies [95]. Speaking of dependencies, MikroORM relies on several well-known JavaScript packages for parsing and metadata reflection, which the package utilizes for establishing relationships and maintaining context.

The documentation for MikroORM is comprehensive, providing all the necessary information for developers to utilize the package effectively [96]. While the types do not direct link to the documentation, they include basic descriptions of the methods, which aids in understanding their usage. MikroORM also offers support for migrations and seeding, with migrations generated by analysing the differences between the database schema and the schema defined within MikroORM. It also supports read replica connections using random selection for which instance to use for the query.

Performance in benchmarks

The Mikro ORM package distinguished itself in performance benchmarks primarily due to its unique features. In addition to standard query handling, the package facilitates field matching using JavaScript native regular expressions, which are subsequently parsed and translated into SQL queries. Another remarkable result was observed in the JSONColumn latency test, where MikroORM significantly outpaced even the pgTyped package. This achievement is not attributed to superior database connection performance but to the package's Entity Manager. This internal cache/repository is designed for particular contexts. It caches the current state based on the object's primary key values, enabling rapid data retrieval from application memory rather than querying the database [97]. However, this approach may introduce inconsistencies, prompting MikroORM to implement optimistic locking for fields potentially impacted by such issues.

Relations are incorporated using the `populate` option, which permits dot notation for further related entities and filtering. While not strictly typed, simple nested objects have enough type support to provide essential information for query composition and function as anticipated. The results are well-typed, although `BigInteger` and `Decimal` types are returned as strings. Transaction support with a direct control sequence API is also implemented. For instances where the integrated interface lacks flexibility, pre-typed `Knex.js` instance is accessible for most queries.

Entities in MikroORM are straightforward to implement, although documentation for their use with complex decomposition tables is limited and has to be implemented through a standard relations between three tables. a minor issue arose due to an undocumented difference between the `columnType` and `type` options; however, the package's developer promptly addressed the concern. Overall, MikroORM offers a compelling balance of features and performance, making it a viable choice for various applications.

```
model cat {
  id          BigInt      @id(map: "pk_cat")
  ↪ @default(autoincrement())
  cat_color_id Int?
  cat_name     String?     @db.VarChar(256)
  date_of_birth DateTime?  @db.Date
  cat_color    cat_color?  @relation(fields: [cat_color_id],
  ↪ references: [id], onDelete: Cascade, onUpdate: NoAction,
  ↪ map: "fk_cats_cat_color")
  house_cat    house_cat[]
}
```

Listing 7: Example of Prisma schema language model definition

7.7 Prisma ORM

PrismaORM has rapidly gained popularity in the development community due to its innovative and modern approach to creating database clients and object-relational mapping. Adopting a unique method for defining database schemas, PrismaORM utilizes its schema language [98], which aims to represent the database structure using concepts more closely aligned with relational syntax rather than complex objects found in traditional object-oriented programming paradigms. An example definition of model in the schema language is shown in Listing 7.

The schema in PrismaORM comprises three main components: the data source definition, the output specification for the schema (such as the Prisma database client), and the database schema itself. A custom client is generated from this schema (and, optionally, a context like the current system architecture, if not specified). This client includes type definitions for type safety, ensuring a robust and reliable database interaction experience. However, one potential drawback of this approach is the increased binary size of the generated client. For example, the resulting binary size in a test database was approximately 15 MB, which may lead to cold start issues in serverless environments. To address this concern, PrismaORM provides specific instructions for many cloud platforms to optimize the binary result and configuration as much as possible [99].

The Prisma suite also includes a migration platform that automatically transforms schema changes into corresponding database updates. PrismaORM boasts impressive adoption rates, with 1,057,351 weekly downloads and 30,431 GitHub stars, making it the second most popular package by the GitHub metric [100] [101]. The package supports both Node.js and Deno as runtime environments, catering to various developers and project requirements.

However, it should be noted that Prisma supports only CommonJS imports by default and does not offer an official method for generating ECMAScript module-compatible code [102]. This limitation may be a challenge for developers who prefer or have to use ECMAScript modules in their projects.

Performance in benchmarks

PrismaORM, a competitive ORM package, has demonstrated performance on par with other leading ORM solutions, such as Sequelize and TypeORM. In the `getToysAvailableToCat` test, which measures relation traversal performance, PrismaORM generated a significantly faster query by employing multiple nested queries instead of the `LEFT JOIN` and `LEFT OUTER JOIN` operations utilized by its competitors. However, in the `countCatsByColor` test, the package produced an overly complicated query with redundant conditions. The complexity of the query plan resulted in the database's planning phase consuming nearly as much time as the query execution itself, taking almost twice as long as queries generated by rival frameworks.

Regarding functionality, PrismaORM stands out as the only ORM that did not necessitate using raw SQL for any query, which is an accomplishment in and of itself. The package supported incrementing and decrementing operations in upsert queries, and although the filter objects became relatively complex, they remained comprehensible. While the transaction implementation does not allow for explicit handling, this approach is more understandable within an ORM context, where SQL queries are already opaque, as opposed to a query builder such as Kysely, which employs a similar methodology.

Furthermore, PrismaORM can accurately convert and type unconventional runtime types, including Big Integer and JSON values. This capability enhances the versatility and applicability of the package for various use cases.

7.8 TypeORM

TypeORM is a pioneering ORM framework designed to support TypeScript and leverage its features. It is compatible with both active directory and data mapper patterns, allowing for easy exchange of entity definitions during development. TypeORM supports a wide range of database engines, including MySQL, PostgreSQL, SQLite, Oracle DB, and SAP Hana, and even has experimental support for the NoSQL database MongoDB.

The framework employs its own query builder and uses Model classes with property decorators to describe its methods. TypeORM supports both Lazy Loading and Eager loading (Listing 8) when working with models and is compatible with CommonJS and ECMAScript. It offers automatic migrations based on its models and manually written migrations. However, it lacks support for seed files, requiring them to be included as migrations if executed through its CLI.

```
await BenchDataSource.getRepository(Cat)
  .findOne({
    where: {
      id: id.toString()
    },
    relations: {
      catColor: {
        colorHex: true,
      },
    },
  })
```

Listing 8: TypeORM Eager Loading example, implementation for getCatColor benchmark test

TypeORM is highly popular, boasting the second-highest download number and the highest amount of stars among those compared, with 1,192,427 weekly downloads [103] and 30,947 stars on GitHub [104]. Released under the MIT License, TypeORM is the ORM with the highest number of downloads and native support for TypeScript, as Sequelize only outperforms it when considering the Sequelize package's download numbers [105], not the Sequelize-TypeScript package [106] used for comparison.

Despite its stable support, TypeORM’s development has shifted towards maintaining existing features in 2018 due to the amount of work for purely volunteer supported development [107]. This maintenance mode has led to 1,873 open issues as of now [104]. Although the project has now resumed development due to receiving financial support, it primarily focuses on more minor updates every few weeks. It is not as actively developed as other “active” projects in this analysis.

The documentation for TypeORM is of good quality, providing all the necessary information for development. However, it needs more formatting and chapters, to make it easier to follow, even if the developer does not know what precisely they are looking for [108]. The model methods include brief descriptions but are mostly limited to a single-sentence short explanation.

TypeORM has the highest number of dependencies among the packages compared, with many dependencies like `buffer` being necessary to support various runtimes, including browser or React Native environments that lack the same standard library support as Node.js. These dependencies are actively developed and have high download numbers, posing no additional risk to the toolchain. However, TypeORM’s early adoption of the TypeScript ecosystem has largely overlooked its JavaScript functionality, as evidenced by the documentation and example projects.

Performance in benchmarks

When examining the performance of TypeORM in various benchmarks, it was observed that this ORM solution closely competes with its main rival, Sequelize. In most tests, TypeORM either slightly outperformed or marginally fell behind Sequelize, with negligible differences in performance. These outcomes can be attributed minimally to disparities in the generated queries, as both ORMs are comparable in their query generation and execution capabilities.

However, TypeORM’s query generation approach raises some concerns when working with complex joined tables. The generated queries are often complex for humans to read due to excessive naming or using hashes instead of more recognizable names. This complexity necessitates additional parsing

for developers to effectively understand and work with these queries, one such query is shown in Listing 9. Moreover, TypeORM often prefers LEFT JOINS, which are computationally more demanding than INNER JOINS and, in this case, will yield the same output thanks to the database schema.

```
SELECT
  "Toy"."id" AS "Toy_id",
  "Toy"."toy_name" AS "Toy_toy_name",
  "Toy"."barcode" AS "Toy_barcode",
  "Toy"."price" AS "Toy_price",
  "Toy"."currency" AS "Toy_currency",
  "Toy"."naughty" AS "Toy_naughty",
  "Toy"."date_introduced" AS "Toy_date_introduced",
  "Toy"."toys_producer_id" AS "Toy_toys_producer_id"
FROM "toy" "Toy"
  LEFT JOIN "toy_house" "Toy__Toy_toyHouses"
    ON "Toy__Toy_toyHouses"."toy_id" = "Toy"."id"
  LEFT JOIN "house"
    ↪ "Toy__Toy_toyHouses__Toy__Toy_toyHouses_house"
    ON "Toy__Toy_toyHouses__Toy__Toy_toyHouses_house"."id" =
    ↪ "Toy__Toy_toyHouses"."house_id"
  LEFT JOIN "house_cat" "859f7912[...]aab7b94c"
    ON "859f7912[...]aab7b94c"."house_id" =
    "Toy__Toy_toyHouses__Toy__Toy_toyHouses_house"."id"
  LEFT JOIN "cat" "521c7a07[...]88acfd85"
    ON "521c7a07[...]88acfd85"."id" =
    "859f7912[...]aab7b94c"."cat_id"
WHERE ("521c7a07[...]88acfd85"."id" = 1)
```

Listing 9: TypeORM Query generated for getToysAvailableToCat benchmark (with hashes shortened)

Another issue encountered with TypeORM relates to its handling of automatically generated primary keys. The ORM disregards user input for these columns if they can be generated automatically, limiting developers' flexibility when working with databases. For instance, this constraint poses challenges when inserting seed data with hard-coded IDs.

In terms of upsert functionality, TypeORM, like Sequelize, does not provide support for increment operations. Additionally, it is impossible to formu-

late an equivalent query using the included query builder, as the syntax does not allow for custom update SQL and only supports ignoring specific data that would be otherwise inserted.

When handling transactions, TypeORM lets developers create an explicit transaction handler that includes entity manager methods and functions for starting, managing, and ending transactions. While the filter types are only lightly typed, they offer sufficient guidance for developers navigating the available filtering options.

7.9 Objection.js

Objection.js is an ORM based on the Knex.js query builder and is closely connected to the Knex ecosystem. It supports SQLite3, Postgres, and MySQL while also being compatible with many other database engines supported by Knex [109]. Unlike Sequelize or TypeORM, Objection.js does not provide extensive abstraction; it only offers Models that assist with query composition, types, and relation fetching. The Models primarily serve as a starting point for SQL queries rather than offering the complex functionality of Active Record or Data Mapper patterns. This results in syntax which is quite similar to Knex as shown in Listing 10.

The package has 128,872 weekly downloads [110] and 6,972 stars on GitHub [109]. Objection.js predates the popularization of TypeScript and is therefore developed fully in JavaScript. Its former lead developer admits that the package requires a significant rewrite of types to compete in TypeScript support, which is not feasible due to the workload required [111]. Objection.js was not maintained for over a year, accumulating technical debt and leading to incompatibility with TypeScript 4.8 and newer due to enhancements to the `strictNullChecks` option. A new version has since been published [112], fixing some issues that arose during that time. New developers have started working on maintaining the project as of writing this thesis.

The package is released under the MIT Licence and offers high-quality web documentation, including extensive usage guides and a detailed API Reference [113]. A unique feature of Objection.js is the ability to provide JSON Schema validation for inserted objects, ensuring database data consistency.

```
// Knex.js
knexInstance
  .select('stock_info')
  .from('toys_producer')
  .where('id', '=', id)
  .first()
  .then(data => data?.stock_info ?? {})

// Objection.js
ToysProducer.query()
  .select('stock_info')
  .where('id', '=', id)
  .first()
  .then(data => data?.stockInfo ?? {})
```

Listing 10: Comparison of Knex.js and Objection.js syntax for count query

Objection.js has only three dependencies for full functionality: Knex, AJV, and db-errors. The AJV dependency provides JSON Schema validation, while db-errors, originating from the same company that published Objection.js, aims to deliver a unified API for handling various errors produced by different database engines. Although the db-errors package has not been updated for over four years, it is unlikely to pose a significant security threat to the package. Objection.js now also supports both ESM and CommonJS, with the latest release fixing ESM compatibility issues.

Performance in benchmarks

Objection.js could only be included in the performance benchmarks only after its typings were updated to be compatible with TypeScript 4.8 and later while maintaining `strictNullChecks`, a requirement for the proper functioning of other packages like Zapatos. Once the compatibility issues were resolved with manually edited types, Objection.js demonstrated performance largely on par with other ORM packages such as MikroORM and TypeORM. However, a notable exception was observed in the `getCatColor` test, where Objection.js was significantly slower than its counterparts.

This performance discrepancy was traced back to the method that was used for fetching related entities: `withGraphFetched`, the only type-supported way to fetch relations beyond a single relationship in `Object.js` without resorting to plain Knex query builder calls [113]. This method was selected for type support, but it caused the speed issue encountered. The method retrieves data through three separate, dependent database calls, resulting in considerably longer query execution times even with minimal latency. While this approach may offer some benefits in specific scenarios, such as applying limits to individual queries to alleviate the load on massive databases, it generally falls short of the performance optimization capabilities offered by relational database management systems (RDBMS) that utilize single, more complex queries.

Another challenge posed by `Object.js` lies in its limited typing support. Many inherited methods from Knex lack template variables to specify the result, despite their original counterparts providing such functionality. Consequently, developers often need to cast the results manually to ensure the correct final type, except for the most basic queries. It was the only package which provided completely incorrect resulting types, which forced the usage of `x as unknown as DesiredType` casting.

The composition of `Object.js`, which positions itself as not quite an ORM nor a pure query builder, often requires developers to have direct access to the query. However, this approach often obscures vital information, forcing developers to rely on experience or testing to understand certain aspects of the system. For instance, the table name is hidden when using predefined relations for joining. Developers must determine the alias assigned to the joined table for `WHERE` clauses without any clear guidance from the package.

7.10 Sequelize

Sequelize is one of the oldest, still popular, and actively supported ORM frameworks for the JavaScript ecosystem, with development starting in 2010. After over 12 years of development, it supports various databases, including PostgreSQL, MySQL, and SQLite3 [114]. Its popularity is attributed to its simple syntax and flexible usage. Sequelize supports read replication, using

round-robin scheduling for read queries and a write pool for write or explicitly marked database calls. It also provides a command-line interface for managing schema and data, offering migration and seeding options.

Sequelize can use either manually written migrations or automatically generated ones based on Model definitions. The framework also supports programmatic synchronization of the database state to reflect the Model definition using the `sequelize.sync()` method. Unlike other ORMs discussed in this work, Sequelize does not expose a query builder interface, only allowing for raw query execution when integrated entity fetching is insufficient.

Full TypeScript support for the main project is still in progress [115]. However, a separate project called *sequelize-typescript* [106] offers support for TypeScript native definitions, using decorators for Model and property specifications. One of the original features of Sequelize is its support for the automatic creation and update of timestamp fields on database tables and the option for “paranoid” tables [116]. In this mode, calling a deletion method sets the `deletedAt` attribute instead of removing the record. The framework behaves like the deleted records do not exist unless previously restored.

Both Sequelize and *sequelize-typescript* are provided under the MIT Licence and actively supported. Due to its extensive user base, the framework has over 750 reported issues [117], with a minority marked as bugs and the majority being feature requests. The central repository of the package has 27,729 stars on GitHub and the largest number of weekly downloads out of all packages compared, at 1,505,485 [105].

Sequelize has 16 dependencies, plus TypeScript-specific helpers required for usage with the current TypeScript version. These dependencies primarily relate to inflexion, code analysis for model dependency graphs, and various data types supported by the framework, including GeoJSON and advanced Date types. While the package offers extensive documentation, differences in Model definition when using TypeScript can be confusing. Documentation for additional operators and decorators is lacking, as it is primarily contained in several Markdown files in its repository.


```
return Cat.count({  
  // Nested objects are not supported for filtering  
  // The key is not typed either  
  where: {  
    '$catColor.colorHex.hex_code$': hexColor,  
  },  
  include: [{ model: CatColor, include: [ColorHex] }],  
})
```

Listing 11: Example of nested where condition in Sequelize - countCatsByColor test

Performance in benchmarks

In performance benchmarks, the Sequelize ORM demonstrated competitive results, closely matching its main rival, TypeORM. Sequelize generated efficient queries for basic operations and performed within 10-50% of the reference pgTyped implementation. However, with more complex queries, Sequelize preferred using LEFT OUTER JOINS when they were not necessarily based on the conceptual schema of the database. Consequently, these test scenarios took 50-150% of the reference solution execution time.

While query execution remained relatively fast, the increased complexity due to unnecessary LEFT JOINS may lead to performance issues that necessitate manual optimization in some instances. As LEFT JOINS are some of the more complex operations databases perform, and their complexity grows rapidly with the amount of data joined, this approach can quickly impact the application's overall performance.

Sequelize's filter types were limited, as even essential attribute matching for search by attribute equality is not typed. This lack of typing support increases the likelihood of developers making errors that may only become apparent during runtime. Furthermore, Sequelize does not provide a dedicated API for WHERE clauses on joined tables, requiring developers to rely on dot notation and unchecked fields to define such filters. Example of such functionality is shown in Listing 11.

While defining models is documented, the example code provided was found to throw errors related to shadowing attribute names. Although the

solution to this issue can be quickly addressed using the TypeScript `declare` keyword, it is essential to mention such features in the introductory documentation for models to minimize confusion for developers.

Like most other ORMs, Sequelize does not support abstracting upsert operations with increments or decrementation on updates. As a result, developers must resort to implementing such operations using raw queries. It also performed the worst among all tested packages during pagination test, as the query used by the package was identical to the one used by other packages and no discrepancy was detected in connection handling, it seems to have been caused by the frameworks overhead.

7.11 Disqualified frameworks

While originally included for analysis and experimentation, some frameworks were not successfully implemented. This approach had to be taken as the packages were found to be lacking in features required for inclusion, such as basic TypeScript support, or execution under the testing environment was unattainable, usually due to outdated code or dependencies or not functioning as described in the documentation. We were unable to fix the issues. These packages are nonetheless included with a basic description of their advertised features and the issues for their exclusion for this comparison.

7.11.1 RDB

RDB, a lesser-known ORM package, was initially selected for comparison due to its distinctive model definition approach and appearance in the npm repository under the ORM tag. At the time of selection, RDB had only 284 weekly downloads [118] and 291 stars on GitHub [119], making it the least popular package among those reviewed. What set RDB apart was its alternative model definition method, which relied on method calls to create the entity model, unlike the schema-based approaches employed by other frameworks.

However, further examination of RDB revealed several limitations that led to its disqualification from the comparison. Firstly, the package does not provide any types for methods beyond connection and model initialization. This

```
const ToyHouse = rdb.table('toy_house')
ToyHouse.primaryColumn('toy_id').numeric()
ToyHouse.primaryColumn('house_id').numeric()
ToyHouse.column('amount').numeric()

// ToyHouse type => rdb.table
interface Table {
  primaryColumn(column: string): ColumnDef;
  column(column: string): ColumnDef;
  join(table: Table): Join;
  hasMany(join: JoinRelation): HasMany;
  hasOne(join: JoinRelation): HasOne;
  formulaDiscriminators(...discriminators: string[]) : Table;
  columnDiscriminators(...discriminators: string[]) : Table;
}
```

Listing 12: RDB entity model type definition

lack of typing support significantly hinders its compatibility with TypeScript, making it challenging to work with in a typed environment.

Additionally, RDB does not offer a solution for circular dependency issues that may arise when defining models across multiple files. Consequently, developers must either use a singleton method to encapsulate the definition or repeat it for each file, both of which are suboptimal approaches. Given these limitations, RDB is most suited for single-file projects that can initially define their database logic.

The framework also lacks typings for search method attributes and resulting object types, further limiting its usefulness in TypeScript-based projects. Due to these issues, as well as the file separation requirements of the benchmark, RDB was ultimately disqualified from the comparison. The full interface is shown in Listing 12 and as seen, it does not contain any methods for referencing the model attributes. Its documentation is quite simple, written in Markdown and consisting of mostly plain examples [120].

In conclusion, while RDB presents an interesting alternative approach to model definition, its limitations in typing support and handling of multi-file projects make it less appealing for developers seeking a robust and flexible ORM solution, mainly when working with TypeScript.

7.11.2 Bookshelf.js

Despite its last update occurring in July 2020 [121], Bookshelf.js remains a popular database access package on npm, with 103,607 weekly downloads at the time of writing this thesis. Started by Tim Grissier, who also initiated the development of the query builder Knex, Bookshelf.js is an ORM which is based on Knex and implements the Data Mapper pattern for entities in the database. Designed to work with PostgreSQL, MySQL, and SQLite3, Bookshelf.js has not been actively developed for an extended period, resulting in compatibility issues with more recent versions of Knex [122].

The last officially supported Knex version for Bookshelf.js was 0.21.17, whereas the current Knex version is 2.4.2. This discrepancy has led to several type errors and incompatibilities as the Knex API has evolved over time. While there are forks of the repository that address significant issues, the package still suffers from limited type support, primarily because the entire project is developed in pure JavaScript, with types generated as an afterthought [123].

The primary reason for disqualifying Bookshelf.js from the comparison was the numerous dependencies with unmaintained and outdated versions, which pose significant security risks. These risks include prototype pollution [124] and SQL injection attacks [125], making the package unsuitable for modern, secure applications. The package itself cannot run unless these dependencies are installed or at least overridden.

7.11.3 Waterline

The Sails framework, an Model-View-Controller style [8, p. 330] architecture framework for JavaScript, is designed for building modern web applications. As part of this framework, the Model component is implemented using an ORM called Waterline. Sails is relatively less popular in the JavaScript ecosystem, with only 31,492 downloads, which pales in comparison to giants like Express (28,825,585 weekly downloads [126]) or Koa (1,600,532 weekly downloads [127]). While Waterline's primary purpose is to serve as a component within the Sails framework, it is also available as a standalone package.

However, during the implementation process, several issues were encountered with Waterline. The package does not provide its own types but relies

on optional types from the `@types` repository [128], which is maintained by volunteers. Unfortunately, these types are outdated, as they only cover version 0.13.x, while the latest Waterline version is 0.15.2. As a result, these types do not accurately reflect the package’s functionality, and initialization using them does not work. Similarly, following the documentation for a standalone setup, as shown on the framework’s website, also proved non-functional as the documentation [129] is written mainly for the full framework usage, with pure waterline usage being an afterthought.

Due to these inconsistencies and the inability to overcome them, Waterline was disqualified from the comparison.

Observations

In this final chapter, we will discuss the performance of various ORM packages based on the benchmarks conducted. The chapter is divided into three main sections: Package Information, Flexibility Assessment, and Performance Test Results.

The Package Information section provides an overview of each package, including the supported database engines, the version used for comparison, popularity statistics, and runtime support. This information is essential for understanding the background and scope of each ORM package and its suitability for different project requirements.

Next, the Flexibility Assessment section evaluates each package's adaptability by determining whether the test was implemented using native ORM functions, the query builder, or raw SQL with parameters. This section will also highlight any issues or challenges encountered while working with each ORM framework. Understanding the flexibility of each package enables developers to make informed decisions regarding the ORM that best fits their needs and project constraints.

Finally, the Performance Test Results section presents the outcomes of each test, focusing on cases where query composition, operator selection, or introduced overhead could play a measurable role in the package's performance. These tests were conducted using the BenchmarkRunner, the frameworks connected to a PostgreSQL instance in Docker, on an AMD Ryzen 6850U processor @ 2.7GHz, Debian GNU/Linux 11 (bullseye) operating system, 32GB of LPDDR5-6400 RAM, and SSD storage.

Full implementation of the benchmark is included as part of this thesis and published online on <https://github.com/ladall1/orm-comparison>. With the Node.js compatibility over many platforms and dependence of performance on multiple factors, the version of the package may be different based on the configuration.

By examining the performance of each ORM package in these three areas, developers can gain valuable insights into the advantages and limitations of each framework, ultimately guiding them in choosing the most appropriate solution for their projects.

8.1 Package Information

While evaluating the ORM frameworks, the latest stable branch version was used for testing at the time of writing. It is important to note that a new version 3.0.2 of Objection.js was released after the testing was completed; however, this update does not introduce any new features, only addressing issues with types and ESM support.

Table 8.1 provides the exact versions used for each package, along with the number of runtime dependencies required (excluding optional packages and database drivers). To assess the availability and popularity of these packages, Table A.1 lists each package with popularity metrics such as weekly downloads from the npm repository and GitHub stars given to the project. The data was collected on the 10th of April, 2023.

Table 8.1: Runtime package information in test environment

| Package | Runtime dependencies | Tested Version |
|---------------|----------------------|----------------|
| PgTyped | 3 | 2.0.1 |
| Zapatos | 0 | 6.1.4 |
| Kysely | 0 | 0.24.2 |
| @Databases/pg | 15 | 5.4.1 |
| Objection.js | 2 | 3.0.1 |
| MikroORM | 7 | 5.6.16 |
| PrismaORM | 1 | 4.10.1 |
| TypeORM | 14 | 0.3.12 |
| Knex.js | 14 | 2.4.2 |
| Sequelize | 16 | 6.31.0 |

8.2 Flexibility Assessment

The primary aspect of the comparison between individual ORM packages is their ability to implement advanced SQL constructs using a more unified API for the programming language. Although abstraction introduces additional logic that requires processing power, it should offer functionality that approaches the capabilities of direct SQL usage. A framework requiring developers to introduce abstraction but still necessitates writing SQL queries, as the request cannot be expressed through the API, is considered less effective as an abstraction layer than one that can perform such requests.

Tables 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 showcase the layers used to perform the required functionality for the benchmark. The shortcuts for the methods are listed in the following list. A requirement for each implementation was that the logic had to be consistently implemented on the database, with the framework only composing the query and parsing the result. For example, it was not allowed to check for an existing object in an upsert operation by querying the database independently.

The order for implementation was as follows:

1. Native methods that abstract the database logic (Native)
2. The integrated query builder (QB)
3. Manually written queries in SQL (SQL)

If the operation was impossible to perform or resulted in problems, the lower level was attempted, and the first successful one is listed in the tables.

Several notable observations can be made from the flexibility comparison. PrismaORM stands out as the only ORM capable of natively implementing the entire logic for each test, thanks to its unique support for increment and decrement logic over upsert operations. The other full-fledged ORM packages in the comparison, such as Sequelize, TypeORM, and MikroORM, performed similarly but could not express upsert incrementation natively.

MikroORM held an advantage over TypeORM, using Knex.js as its query builder, which could express the upsert operation while TypeORM's custom internal query builder could not. On the other hand, Zapatos was the only

package that partially failed in any test. It could not correctly parse bigint values from PostgreSQL as strings or BigInt primitives in JavaScript when using native methods, casting the result into a number instead. However, this issue was resolved when a manually written query was used.

Lastly, it is worth noting that only @databases/pg parsed bigint values into JavaScript BigInt primitives with typing. PrismaORM also returned the value correctly, however the result itself was untyped, which made its usage significantly more complicated. All other packages returned character representations of the value.

Table 8.2: Entity Traversal Benchmark implementation methods

| Package | getCatColor | countCatsByColor | getToysAvailableToCat |
|---------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| @Databases/pg | SQL ¹ | SQL ¹ | SQL ¹ |
| Knex | QB | QB | QB |
| Kysely | QB | QB | QB |
| MikroORM | Native | Native | Native |
| Objection.js | Native | Native | Native |
| PgTyped | SQL | SQL | SQL |
| PrismaORM | Native | Native | Native |
| Sequelize | Native | Native | Native |
| TypeORM | Native | Native | Native |
| Zapatos | Native | SQL ¹ | SQL ¹ |

¹ With type support in template fields

8.3 Latency benchmark results

The second aspect of the benchmarking process involved evaluating the performance of the various packages. This evaluation focused on the optimality of the queries formulated by each package and the overhead introduced by the composition of the queries and result parsing. Through code analysis, the pgTyped package was expected to exhibit minimal overhead and the most efficient manually written queries. Consequently, pgTyped was employed as a reference for optimal queries and minimal performance.

Several noteworthy observations emerged from the testing process. The most apparent performance loss occurred with Objection.js during the getColorLatency test shown in Figure 8.1. This performance loss resulted from

Table 8.3: Special SQL Actions Benchmark implementation methods

| Package | Upsert | JSON type | JSON Where | Transaction | Like Query | ILike Query |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|
| @Databases/pg | SQL ¹ | Native | Native | Native | SQL ¹ | SQL ¹ |
| Knex | QB ² | QB | QB | QB | QB | QB |
| Kysely | QB ² | QB | QB | QB | QB | QB |
| MikroORM | QB ² | Native | Native | Native | Native | Native |
| Objection.js | QB ² | QB | QB | Native | QB | QB |
| PgTyped | SQL | SQL | SQL | SQL | SQL | SQL |
| PrismaORM | Native | Native | Native | Native | Native | Native |
| Sequelize | SQL | Native | Native ³ | Native | Native | Native |
| TypeORM | SQL | Native | Native | Native | Native | Native |
| Zapatos | Native ² | Native | SQL ¹ | Native | SQL ¹ | SQL ¹ |

¹ With type support in template fields² Raw SQL for increment on update³ Raw SQL for fetching key value as promoted nested keys did not result in syntactically correct query

Table 8.4: Edge Cases Benchmark implementation methods

| Package | SQL Injection | BigInt handling | Maximum value query |
|---------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| @Databases/pg | SQL ¹ | Native ⁴ | SQL ¹ |
| Knex | QB | QB ³ | QB ³ |
| Kysely | QB | QB ³ | QB ³ |
| MikroORM | Native | Native ⁴ | QB ³ |
| Objection.js | QB ² | QB ^{2,3} | QB ^{2,6} |
| PgTyped | SQL | SQL ³ | SQL ³ |
| PrismaORM | Native | Native ⁴ | Native ⁴ |
| Sequelize | Native | Native ³ | Native ³ |
| TypeORM | Native | Native ³ | QB ⁴ |
| Zapatos | SQL ¹ | SQL ^{3,5} | SQL ³ |

¹ With type support in template fields² Query builder attached to model³ Value returned as string⁴ Value returned as Native type (BigInt or Number)⁵ Native method converted value to Number, losing precision⁶ Invalid typing requiring full cast


Table 8.5: BulkOperations Benchmark implementation methods

| Package | bulkInsert | bulkDelete | bulkUpdate | Pagination |
|---------------|---------------------|------------|------------|---------------------|
| @Databases/pg | Native | Native | Native | SQL |
| Knex | QB | QB | QB | QB |
| Kysely | QB ¹ | QB | QB | QB |
| MikroORM | Native | Native | Native | Native |
| Objection.js | Native | Native | Native | Native ² |
| PgTyped | SQL | SQL | SQL | SQL |
| PrismaORM | Native | Native | Native | Native |
| Sequelize | Native | Native | Native | Native |
| TypeORM | Native ¹ | Native | Native | Native ² |
| Zapatos | Native ¹ | Native | Native | Native |

¹ Bulk/Batch operations not supported, data chunked manually

² Native pagination without offset calculation


Figure 8.1: getColorLatency Results



Objection.js favouring multiple dependent queries over a single query with joins when utilizing the withGraphJoined method. While it would have been possible to rewrite the query using the integrated query builder and resolve the issue, this approach would compromise the flexibility testing and be thus considered inadvisable.

Another fascinating result was the exceptional performance of MikroORM in the JSONColumn test, results of which are in Figure 8.4, where it surpassed

Figure 8.2: countCatsByColor Results




even the pgTyped reference. This performance advantage can be attributed to MikroORM's caching mechanism, which leverages primary keys within its entityManager to prevent repeated database queries for the same data, yielding faster results than the reference. This feature can be highly beneficial for a skilled developer, but can also cause problems, if the developer does not know about it.

On the contrary, MikroORM struggled with the BulkInsertion test when using the native entity creation function and unit of work paradigm over the entity manager, losing out to all other packages by a significant margin, as seen in Figure 8.5 in MikroORM UoW bar. The issue stems from the batching method, which resolves the flushing of the Unit of Work entity, which batches the method by 300 entities by default [130]. However, the framework also includes the native `insertMany` method, which handles the insertion at a comparable efficiency with other packages, as seen in the same figure under MikroORM native value.

Kysely demonstrated comparable capabilities to Knex while offering an enhanced developer experience through type safety. Both Sequelize and TypeORM exhibited similar performance levels; however, TypeORM provided superior types for methods and filters. MikroORM, though smaller in scale,

Figure 8.3: getToysAvailableToCat Results




proved to be functionally rich and benefited from access to the well-established and thoroughly tested Knex.js query builder when model methods were insufficient.

The performance of Sequelize in the pagination test was investigated to ensure the error was not in the wrong usage of the package. However, the resulting query performs precisely as it should, and its handling is equivalent to other packages. The result has to be caused by the overhead of the package rather than the database of the usage.

Most ORMs lost out to query builders mainly because they prefer left joins over stricter inner joins for many select operations. This behaviour is primarily caused by the inability to specify precisely all the details necessary for the realization of a query in a relational schema using the model schema these packages used. PrismaORM avoided many of these mistakes thanks to its more expressive and purpose-built prisma schema, which can be more expressive than class or object definition.


Other than the few noted exceptions, the test results were as expected, with packages using less abstraction of the database logic being able to use optimal queries, which gave them an advantage over generic ORM queries.

Figure 8.4: JSON Column handling Results



Object-relational mapping packages carry a drawback of possible less optimal data path resolution, as shown by Objection.js results in Figure 8.1 or Figure 8.3. However, the drawback is only prominent when dealing with complex queries involving multiple joins. It is preferable to use ORMs where the amount of data in the database will not result in suboptimal computation time, as the overhead of the package itself is negligible. Figures 8.2, 8.4, and A.2 through A.9 (included in the appendix), show that while the relative performance of the queries is almost double that of reference, it is still minor for the amount of data usually considered for most smaller projects. When considering enterprise-level databases, the toll in which the suboptimal queries can result will accumulate. It can result in redundant work as the application must be repeatedly optimized while the ORM obfuscates which application operation is causing the slowdown.

Figure 8.5: BulkInsert Results



Conclusion

In conclusion, this thesis has successfully investigated the spectrum of database access options available to developers within the TypeScript ecosystem. The research has led to the development of a scalable benchmarking framework designed to evaluate the capability of various packages to execute database operations. This framework accommodates additional test databases and suites, providing opportunities for future research and expansion.

Several avenues for future work emerge from the findings of this thesis. These include extending the benchmark framework to incorporate a more comprehensive array of packages and databases, evaluating the capacity of these packages to describe database schemas, and devising additional test suites to assess the flexibility and performance of the packages under investigation.

The results of the benchmarking process provide valuable insights into the performance and capabilities of several prominent ORM frameworks. While there appeared to be negligible performance differences between TypeORM and Sequelize, the two leading ORM frameworks, TypeORM demonstrated significantly better support for TypeScript features, utilizing them to its advantage. Furthermore, two lesser-known packages, Kysely and MikroORM, displayed remarkable utility and flexibility in their respective domains.

Kysely, a query builder alternative to the more popular Knex, exhibited superior type support while delivering faster results and maintaining an equal capacity for query creation. Kysely has significant potential to become a compelling alternative for developers seeking a more type-safe and performant query builder.

MikroORM surprised with its extensive feature set, excellent type support, and the ability to leverage Knex for crafting highly complex queries. Its performance in the benchmarks underscores the potential value of MikroORM for developers who require a more feature-rich and type-safe ORM solution while still retaining the flexibility to utilize Knex when necessary.

The findings of this thesis emphasize the importance of considering lesser-known packages in addition to the most popular solutions when selecting a suitable ORM framework or query builder. By doing so, developers can make more informed decisions that align with their specific requirements, maximizing the benefits of the chosen package and optimizing the overall development process.

As the ecosystem of TypeScript-compatible database access packages continues to evolve, the framework can be updated and expanded to ensure that developers stay well-informed about the strengths and weaknesses of emerging solutions. Such service would enable them to make better-informed decisions when selecting a package that best suits their project's needs, ultimately contributing to more efficient and robust application development.

In summary, this thesis shed light on the diverse landscape of TypeScript-compatible database access packages, providing insights into their capabilities and performance. With the knowledge gained from this study, developers stand better equipped to select the most suitable package for their specific requirements, ensuring a more streamlined and effective development process.

Bibliography

1. O'REILLY, Tim. *What is web 2.0: Design Patterns and Business Models for the Next Generation of Software* [online] . " O'Reilly Media, Inc.", 2005 [visited on 2023-04-15]. Available from : <https://www.oreilly.com/pub/a/web2/archive/what-is-web-20.html>.
2. *Stack Overflow Developer Survey 2022* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : https://survey.stackoverflow.co/2022/?utm-source=social-share&utm_medium=social&utm_campaign=dev-survey-2022.
3. TORRES, Alexandre; GALANTE, Renata; PIMENTA, Marcelo S.; MARTINS, Alexandre Jonatan B. Twenty years of object-relational mapping: A survey on patterns, solutions, and their implications on application design. *Information and Software Technology*. 2017, vol. 82. ISSN 09505849. Available from DOI: 10.1016/j.infsof.2016.09.009.
4. *Drizzle northwind pg* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://github.com/drizzle-team/drizzle-northwind-benchmarks-pg>.
5. *imdb-bench* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://github.com/edgedb/imdbench>.
6. *Mapping Objects to Relational Databases: O/R Mapping In Detail* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <http://www.agiledata.org/essays/mappingObjects.html>.

7. *artima - Inappropriate Abstractions* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.artima.com/articles/inappropriate-abstractions#part3>.
8. FOWLER, Martin. *Patterns of enterprise application architecture*. Boston: Addison-Wesley, 2003. The Addison-Wesley signature series. ISBN 9780321127426.
9. GAMMA, Erich; RICHARD, Helm; RALPH, Johnson; JOHN, Vlissides. *Design patterns: elements of reusable object-oriented software*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1995. Addison-Wesley professional computing series. ISBN 9780201633610.
10. *4.1. Lexical Structure* [online] . 2023-02. [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.postgresql.org/docs/15/sql-syntax-lexical.html>.
11. *PostgreSQL: About* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.postgresql.org/about/>.
12. *PostgreSQL Licence* [online] . 2023-02. [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.postgresql.org/about/licence/>.
13. *13.2. Transaction Isolation* [online] . 2023-02. [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.postgresql.org/docs/15/transaction-iso.html>.
14. *Chapter 8. Data Types* [online] . 2023-02. [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.postgresql.org/docs/15/datatype.html>.
15. *Chapter 34. libpq — C Library* [online] . 2023-02. [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.postgresql.org/docs/15/libpq.html>.
16. *psycopg2: psycopg2 - Python-PostgreSQL Database Adapter* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://psycopg.org/>.
17. *Home — pgJDBC* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://jdbc.postgresql.org/>.

-
18. *node-postgres* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://node-postgres.com/>.
 19. *Lazy loading - Web Performance* [online] . 2023-04. [visited on 2023-04-20]. Available from : https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/Performance/Lazy_loading.
 20. *Eager Loading — Sequelize* [online] . 2023-04. [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://sequelize.org/docs/v6/advanced-association-concepts/eager-loading/>.
 21. *Node.js V20.0.0 documentation* [online] . 2023-04. [visited on 2023-04-20]. Available from : https://nodejs.org/api/modules.html#modules_cycles.
 22. *Documentation - Modules* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.typescriptlang.org/docs/handbook/modules.html>.
 23. MELTON, Hayden; TEMPERO, Ewan. An empirical study of cycles among classes in Java. *Empirical Software Engineering* [online] . 2007, vol. 12, no. 4 [visited on 2023-04-21]. ISSN 1382-3256, ISSN 1573-7616. Available from DOI: 10.1007/s10664-006-9033-1.
 24. HAERDER, Theo; REUTER, Andreas. Principles of transaction-oriented database recovery. *ACM Computing Surveys* [online] . 1983, vol. 15, no. 4 [visited on 2023-04-21]. ISSN 0360-0300, ISSN 1557-7341. Available from DOI: 10.1145/289.291.
 25. GUPTA, Kirti; MATHURIA, Manish. Improving performance of web application approaches using connection pooling. In : *2017 International conference of Electronics, Communication and Aerospace Technology (ICECA)* [online] . Coimbatore: IEEE, 2017 [visited on 2023-04-21]. ISBN 9781509056859. Available from DOI: 10.1109/ICECA.2017.8212833.
 26. *Chapter 27. High Availability, Load Balancing, and Replication* [online] . 2023-02. [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.postgresql.org/docs/15/high-availability.html>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

27. *A Brief History of JavaScript* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://auth0.com/blog/a-brief-history-of-javascript/>.
28. *CoffeeScript* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://coffeescript.org/>.
29. *Dart programming language* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://dart.dev/>.
30. *TypeScript* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.typescriptlang.org/>.
31. *Mission* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.ecma-international.org/mission/>.
32. *ECMA-262* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.ecma-international.org/publications-and-standards/standards/ecma-262/>.
33. *SpiderMonkey — Firefox Source Docs documentation* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://firefox-source-docs.mozilla.org/js/index.html>.
34. *V8 — JavaScript engine* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://v8.dev/>.
35. *JavaScriptCore — WebKit* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://trac.webkit.org/wiki/JavaScriptCore>.
36. *CommonJS Spec Wiki* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://wiki.commonjs.org/wiki/CommonJS>.
37. *Introduction - CommonJS Spec Wiki* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://wiki.commonjs.org/wiki/Introduction>.
38. *TypeScript Programming with Visual Studio Code* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://code.visualstudio.com/docs/languages/typescript>.

39. *TypeScript — WebStorm* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.jetbrains.com/help/webstorm/typescript-support.html>.
40. *About* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://nodejs.org/en/about>.
41. *Ryan Dahl: Original Node.js presentation* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ztspvPYybiY>.
42. ORSINI, Lauren. *What You Need To Know About Node.js* [online] . 2013-11. [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://readwrite.com/what-you-need-to-know-about-nodejs/>.
43. *Promises - MDN*. 2023-04. Available also from : https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/JavaScript/Reference/Global_Objects/Promise.
44. *Deno runtime* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://deno.land/>.
45. *cli/README.md - npm/cli* [online] . 2009-09. [visited on 2023-04-21].
46. *npm Logs and Usage* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://docs.npmjs.com/policies/logos-and-usage>.
47. *Yarn package manager*. Available also from : <https://classic.yarnpkg.com/en/docs/getting-started/>.
48. *The JSON Data Interchange Syntax - ECMA-404* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.ecma-international.org/publications-and-standards/standards/ecma-404/>.
49. DAVID. *ORM Patterns: The Trade-Offs of Active Record and Data Mappers for Object-Relational Mapping*. 2018. Available also from : <https://www.thoughtfulcode.com/orm-active-record-vs-data-mapper/>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

50. *keywords:orm - npm repository search* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.npmjs.com/search?q=keywords:orm>.
51. WANYOIKE, Michael [online] . 2021-03. [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.sitepoint.com/javascript-typescript-orms/>.
52. WANG, Xiaoxuan. *Popular ORMs in JavaScript* [online] . 2020-04. [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://medium.com/@ysz320/popular-orms-in-javascript-d101f667c0be>.
53. *MIT License* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://mit-license.org/>.
54. *Apache License Version 2.0* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.apache.org/licenses/LICENSE-2.0.html>.
55. FREE SOFTWARE FOUNDATION, Inc. *The GNU General Public License v3.0 - GNU Project - Free Software Foundation* [online] . 2007. [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.gnu.org/licenses/gpl-3.0.en.html>.
56. *Documentation - JSDoc Reference* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.typescriptlang.org/docs/handbook/jsdoc-supported-types.html>.
57. *Date - JavaScript* [online] . 2023-04. [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/JavaScript/Reference/Global_Objects/Date.
58. *Date/Time Types* [online] . 2023-02. [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://www.postgresql.org/docs/15/datatype-datetime.html>.
59. KARWIN, Bill. *Answer to "Still Confused About Identifying vs. Non-Identifying Relationships"* [online] . 2010-05. [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://stackoverflow.com/a/2814663>.

60. *Upsert — CockroachDB* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.cockroachlabs.com/docs/stable/upsert.html>.
61. *INSERT* [online] . 2023-02. [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.postgresql.org/docs/15/sql-insert.html>.
62. *5.4. Constraints* [online] . 2023-02. [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.postgresql.org/docs/15/ddl-constraints.html>.
63. *8.14. JSON Types* [online] . 2023-02. [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.postgresql.org/docs/15/datatype-json.html>.
64. *Jest testing framework* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://jestjs.io/>.
65. *Mocha - the fun, simple, flexible JavaScript test framework* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://mochajs.org/>.
66. *Assert* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://nodejs.org/api/assert.html>.
67. *Workspaces* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://docs.npmjs.com/cli/v7/using-npm/workspaces/>.
68. *Sass: Syntactically Awesome Style Sheets* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://sass-lang.com/>.
69. *Number - JavaScript* [online] . 2023-04. [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/JavaScript/Reference/Global_Objects/Number.
70. *8.1. Numeric Types* [online] . 2023-02. [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://www.postgresql.org/docs/15/datatype-numeric.html>.
71. *BigInt - JavaScript* [online] . 2023-04. [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/JavaScript/Reference/Global_Objects/BigInt.

- 72. *55.7. Message Formats* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-25]. Available from : <https://www.postgresql.org/docs/current/protocol-message-formats.html>.
- 73. *Queries with more than 32k parameters are allowed #2579* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://github.com/brianc/node-postgres/issues/2579>.
- 74. *PgTyped - Typesafe SQL in Typescript* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://pgtyped.dev/>.
- 75. *@pgtyped/cli* [online] . 2023-03. [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://www.npmjs.com/package/@pgtyped/cli>.
- 76. *@pgtyped/runtime dependencies* [online] . 2023-03. [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://www.npmjs.com/package/@pgtyped/runtime?activeTab=dependencies>.
- 77. *pgTyped Documentation* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://pgtyped.dev/docs/>.
- 78. *@databases/pg-schema-cli* [online] . 2023-01. [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://www.npmjs.com/package/@databases/pg-schema-cli>.
- 79. *@databases/pg* [online] . 2023-01. [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://www.atdatabases.org/docs/pgg>.
- 80. *@databases/pg* [online] . 2023-01. [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://www.npmjs.com/package/@databases/pg>.
- 81. *Zapatos* [online] . 2023-01. [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://www.npmjs.com/package/zapatos>.
- 82. *Zapatos Documentation* [online] . 2023-01. [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://jawj.github.io/zapatos/>.
- 83. *Commits · knex/knex* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://github.com/knex/knex>.
- 84. *Installation — Knex.js* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://knexjs.org/guide/>.

85. KRIASOFT. *knex-types* [online] . 2022. [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://www.npmjs.com/package/knex-types>.
86. *Knex.js issue #5091* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://github.com/knex/knex/issues/5091>.
87. *Knex.js issue #3112* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://github.com/knex/knex/issues/3112>.
88. *Kysely Documentation* [online] . [N.d.]. [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://kysely.dev/docs/intro>.
89. *Kysely* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://github.com/kysely-org/kysely>.
90. *kysely-codegen* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://github.com/RobinBlomberg/kysely-codegen>.
91. *prisma-kysely* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://github.com/valtyr/prisma-kysely>.
92. *MikroORM* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://mikro-orm.io/>.
93. *mikro-orm* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://www.github.com/mikro-orm/mikro-orm>.
94. *mikro-orm* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://www.npmjs.com/package/mikro-orm>.
95. *Support for deno?* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://github.com/mikro-orm/mikro-orm/discussions/3079>.
96. *MikroORM Documentation* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://mikro-orm.io/docs/>.
97. *Working with Entity Manager* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://mikro-orm.io/docs/entity-manager>.
98. *Prisma Schema* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://www.prisma.io/docs/concepts/components/prisma-schema>.

99. *Deployment guides* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-20]. Available from : <https://www.prisma.io/docs/guides/deployment/deployment-guides>.
100. *prisma* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://www.npmjs.com/package/prisma>.
101. *prisma/prisma* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://www.github.com/prisma/prisma>.
102. *Support ES6 modules export / ESM* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://github.com/prisma/prisma/issues/5030>.
103. *TypeORM* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://www.npmjs.com/package/typeorm>.
104. *typeorm/typeorm* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://www.github.com/typeorm/typeorm>.
105. *Sequelize* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://www.npmjs.com/package/sequelize>.
106. *Sequelize Typescript* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://www.npmjs.com/package/sequelize-typescript>.
107. *Future of TypeORM* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://www.github.com/typeorm/typeorm/issues/3267>.
108. *TypeORM Documentation* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://www.typeorm.io/>.
109. *Vincit/objection.js* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://www.github.com/Vincit/objection.js>.
110. *Objection.js* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://www.npmjs.com/package/objection>.
111. *The future of Objection.js* [online] . 2022-11. [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://github.com/Vincit/objection.js/issues/2335>.
112. *Objection.js 3.0.2* [online] . 2023-03. [visited on 2023-03-30]. Available from : <https://github.com/Vincit/objection.js/releases/tag/3.0.2>.

- 113. *Objection.js Documentation* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://vincit.github.io/objection.js/>.
- 114. *Sequelize Documentation* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://sequelize.org/docs/>.
- 115. *TypeScript* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://sequelize.org/docs/v6/other-topics/typescript/>.
- 116. *Paranoid* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://sequelize.org/docs/v6/core-concepts/paranoid/>.
- 117. *sequelize/sequelize* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://www.github.com/sequelize/sequelize>.
- 118. *rdb* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://www.npmjs.com/package/rdb>.
- 119. *alfateam/rdb* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://github.com/alfateam/rdb>.
- 120. *RDB Documentation* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://github.com/alfateam/rdb/blob/master/docs/docs.md>.
- 121. *Bookshelf* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://www.npmjs.com/package/bookshelf>.
- 122. *bookshelf/bookshelf* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://www.github.com/bookshelf/bookshelf>.
- 123. *Bookshelf Documentation* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://bookshelfjs.org/>.
- 124. *CVE-2019-10744 - GitHub Advisory Database* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://github.com/advisories/GHSA-jf85-cpcp-j695>.
- 125. *CVE-2016-20018 - GitHub Advisory Database* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://github.com/advisories/GHSA-4jv9-3563-23j3>.
- 126. *Express — npm* [online] . 2022-10. [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.npmjs.com/package/express>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

127. *Koa* — *npm* [online] . 2023-04. [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.npmjs.com/package/koa>.
128. *DefinitelyTyped/types/waterline at master · DefinitelyTyped* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://github.com/DefinitelyTyped/DefinitelyTyped>.
129. *Models and ORM - Sails.js* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://sailsjs.com/documentation/concepts/models-and-orm>.
130. ADÁMEK, Martin. *MikroORM 4.1: Let's talk about performance* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-24]. Available from : <https://mikro-orm.io/blog/mikro-orm-4-1-released>.
131. ROSENWASSER, Daniel. *Announcing TypeScript 4.8* [online] . 2022-08. [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://devblogs.microsoft.com/typescript/announcing-typescript-4-8/>.
132. *initial import · sequelize/sequelize@fee9208* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://github.com/sequelize/sequelize/commit/fee92083a75c15f5b6cd2d0c2f3bb043ae155e68>.
133. *Future of TypeORM · Issue #3267 · typeorm/typeorm* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://github.com/typeorm/typeorm/issues/3267>.
134. *ECMAScript 2015 (ES6) and beyond* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://nodejs.org/en/docs/es6>.
135. *Frequently Asked Questions about the GNU Licenses* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <https://www.gnu.org/licenses/gpl-faq.html#WhySomeGPLAndNotLGPL>.
136. KRIASOFT. *Knex.js* [online] . 2022. [visited on 2023-04-22]. Available from : <https://www.npmjs.com/package/knex>.
137. *kysely* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://www.npmjs.com/package/kysely>.
138. *Type-safe relations* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://mikro-orm.io/docs/type-safe-relations>.

139. MARTIN, Robert C. *The Principles of OOD* [online] . 2003. [visited on 2023-04-21]. Available from : <http://butunclebob.com/ArticleS.UncleBob.PrinciplesOfOod>.
140. *sequelize/sequelize-typescript* [online] . [visited on 2023-04-23]. Available from : <https://github.com/sequelize/sequelize-typescript>.

Appendix

Table A.1: Popularity and homepages of packages

| Package | npm weekly downloads | GitHub Stars | Homepage |
|---------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|
| PgTyped | 9937 | 2348 | https://github.com/adelsz/pgtyped |
| @databases/pg | 26613 | 517 | https://atdatabases.org/docs/pg |
| Zapatos | 14933 | 980 | https://jawj.github.io/zapatos/ |
| Knex.js | 1346100 | 17419 | https://knexjs.org/ |
| Kysely | 53635 | 4683 | https://kysely.dev/ |
| MikroORM | 189128 | 5777 | https://mikro-orm.io/ |
| PrismaORM | 1057351 | 30431 | https://prisma.io/ |
| TypeORM | 1192427 | 30947 | https://typeorm.io/ |
| Objection.js | 128872 | 6972 | https://vincit.github.io/objection.js/ |
| Sequelize | 1505485 | 27729 | https://sequelize.org/ |
| RDB | 284 | 291 | https://github.com/alfateam/rdb |
| Bookshelf.js | 103607 | 6315 | https://bookshelfjs.org/ |
| Waterline | 29086 | 5387 | https://waterlinejs.org/ |

Figure A.1: HTMLReporter result - partial screenshot




Figure A.2: JSON Where query Results




Figure A.3: Transactional operations Results




Figure A.4: Pattern Matching (likeQuery) Results




Figure A.5: Case insensitive pattern (ilikeQuery) Results




Figure A.6: BulkDelete Results





Figure A.7: BulkUpdate Results







Figure A.9: Maximum value query Results



Structure of attachments

```

|  readme.txt ..... file with the attachment structure
|  └─ src ..... the directory of source codes
|     └─ benchmark ..... implementation sources
|        └─ thesis ..... the directory of LATEX source codes of the thesis
|  └─ thesis.pdf ..... the thesis text in PDF format

```