

# SIMD Acceleration for Index Structures

Marten Wallewein-Eising  
Otto-von-Guericke University  
Magdeburg, Germany  
marten.wallewein-eising@st.ovgu.de

**Abstract**—Index structures designed for disk-based database systems do not fulfill the requirements for modern database systems. To improve the performance of these index structures, different approaches are presented by several authors, including horizontal vectorization with SIMD and efficient cache line usage.

In this work, we compare the adapted index structures Seg-Tree/Trie, FAST, VAST, and ART and evaluate the usage of SIMD within these. We extract important criteria of these adaptations and weight them according to their impact on the performance. Furthermore, we present openings in the considered index structures for additional adaptations to combine advantages of them.

**Index Terms**—SIMD, horizontal vectorization

## I. INTRODUCTION

After decades of creating and improving index structures for disk-based database systems, nowadays even large databases fit into the main memory. Since index structures like the  $B^+$ -tree or the radix tree have an important part in database systems to realise scan or range-based search operations, these index structures experienced many adaptations to fulfill the needs of modern database systems. Instead of overcoming the bottleneck of IO-operations from disk to RAM, the target of modern index structures is to improve the usage of CPU cache and processor architectures.

Several index structures have already shown that the bottleneck from RAM to CPU can be overcome using Single Instruction Multiple Data (SIMD) [1] operations. These index structures include: the  $k$ -ary Search Tree (Seg-tree) [3], Adapted Radix Tree (ART) [4], Fast Architecture Sensitive Tree (FAST) [6], and Vector-Advanced and Compressed Structure Tree (VAST) [5]. As Yamamuro et al. show, important causes for increased runtime are cache misses and branch mispredictions. To overcome branch mispredictions and to decrease CPU cycles, SIMD is used in modern index structures for tree traversal [2]. Zeuch et al. show how to use SIMD to compare multiple keys in one CPU cycle. To decrease cache misses, the Kim et al. and Leis et al. show how they adapted FAST and ART to the cache line size.

All approaches use SIMD only for key comparison within tree traversal and try to decrease the key size to fit more keys into one SIMD register. Therefore FAST and Seg-tree only provide implementations for search algorithms. With this work we make the following contributions:

- We compare different adaptations of index structures to fulfill requirements of modern database systems
- We highlight the usage of SIMD and the cache line adaptations in all approaches




Fig. 1. Coherence between data, instructions, and the results of SIMD and SISD.

- We extract the important points of these adaptations and their performance impact on the index structures

We organized the rest of the paper as follows. In Section 2, we give the preliminaries for SIMD in general and for the use in index structures. In Section 3, we present the different approaches of adapted index structures and compare them comparison in Section 4. In Section 5, we name related work. In Section 6, we present our conclusion and describe future work.

## II. SIMD-STYLE PROCESSING

A common approach of decreasing CPU cycles for algorithms is to adapt the algorithm to pipelining. While one instruction is executed, the next instruction is already fetched. This approach executes one instruction on one data item, called Single Instruction Single Data (SISD). In contrast to execute one operation on one data item after another, the idea of SIMD is to execute a single instruction on multiple data items in parallel. In Figure 1, we show the coherence between data, instructions, and the results of SIMD and SISD. Modern CPUs have additional SIMD registers along with an additional instruction set adapted to process multiple data items in parallel. In Table 1, we show some SIMD instructions from Streaming SIMD Extensions 2 (SSE2). We consider `_mm_cmpgt_epi32` to show how SIMD works. After loading 4 different signed 32-bit integers in register  $a$  and 4 equal signed 32-bit integers in register  $b$ , we compare them using `_mm_cmpgt_epi32`. The comparison returns a bitmask showing which of the search keys in  $a$  is greater than the one in  $b$ .

TABLE I  
SIMD INSTRUCTIONS FROM STREAMING SIMD EXTENSIONS 2 (SSE2)

SIMD instruction	Explanation
<code>__m128i __mm_load_si128 (__m128i *p)</code>	Loads a 128-bit value. Returns the value loaded into a variable representing a register.
<code>__m128i __mm_cmpgt_epi32 (__m128i a, __m128i b)</code>	Compares 4 signed 32-bit integers in a and 4 signed 32-bit integers in b for greater-than.
<code>__m128i __mm_set1_epi32(int i)</code>	Sets the four signed 32-bit integer values to i.

Consequently, the main advantage of SIMD is to process multiple data parallel in contrast to pipelining and SISD. The main restriction of SIMD instructions is that a sequential load of data is required. To load data into a SIMD register, the data has to be stored consecutively in main memory. Additionally, the size of SIMD registers is limited. Therefore processing data types of the common size of 64-bit and more lead to a small performance increase, since only few data items are processed with a single instruction.

Polychroniou et al. [7] show two general approaches to use SIMD, horizontal and vertical vector processing. They name the comparison of one search key to multiple other keys horizontal vectorization, whereas processing a different input key per vector lane is named vertical vectorization.

Since FAST, Seg-Tree, ART and VAST only use horizontal vectorization, we focus on this approach. For example, Zeuch et al. [3] use 128-bit SIMD registers and adjusted SIMD operations to load data into a register and to compare the data of one SIMD register with another. For example, a 128-bit SIMD register processes sixteen 8-bit or eight 16-bit data items with one instruction.

### III. ADAPTED TREE STRUCTURES

In this section we present the previously mentioned index structures Seg-Tree/Trie, FAST, ART, and VAST. We consider the adaptations made compared to the base index structure, the usage of SIMD, and the performance gain presented by the authors of the certain index structures.

#### A. Seg-Tree and Seg-Trie

Zeuch et al. adapted the  $B^+$ -Tree by having a  $k$ -ary search tree as each inner node, called segment, and perform a  $k$ -ary search on each segment. In Figure 2, we show the adaption of nodes made by Zeuch et al. for Seg-Tree. The  $k$ -ary search bases on the binary search but divides the search space into  $k$  partitions with  $k-1$  separators. Compared to binary search, the  $k$ -ary search reduces the complexity from  $O(\log_2 n)$  to  $O(\log_k n)$ . They consider  $m$  as the most bits to represent a data type and  $|SIMD|$  as the size of SIMD-register, called SIMD bandwidth. Then,  $k = \frac{|SIMD|}{m}$  defines the number of partitions for the  $k$ -ary search.

As mentioned before, each segment of the Seg-Tree is a  $k$ -ary search tree. To perform a  $k$ -ary search on a segment, Zeuch et al. linearise the elements of the segment. They show two algorithms for linearisation using breadth-first search and depth-first search. Because of the condition  $k = \frac{|SIMD|}{m}$ , each partition of the  $k$ -ary search fits into a SIMD register and is compared to the search key. A perfect  $k$ -ary search tree




Fig. 2. Inner node format of Seg-Tree

contains  $S_{max} = k^h - 1$  keys for an integer  $h > 0$ . The considered search algorithm only works for sequences with a multiple of  $k - 1$  keys. In case of sequences with less than a multiple of  $k - 1$  keys, they replenish the sequence with elements having the value  $k_{max} + 1$  for the maximal key value  $k_{max}$  in the sequence. Consequently, the adapted search algorithm works for sequences with less than a multiple of  $k - 1$  keys.

The performance of Seg-Tree depends on  $k$ -ary search and horizontal vectorization. The smaller a key the more keys are compared parallel. According to the relevance of 32 and 64-bit data types in modern systems, the  $k$ -ary search performance increases only by the factor of four for 32-bit types and two for 64-bit types.

Zeuch et al. also show the  $k$ -ary search on an adapted prefix tree (trie for short) called Seg-Trie. A trie is a search tree where nodes store a parts of the key, called chunks. For example, a 32 bit key with a chunk size of 8 bit is stored in a trie with 4 levels. Analogue to the Seg-Tree, each node is again designed as a  $k$ -ary search tree. Complete keys are stored in leaf nodes or are build by concatenating partial keys from the root node to a leaf node. This approach benefits of the separation of the keys in different levels of the tree. Consequently, the compare keys are smaller and more keys can be compared in parallel. The Seg-Trie<sub>L</sub> is defined as a balanced trie where each node on each level contains one part of the key with  $L$  Bits. The tree has  $r = \frac{m}{L}$  levels ( $E_0, E_1, \dots, E_r$ ), where  $m$  is the number of most bits to



Fig. 3. (a) Node indices (=memory locations) of the binary tree (b) Rearranged nodes with SIMD blocking (c) Index tree blocked in three-level hierarchy first-level page blocking, second-level cache line blocking, third-level SIMD blocking. Adapted from Kim et al. [6].

represent the data type.

To perform a tree traversal on the Seg-Trie, the search key is split into  $r$  segments and each segment  $r_i$  is compared to the level  $E_i$ . If a matching partial key is found in one node of  $E_i$ , the search continues at the referenced node for the partial key. If no match of the partial key is found, the Seg-Trie does not contain the search key and the search is finished. Consequently, the advantage of Seg-Trie against tree structures is the reduced comparison effort for non-existing key segments.

### B. FAST

Kim et al. adapted a binary tree to optimize for architecture features like page size, cache line size, and SIMD bandwidth called Fast Architecture Sensitive Tree [6]. In contrast to Seg-Tree, FAST is also adapted to disk-based database systems. Kim et al. show the performance increase because of decreasing cache misses and better cache line usage. In order to optimize for architectural features, tree nodes are rearranged for hierarchical blocking. In Figure 3, we show an index tree blocked in three-level hierarchy introduced by Kim et al.

According to Figure 3, we define  $d_K = 2$  as the depth of a SIMD block,  $d_L = 5$  as the depth of a page block,  $N_K = 2^{d_K} - 1$  as the number of keys that fit into a SIMD register, and  $N_L = 2^{d_L} - 1$  as the number of keys that fit into a cache line. To rearrange the nodes, Kim et al. sorted the nodes, as shown in Figure 3 (a). Afterwards, they combine the first  $N_K$  keys and lay them out in breadth-first fashion (the first key as root, the next  $N_K - 1$  keys as children on depth 2). These first  $N_K$  represent a SIMD block. They continue to lay out the next keys the same fashion, building the SIMD blocks with root keys 3, 6, 9, and 12, as shown in Figure 3 (b). This process continues for all sub-trees that are completely within the first  $d_L$  levels from the root. If a sub-tree does not completely fit in the first  $d_L$  levels, the keys are laid out according to the appropriate number of levels ( $d_L \% d_K$ ) as shown in depth 4 in Figure 3 (b). The first  $N_L$  keys represent a cache line block. We define  $d_P = 31$  as the depth of a page block,  $N_P = 2^{d_P} - 1$  as the number of keys that fit into a page. The procedure of hierarchical blocking continues analogue until the  $N_P$  keys are laid out, representing a page block. After building one page

block, the next page block is build up the same way. In Figure 3 (c) we show the different blocks in a hierarchical blocked index tree.

Kim et al. present implementations for building and traversing the tree adapted for CPU and also for GPU. Building up the tree, SIMD is used to computing the index for  $N_K$  keys within the SIMD level block in parallel, achieving around 2X SIMD scaling as compared to the scalar code. With a Core i7 processor, the runtime of building a FAST tree with 64M tuples is less than 0.1 seconds. Traversing the tree, they compare one search key to multiple keys of the index structure. To use the complete bandwidth of cache and main memory within the search, blocks are loaded completely into associated memories from large blocks to small blocks. For a page block, at first the page is loaded into main memory. Then cache line blocks are loaded one after another in the cache and for each cache line block, the included SIMD blocks are loaded into the SIMD register. All keys of this SIMD block are compared with one SIMD instruction. After looking up the resulting bitmask, the corresponding SIMD block is loaded (including the load of the surrounding larger blocks) until the key is found or the last level of the index structure is reached.

Kim et al. consider the search performance as queries per second. The CPU search performance on the Core i7 with 64M 32-bit (key, rowID) pairs is 5X faster than the best reported number [14], resulting in a throughput of 50M search queries per second. Considering larger index structures, the GPU performance increase exceeds the CPU performance increase, because TLB and cache misses grow up and the CPU search becomes memory bandwidth bound.

### C. VAST

Yamamuro et al. extended FAST building an index structure called Vector-Advanced and Compressed Structure Tree (VAST) [5]. They adapt the blocking and aligning structure of FAST and add compression of nodes along with improved SIMD usage. In Figure 5, we show the structure of the VAST-Tree including layers and different blocking elements. The top layer  $P_{32}$  uses the techniques of FAST with the same SIMD, cache line and page blocking with 32 bit keys.




Fig. 4. An overview of VAST-Tree. The top layer ( $P_{32}$ ) of VAST-Tree uses FAST techniques, and VAST-Tree compresses the middle and the bottom layers ( $P_{16}$  and  $P_8$ ) of the trees. Moreover, keys in leaf nodes ( $key_1, key_2, \dots, key_N$ ) are compressed by using lossless compression. Adapted from Yamamuro et al. [5].

In order to decrease the size of the index structure to better fit into main memory, the middle and bottom layers use compressed nodes. In the layer  $P_{16}$ , the 32 bit keys of each node are compressed to 16 bit keys using lossy compression. Analogue, in  $P_8$  the keys are compressed to 8 bit with lossy compression. In the leaf nodes Yamamuro et al. decrease the node size with the lossless compression algorithm *P4Delta*, which results in a good balance between compression ratio and decompression speed. If an error occurs due to information loss, they present an algorithm for error correction. They use prefix and suffix truncation to compress keys and calculate an offset  $\Delta w$  of the incorrect key to the correct key during tree traversal. If the  $\Delta w \neq 0$ , VAST-Tree scans the leaf nodes sequentially until  $\Delta w \neq 0$  becomes 0.

Along with the other considered index structures, Yamamuro et al. compare multiple keys to one search key with SIMD in the tree traversal. Due to the key compression of nodes, the VAST-Tree compares more keys in parallel than FAST. Additionally, they reduce branch misses with an adapted SIMD usage. They use addition and multiplication operations on the results of a SIMD key comparison, instead of if-then paths, to find the next node in tree traversal.

Due to lossy and lossless compression of the majority of nodes, Yamamuro et al. reach a 95% less space consumption of the VAST-Tree compared to a binary tree or FAST. When considering an index with  $2^{32}$  keys, they reach up to 6.0 and 1.24 times performance increase compared to a binary tree and FAST. Although errors occur due to lossy compression, the error correction does not take a major influence on the traversal speed.

#### D. ART

Leis et al. adapted a radix tree for efficient indexing in main-memory database systems called Adaptive Radix Tree [4].

Analogue to the Seg-Tree, the height of a radix tree depends on the chunk size of the keys stored in each node. ART divides keys into 8-bit chunks. They differentiate between inner nodes and leaf nodes and adapt each of them in a different way.

Instead of using a constant node size for each inner node, they present four types of nodes with different numbers of keys and children. The types of nodes, sorted ascending by their size, are *Node4*, *Node16*, *Node48*, and *Node256*. When the capacity of a node is exhausted due to insertion, it is replaced by a larger node type. When a node becomes underfull due to key removal, it is replaced by a smaller node type. In Figure 5, we show these node types containing keys that are mapped to subtrees.

**Node4:** The smallest node type consists of one array with up to four sorted keys and another array with up to four children. The keys and pointers are stored at corresponding positions.

**Node16:** This node type consists of arrays of 16 keys and 16 children, storing keys and children analogue to *Node4*.

**Node48:** To avoid searching keys in many elements, this node type does not store the keys explicitly. Instead, an array with 256 elements is used. This array can be indexed with key bytes directly. It stores indexes into a second array with the size of 48 elements containing the pointers to child nodes.

**Node256:** The largest node type is simply an array of 256 pointers. Consequently, the next node can be found efficiently using a single lookup of the key byte in that array.

For leaf nodes, Leis et al. use a mix of pointer and value slots in an array. If the value fits within the slot, they store it directly in the slot. Otherwise, a pointer to the value is stored. They tag each element with an additional bit indicating if a pointer or a value is stored.

According to FAST and Seg-Tree, Leis et al. use SIMD within the tree traversal. They use horizontal vectorization, comparing the search key against multiple keys of a node. In contrast to Zeuch et al., using horizontal vectorization for each inner node, Leis et al. only compare the keys of nodes with type *Node16* in parallel. Therefore, they replicate the search key 16 times and compare these against all keys of nodes of type *Node16*.

In contrast to FAST and Seg-Tree, the goal of ART is also to reduce space consumption. Leis et al. use lazy expansion and path compression. The first technique, lazy expansion, is to create inner nodes only if they are required to distinguish at least two leaf nodes. The second technique, path compression, removes all inner nodes that have only one child.

Since SIMD is only used in the tree search, we do not consider the performance increases of ART in insert and update operations. Leis et al. show, that looking up random keys using ART is faster than Seg-Tree and FAST, because ART has less cache misses and less CPU cycles per comparison. They consider the performance increases for dense and sparse keys, whereas ART works better with dense keys. Also they show that a span of 8 results in better performance than a smaller span.




Fig. 5. Inner nodes of ART. The partial keys 0, 2, 3, and 255 are mapped to the subtrees a, b, c, and d. Adapted from Leis et al. [4]

#### IV. EVALUATION

In this section, we define criteria to compare the adaptations made in Seg-Tree, FAST, ART, and VAST to increase performance and show differences. We primarily focus on the usage of SIMD within the adapted index structures. In Table 2, we show the performance criteria and its impact on performance increase and show which index structure implements which of the criteria. In the following, we consider each criterium in detail before summarizing the comparison. For each criteria, we show how the index structure implements it. If the index structure does not implement the criteria, we consider if it is possible to implement it. Furthermore, we constitute why the adaptations cannot be compared directly in view of performance.

##### A. Horizontal Vectorization

Segmenting the index structure is important to reach a better performance increase with SIMD instructions. Since the data for a SIMD operation has to be stored sequentially in main memory, a good segmenting and blocking strategy is necessary. In Section 2, we present the vertical vectorization as alternative to horizontal vectorization. Due to the necessity of sequential data storage in main memory, comparing a different search key per vector lane is not applicable for SIMD instructions in tree traversal. All considered adaptations use horizontal vectorization in search operation for a single search key in the index structure.

The search performance also depends on the evaluation of a comparison with SIMD operations. Kim et al. and Zeuch et al. use conditional branches (if-then paths) within their search

algorithms, which leads to more branch misses compared to the approach of Yamamuro et al. They perform addition and multiplication operations on the bitmask to avoid branch misses for better search performance. This approach can also be applied on Seg-Tree/Trie and ART to reduce branch misses.

##### B. Minimized key size

Minimizing the key size as much as possible speeds up the search performance, because more keys can be compared with a single SIMD instruction. Additionally, the smaller the keys are, the more keys fit into a cache line. Since tries or radix trees, depending on their span, have small chunks of the search key in each node, more keys are compared in parallel.

Zeuch et al. minimize the key size for the Seg-Trie using a small chunk size. This leads to a bigger tree height, but the performance increase of comparing more keys in parallel leads to better search performance. For the Seg-Tree, they do not use adaptations to minimize the key size, therefore the performance increase with SIMD depends on the size of the used data type. Analogue to the Seg-Trie, Leis et al. use a small key size for ART to increase the performance speed up.

Kim et al. do not minimize the key size for FAST, therefore the performance increase with SIMD also depends on the size of the used data type. Yamamuro et al. use compression to minimize the key size of VAST, respectively to the layer. Since VAST is an extended Version of FAST, there is no need to check if this adaption is also applicable for FAST.

##### C. Adapted node sizes and types

Index structures for disk-based database systems often adapt their node size to the page size of disk. In modern database systems, this adaption becomes obsolete. Consequently, the considered index structures adapt their node to other parameters.

Zeuch et al. adapted the  $B^+$ -Tree by having a k-ary search tree as each inner node. To perform k-ary search on the keys of a node, each node has the size of multiple of the SIMD-bandwidth  $k$ .

Kim et al. segment FAST into SIMD, cache, and page blocks. Each block contains multiple nodes, respectively to the block size. Since FAST is based on binary tree, every node contains still a single element and is not adapted in type or size. VAST uses the same hierarchical blocking and also does not adapt single nodes.

Leis et al. present different node types for inner nodes of ART. The node types differ in the number of keys and child nodes.

##### D. Decreased branch misses

Evaluating the result of a comparison with SIMD using conditional branches can lead to branch misses, if the CPU prefetches the wrong branch. Consequently, decreasing branch misses improves search performance because less CPU cycles are needed. Yamamuro et al. use addition and multiplication operations in VAST to find the next node in their evaluation of the comparison result. This avoids conditional branching and therefore decreases branch misses.



TABLE II  
COMPARISON OF THE CONSIDERED INDEX STRUCTURES BASED ON EXTRACTED CRITERIA AND THE IMPACT ON PERFORMANCE INCREASE

Criterion	Seg-Tree/Trie	FAST	ART	VAST	Impact
Horizontal vectorization	x	x	x	x	high
Minimized key size	o	-	x	x	high
Adapted node sizes and types	-	x	-	x	low
Decreased branch misses	-	x	-	x	medium
Full use of cache line using blocking and alignment	-	x	-	x	medium
Usage of Compression	o	-	x	x	medium
Adapt search algorithm for linearised nodes	x	-	-	-	low
Legend: x: implements the issue, o: partially implements the issue, -: not implements the issue					

Zeuch et al. use conditional branches in their search algorithms for the Seg-Tree and Seg-Trie, which can be replaced by the approach of VAST to decrease branch misses. Analogue, ART can be adapted using this approach to speed up the search performance.

#### E. Full use of cache line using blocking and alignment

Due to in-memory database systems, the IO-bottleneck moves from disk to RAM further to RAM to cache. Consequently, an efficient cache line usage is important to speed up the performance of index structures. An efficient cache line usage is reached by blocking parts of index structures to cache line size.

Zeuch et al. linearise keys to a multiple of the SIMD bandwidth with the Seg-Tree but not adapt the node size to the cache line size. Accordingly, an adaption of the inner nodes of Seg-Tree to the cache line size could lead to better cache line usage and consequently to better search performance.

Kim et al. segmented FAST into SIMD, cache, and page blocks. They highly optimize FAST for efficient cache line usage by blocking the index structure into blocks with the size of a cache line.

Leis et al. also do not make adaptations of ART in view of blocking to the cache line size. Thus, a performance increase can be reached by adapting ART to cache line size.

#### F. Usage of compression

Along with the fast growing amount of data stored in modern database systems, the size of index structures grows fast. Compression of nodes decreases the size of index structures. Key compression leads to better search performance with SIMD, because more keys are compared in parallel.

Zeuch et al. do not use any node or key compression for Seg-Tree. Kim et al. also do not compress nodes or keys in FAST. Consequently, considering compression for Seg-Tree and FAST provides space for additional performance increase.

Yamamuro et al. use lossy block compression to decrease the key size of blocks. Consequently, they compare more keys with one SIMD instruction, whereas performance decrease of the occurring errors is smaller than the performance increase of the compression. Instead of compressing blocks, Seg-Trie and ART use path compression to decrease the tree height. Consequently, less nodes are passed to reach the matching leaf node, if it exists.

Leis et al. use path compression within ART. Path compression removes all inner nodes that have only one child to decrease the tree height and therefore increase search performance. Key compression is a possible adaption for ART to improve the search performance.

#### G. Adapt search algorithm for linearised nodes

Searching children in nodes with many keys can be speeded up with adapted search algorithms compared to linear search.

Zeuch et al. introduce k-ary search for the Seg-Tree and Seg-Trie, which performs in  $O(\log_n)$  compared to  $O(n)$  of linear search, where  $k$  is the SIMD bandwidth. Consequently, less keys are compared in one node, whereas a linearised storage of the keys in the node is required.

For FAST and VAST, the k-ary search is not applicable because they are adapted from binary trees and have only one key in each node. Leis et al. use linear search in their adapted nodes of ART to find children. For node type *Node256* k-ary search can speed up finding the correct child node. Therefore ART provides space to use k-ary search for this node type.

#### H. Summary

After considering each performance criteria in detail, we summarize the comparison and weight the mentioned criteria according to their performance increase.

As mentioned before, comparing a different search key per vector lane is not applicable for SIMD instructions in tree traversal. Therefore, all considered adaptations use horizontal vectorization, but evaluate the result of the SIMD comparison in different ways. Since horizontal vectorization with SIMD, depending on the key size, leads to direct performance increase up to a multiple, we assign the highest weight to it.

Due to the mentioned performance increase of horizontal vectorization, minimizing key size also leads to better search performance. We assign the second highest weight to minimizing the key size, since more keys are compared in parallel. Because of the compression of keys, VAST reaches the highest performance increase by minimizing key size compared to the other index structures.

Compared to horizontal vectorization and minimizing key size, an efficient cache line usage and avoiding branch misses lead to lesser performance increase. Although, both criteria decrease the number of CPU cycles, the performance increase does not reach a multiple. Therefore, we assign the third

highest weight to efficient cache line usage and to avoiding branch misses.

Afterwards, we assign the fourth highest weight to the usage of compression. With key compression, the performance increase of horizontal vectorization rises. Path compression decreases the height of index structures and consequently less nodes are passed during traversal.

We assign the lowest weight to the adaption of nodes and to the usage of an adapted search algorithm. The adaption of nodes does not lead directly to performance increase, but is the basis for horizontal vectorization and efficient cache line usage. The usage of an adapted search algorithm, for example k-ary search, needs lesser comparisons. Nevertheless, it is not applicable for all of the considered index structures and it requires large node sizes to increase the performance.

Although our qualitative comparison yields various structural differences of the index structures, we cannot infer unbiased performance differences from the literature. The performance increases highly depend on the underlying hardware, the data types chosen for the keys, and the amount of keys inserted in the index structure. Therefore, comparing all structures directly does not lead to reasonable results. Although, Yamamuro et al. and Leis et al. compare VAST [5] and ART [4] to FAST, they only consider specific key sizes and data types.

## V. RELATED WORK

In main-memory database systems, a  $B^+$ -Tree does not fulfill the requirements of efficient cache line usage. Therefore, it is important to adapt  $B^+$ -Trees to efficient cache line usage. Rao et al. show improved cache line usage for  $B^+$ -Trees [8]. Compression is used to decrease the index size to fill more keys into the cache line. Zukowski et al. show the performance increase of better cache line usage with compression [9]. This adaption gives an alternative for us compared to the compression used in VAST.

Graefe et al. present and summarize several techniques for improving cache performance for B-Trees [10]. Furthermore, Bender et al. show a cache oblivious B-Tree [11] and a cache oblivious B-Tree for string data types [12]. Other adapted index structures are shown by Rao et al., the Cache-Sensitive Search Trees (CSS-Tree) [8], and the Cache Sensitive  $B^+$ -Tree (CSB+-Trees) [13]. They construct the tree such that the keys are placed with the best cache optimization as possible in terms of spatial or temporal locality. Since we consider efficient cache line usage as an important criteria for modern index structures, these adaptations gave useful ideas to measure performance increase due to efficient cache line usage.

During the traversal of an index structure in modern database systems, a huge number of keys are compared. Consequently, using SIMD instructions leads to better search performance. Polychroniou et al. consider different techniques to process multiple data items with one SIMD instruction [7]. They differentiate between horizontal and vertical vector processing and present benefits of each approach. We use

this differentiation of vector processing for our comparison of SIMD usage.

To compare as less keys as possible within one node to find the matching children, Zeuch et al. show the performance increase using k-ary search with SIMD instructions [3]. Schlegel et al. present the general benefits of k-ary search on modern processors [14]. Since k-ary search leads to a considerable factor of lesser key comparisons for large nodes, we choose the usage of an adapted search algorithm as one of our performance criteria.

Comparing adapted index structures for modern database systems leads to find important points to increase the performance of index structures. Yamamuro et al. and Leis et al. compare VAST [5] and ART [4] to FAST and show a performance increase. We consider this comparison to weight our performance criteria.

## VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this work, we compare the adapted index structures Seg-Tree/Trie, FAST, VAST, and ART and evaluate the usage of SIMD within these. We extract important criteria of these adaptations and weight them according to their impact on the performance.

Due to direct performance increase of horizontal vectorization with SIMD up to a multiple, this is the highest weighted criteria. Minimizing the key size leads to the comparison of more keys in parallel and is therefore assigned with the second highest weight. Afterwards, we assign the efficient usage of the cache line and the decrease of branch misses the third highest weight. The other considered criteria, in descending order in view of performance increase, are the usage of compression, the adaption of node types and size, and the usage of an adapted search algorithm to find keys within nodes.

Since not all considered index structures implement all criteria, we plan to combine different approaches. We presented that key compression leads to considerable performance increase. Therefore, we plan to examine the usage of key compression for Seg-Tree and ART. Furthermore, we plan to apply the evaluation of SIMD comparison results with addition and multiplication operations used in VAST to Seg-Tree and ART.

At last, we plan to examine the usage of k-ary search in ART for the node type *Node256*, since the other node types contain too less keys to get a considerable performance increase.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Suaib, A. Palaty and K. Sambhav Pandey, "Architecture of SIMD Type Vector Processor" in *IJCA (0975 - 8887) Volume 20, No.4*, 2011.
- [2] J. Zhou and K. A. Ross "Implementing Database Operations Using SIMD Instructions" in *ACM SIGMOD02*, pp. 145-156, 2002.
- [3] S. Zeuch, F. Huber and J.-C. Freytag "Adapting Tree Structures for Processing with SIMD Instructions" in *EDBT*, 2014.
- [4] V. Leis, A. Kemper and T. Neumann "The Adaptive Radix Tree: ARTful Indexing for Main-Memory Databases" in *ICDE 2013*, pages 38-49, 2013.
- [5] T. Yamamuro, M. Onizuka, T. Hitaka, and M. Yamamuro "VAST-Tree: A Vector-Advanced and Compressed Structure for Massive Data Tree Traversal" in *EDBT 2012*, pp. 396-407, 2012.

- [6] C. Kim, J. Chhugani, N. Satish, E. Sedlar, A. D. Nguyen, T. Kaldewey, V. W. Lee, S. A. Brandt and P. Dubey “FAST: Fast Architecture Sensitive Tree Search on Modern CPUs and GPUs” in SIGMOD10, pp. 339-350, 2010.
- [7] O. Polychroniou, A. Raghavan and K. A. Ross, “Rethinking SIMD Vectorization for In-Memory Databases” in SIGMOD15, pages 1493-1508, 2015.
- [8] J. Rao and K. A. Ross “Cache conscious indexing for decision support in main memory” in VLDB, pages 78-89, 1999.
- [9] M. Zukowski, S. Heman, N. Nes, and P. Boncz. “Super-scalar ram-cpu cache compression” in ICDE, pp. 59, 2006.
- [10] G. Graefe and P.-A. Larson. “B-tree indexes and cpu caches” in ICDE, pp. 349-358, 2001.
- [11] M. A. Bender, E. D. Demaine, and M. Farach-Colton “Cache-oblivious b-trees” in FOCS, pp. 399-409, 2000.
- [12] M. A. Bender, M. Farach-Colton, and B. C. Kuszmaul “Cache-oblivious string b-trees” in PODS, pp. 233-242, 2006.
- [13] J. Rao and K. A. Ross “Making  $B^+$ -Trees cache conscious in main memory” in SIGMOD00, Vol. 29, No.2, pp. 475-486, 2000.
- [14] B. Schlegel, R. Gemulla, and W. Lehner “K-ary search on modern processor” in DaMoN workshop, pp. 52-60, 2009.