

MySQL / alternatives comparative benchmark

Database engines:

- **MySQL 5.1.42-gpl-advanced-log** (currently used as the backend of the EhBackup system in production)
- **MySQL 5.5.16-community**
- **MySQL 5.5.18-enterprise-commercial** (30 days trial)
- **MariaDB 5.2.10**

Hardware configuration:

The server software was installed on bkpschdmass01, bkpschdmass02, bkpctrlmass01 (.schlund.de). All 3 servers have identical hardware configurations (Xeon CPUs, 16 cores, 16 GB memory).

The data partition was shared between bkpschdmass01 and bkpschdmass02 via DRBD and to bkpctrlmass01 via NFS. All the servers are connected via Gigabit Ethernet.

Benchmarking software:

The only software used was the sql bench suite included with all MySQL source distributions. The graph generating perl script was improved for readability.

Software set-up:

- MySQL 5.1 was installed and benchmarked on bkpctrlmass01
- MySQL 5.5 (both) were installed and benchmarked on bkpschdmass01
- MariaDB was installed and benchmarked on bkpschdmass02
- The configuration file (my.cnf) was identical for all engines
- The test suite was run locally on each machine
- All the tests were performed on the database “test” created for this purpose alone
- Connection type was tcp (enforced)

How to read the graphical result

- “smaller” means better result
- x10 / x100 / ... mean that the indicated number of operations were performed in that amount of time
- 0.0 readings may indicate both that the database system was very fast or that it did not support a certain SQL extension; ignoring these lines is the recommended option
- The last line of the graph is the so-called “Wisconsin benchmark” (described here: <http://www.slideshare.net/Tess98/wisconsin-benchmark-june-2001-prof-sang-ho-lee>)

Color codes:

- MySQL 5.1.42 is **blue**
- MySQL 5.5.16-community is **red**
- MySQL 5.5.18-enterprise is **magenta**
- MariaDB 5.2.10 is **green**

Benchmark conclusions

MySQL 5.1.42 exhibited very poor performance on creating tables and defining indexes. This is not relevant for EhBackup where most operations are selects with joins using indexes. Unfortunately poor performance was also noted when inserting rows into tables with many indexes (possibly due to updating indexes?), this having the potential of affecting EhBackup master scheduler performance. Selecting using joins seems to be 5-10x slower compared to MySQL 5.5 and MariaDB. Wisconsin benchmark showed a 2x worse result than the other databases benchmarked.

MySQL 5.5-community surprisingly exhibited very poor performance on deletes, inserts and updates while the basic select operations (without joins) proved also to be slower than on the 5.1.42. The entire suite ran in nearly 22 minutes, a bit longer than the run time on the 5.1.42.

MySQL 5.5-enterprise proved to be marginally better on most write operations than the community version but didn't get close to MariaDB. Basic selects seemed very fast, though; in certain scenarios being the fastest from all variants tested. Wisconsin benchmark is in line with the community version and MariaDB.

MariaDB 5.2.10 exhibited balanced performance on most operations, being the fastest in most select operations (what is relevant for EhBackup) or in line with the MySQL enterprise version. The entire suite ran in about 11 minutes, which is about half the time measured with the other engines.

Running with EhBackup

All database engines worked with EhBackup in the mass testing environment without any changes (other than server address) so the only evaluation was performed on scaling and CPU load. The tool used was **top** with core usage display enabled (key 1 pressed).

MySQL 5.1.42 appeared to use just a single core (out of 16); the overall CPU load was ~40%

MySQL 5.5-community, MySQL 5.5-enterprise and MariaDB appeared to scale evenly on multiple cores; the overall CPU load was for all of them ~30%

Comparative summary

| | MySQL 5.1 | MySQL 5.5-community | MySQL 5.5-enterprise | MariaDB 5.2 |
|-----------------|---|---|--|---|
| Benefits | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change needed | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easy to deploy Free of charge | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easy to deploy Corporate technical support | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easy to deploy (drop in replacement for MySQL 5.1) Free of charge The fastest of all free alternatives The community and the interest around this project is growing |
| Costs | - | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> License fees (to be determined) | - |
| Risks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obvious scalability problems and load limitations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible future issues due to the Oracle business strategy focused on investing most of the efforts in the enterprise version only Poor performance in write operations No official support by default (community support and 3rd party support are available) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Not so good" performance in write operations Scalability may be limited by the licensing terms (e.g. different fees for multiple core support) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long term stability not yet determined No official support by default (community support and 3rd party support are available) |

MySQL Benchmark Results Computer: server.mysql3.jp8-201108

