fast scans 1.0
prof. Stratos Idreos

HTTP://DASLAB.SEAS.HARVARD.EDU/CLASSES/CS165/
Tuesday Research session
\textbf{shared scans and scans vs indexes} (project=m2,m3)

Wednesday section
\textbf{performance tools} (all project milestones)

Thursday section (extra), 6:30-8pm, Pierce, 100F
\textbf{midterm review}

Sunday OH with Stratos, 2-6:30pm
\textbf{milestone 2 & 3}
milestone 5 becomes bonus

milestone 2 tests are up
& automated testing + leaderboard start today
fast scans

hardware, data and query based optimizations
(project=m3)

apply to all algo/data structures
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& utilize all resources!
1. can do >1 tasks at the same time
2. can predict data accesses
3. can do the same task on >1 data
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from multi-core to NUMA
data placement becomes crucial

ATraPos: Adaptive transaction processing on hardware Islands
Danica Porobic, Erietta Liarou, Pinar Tözün, Anastasia Ailamaki
International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE), 2014
many “small” cores (1000s)
subsets of cores work on same task
so branches are again problematic

data transfer may be expensive
Jim Gray, IBM, Tandem, DEC, Microsoft
ACM Turing award
ACM SIGMOD Edgar F. Codd Innovation award

many more levels and latency differences
**utilization**

**energy side-effects**

**challenge**

how do we keep all CPUs/cores at 100%?

---

Dynamic fine-grained scheduling for energy-efficient main-memory queries

Iraklis Psaroudakis et al

International Workshop on Data Management on New Hardware (Damon), 2014
data transfer problems remain the same

whatever we bring in L1 we can break into L1/cores problems assign to core threads

can work in parallel
operator: average

memory

56, 34, 12, 1, 87, 22, 98, 49, 7, 12, ...
data size=L1 size x 10

L1

core1

core2
divide problem & run in parallel

read it only once in L1

read it only once in memory

- CPU
- registers
- on chip cache
- on board cache
- memory
- disk
loop fusion

watch out for *data locality*

```c
for(i=0; i<1000; i++)
    min = a[i] < min ? a[i] : min

for(i=0; i<1000; i++)
    max = a[i] > max ? a[i] : max
```
for(i=0;i<1000;i++)
    min = a[i]<min ? a[i] : min

for(i=0;i<1000;i++)
    max = a[i]>max ? a[i] : max

**Vs.**

for(i=0;i<1000;i++)
    min = a[i]<min ? a[i] : min
    max = a[i]>max ? a[i] : max
loop fission

watch out for data locality

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{for}(i=0; i<1000; i++) \\
\quad \text{min} &= a[i] < \text{min} \ ? \ a[i] \ : \ \text{min} \\
\quad \text{max} &= b[i] > \text{max} \ ? \ b[i] \ : \ \text{max}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{for}(i=0; i<1000; i++) \\
\quad \text{min} &= a[i] < \text{min} \ ? \ a[i] \ : \ \text{min} \\
\quad \text{max} &= b[i] > \text{max} \ ? \ b[i] \ : \ \text{max}
\end{align*}
\]
**vectorization**

process one block of data at a time

**select** \( \min(A) \), \( \max(A) \)

**from** \( R \)

**where** \( A < 10 \)
**full scan:** for every tuple check if the value satisfies the predicate and if it does remember the position of the tuple

```cpp
select(input, low, high, inclusiveLow, inclusiveHigh)
1: int *output = new array(sizeOf(input))
2: for (i=0; i<tuples; i++, input++)
3:   if *input>=low && *input<high
4:     *output++=i
5: return output
```

Sequential access pattern = good for CPU + memory hierarchy
(next class more about why this is true)
what if we have >> 1 queries arriving in parallel?

how can we keep all CPUs busy to 100% & minimize data movement?
N queries/selects in parallel on the same column
1) cost (L1 misses) for plain scan
2) devise shared scan approach
3) cost (L1 misses) for shared scan

corner cases:
what if queries do not arrive at the same time?
what if some queries are faster than others?
is there a limit to the number of queries in a shared scan?

(assume simplified memory hierarchy)
Column >L1, Column < L2, L1 block = L2 block = block bytes, Column = C blocks
CPU can read directly from level 1 only
1) gather queries
2) schedule queries on same data to run in parallel
3) each query gets a thread/core from thread pool

data moves once
# of cores queries run in parallel
attach queries arriving asynchronously  
elevate queries that are slow

q1, q2, q3

q4

q4
fast scans

what to do for milestone 3?

assume you have all queries
minimize data movement, try to utilize CPUs 100%
ideally (within reason) shared scan scales with # of queries and # of CPUs
numa: straightforward partitioning is ok

bonus: queries arriving asynchronously
Navigating big data with high-throughput, energy-efficient data partitioning.
L. Wu, R. J. Barker, M. A. Kim, K. A. Ross

Meet the walkers: Accelerating index traversals for in-memory databases.
O. Koçberber, B. Grot, J. Picorel, B. Falsafi, K. T. Lim, P. Ranganathan
International Symposium on Microarchitecture, 2013

Beyond the Wall: Near-Data Processing for Databases
S. Xi, O. Babarinsa, M. Athanassoulis, S. Idreos.
International Workshop on Data Management on New Hardware, 2015
Cooperative Scans: Dynamic Bandwidth Sharing in a DBMS
Marcin Zukowski, Sándor Héman, Niels Nes, Peter A. Boncz
Very large Databases Conference (VLDB), 2007

Morsel-driven parallelism: a NUMA-aware query evaluation framework for the many-core age
Viktor Leis, Peter A. Boncz, Alfons Kemper, and Thomas Neumann
ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, 2014

next: fast scans & modern hardware 2.0
fast scans 1.0
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