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Overview of Query Evaluation

- **Query Plan:**
  - Tree of relational algebra operators
  - with choice of algorithm for each operator.

- **Example:** What are the names of sailors who have reserved boat 103
  - What are the operators

```sql
SELECT S.name
FROM Sailors S, Reserves R
WHERE S.sid=R.sid AND R.bid=103
```
Overview of Query Evaluation

- Two main issues in query optimization:
  - For a given query, **what plans are considered?**
    - Algorithm to search plan space for cheapest (estimated) plan.
  - How is the **cost of a plan estimated?**

- **Ideally:** Want to find best plan.
  - Practically: Avoid worst plans!

- Each operator is typically implemented using a `pull` interface: when an operator is `pulled` for the next output tuples, it `pulls` on its inputs and computes them.
Relational Operations

- We will consider how to implement:
  - **Selection** (\( \sigma \)) Selects a subset of rows from relation.
  - **Projection** (\( \pi \)) Deletes unwanted columns from relation.
  - **Join** (\( \bowtie \)) Allows us to combine two relations.
  - **Set-difference** (\( - \)) Tuples in reln. 1, but not in reln. 2.
  - **Union** (\( \cup \)) Tuples in reln. 1 and in reln. 2.
  - **Aggregation** (SUM, MIN, etc.) and GROUP BY

- Since each op returns a relation, ops can be *composed*!
After we cover the operations, we will discuss how to optimize queries formed by composing them.
Some Common Techniques

- Algorithms for evaluating relational operators use some simple ideas extensively:
  - **Indexing:** Can use WHERE conditions to retrieve small set of tuples (selections, joins)
  - **Iteration:** Sometimes, faster to scan all tuples even if there is an index. (And sometimes, we can scan the data entries in an index instead of the table itself.)
  - **Partitioning:** By using sorting or hashing, we can partition the input tuples and replace an expensive operation by similar operations on smaller inputs.
Statistics and Catalogs

- Need information about the relations and indexes involved. *Catalogs* typically contain at least:

  - # tuples (NTuples) and # pages (NPages) for each relation.
  - # distinct key values (NKeys) and NPages for each index.
  - Index height, low/high key values (Low/High) for each tree index.
Statistics and Catalogs

- Catalogs are updated periodically.
  - Updating whenever data changes is too expensive; lots of approximation anyway, so slight inconsistency ok.

- More detailed information (e.g., histograms of the values in some field) are sometimes stored.
A Note on Complex Selections

Selection conditions are first converted to **conjunctive normal form (CNF):**

\[(\text{day}<8/9/94 \text{ OR } \text{rname}='Paul') \text{ OR } \text{bid}=5 \text{ OR } \text{sid}=3 \] AND \[(\text{rname}='Paul' \text{ OR } \text{bid}=5 \text{ OR } \text{sid}=3)\]

- We only discuss case with no ORs; see text if you are curious about the general case.
Access Paths

- An **access path** is a method of retrieving tuples:
  - File scan, or index that matches a selection (in the query)
- A tree index **matches** (a conjunction of) terms that involve only attributes in a prefix of the search key.
  - E.g., Tree index on \(<a, b, c>\) matches the selection \(a=5\) \(\text{AND} b=3\), and \(a=5\) \(\text{AND} b>6\), but not \(b=3\).
- A hash index **matches** (a conjunction of) terms that has a term \(attribute=\text{value}\) for every attribute in the search key of the index.
  - E.g., Hash index on \(<a, b, c>\) matches \(a=5\) \(\text{AND} b=3\) \(\text{AND} c=5\); but it does not match \(b=3\), or \(a=5\) \(\text{AND} b=3\), or \(a>5\) \(\text{AND} b=3\) \(\text{AND} c=5\).
The Selection Operator

- **Most selective access path**: An index or file scan that we estimate will require the fewest page I/Os.
- **Find the most selective access path**, retrieve tuples using it, and apply any remaining terms that don’t match the index:
  - Terms that match this index reduce the number of tuples retrieved; other terms are used to discard some retrieved tuples, but do not affect number of tuples/pages fetched.
  - Consider \( \text{day}<8/9/94 \text{ AND bid}=5 \text{ AND sid}=3 \). A B+ tree index on \( \text{day} \) can be used; then, \( \text{bid}=5 \) and \( \text{sid}=3 \) must be checked for each retrieved tuple. Similarly, a hash index on \( \langle \text{bid}, \text{sid} \rangle \) could be used; \( \text{day}<8/9/94 \) must then be checked.
General Selections (CNF Form)

- **First approach**: Find the most selective access path, retrieve tuples using it, and apply any remaining terms that don’t match the index:
  - Consider \( \text{day} < 8/9/94 \text{ AND bid} = 5 \text{ AND sid} = 3 \). A B+ tree index on \( \text{day} \) can be used; then, \( \text{bid} = 5 \) and \( \text{sid} = 3 \) must be checked for each retrieved tuple. Similarly, a hash index on \(<\text{bid}, \text{sid}>\) could be used; \( \text{day} < 8/9/94 \) must then be checked.

- **Second approach**: Get sets of rids of data records using each matching index.
  - Then intersect these sets of rids
  - Retrieve the records and apply any remaining terms.
  - Consider \( \text{day} < 8/9/94 \text{ AND bid} = 5 \text{ AND sid} = 3 \). If we have a B+ tree index on \( \text{day} \) and an index on \( \text{sid} \), we can retrieve rids of records satisfying \( \text{day} < 8/9/94 \) using the first, rids of recs satisfying \( \text{sid} = 3 \) using the second, intersect, retrieve records and check \( \text{bid} = 5 \).
The Selection Operator: Reduction factor

- **Reduction factor.** The fraction of tuples in a table that satisfy a given conjunct
  - When there are several primary conjuncts, the total reduction factor is the product of all reduction factors (approximately)
- If there is no available information about the reduction factor, we can assume either uniform distribution, or simply reduction factor is set to a default value (0.1)
  - More sophisticated techniques use histograms
- Based on the reduction factor, we may decide upon several index choices
Using an Index for Selections

- Cost depends on #qualifying tuples, and clustering.
  - Cost of finding qualifying data entries (typically small) plus cost of retrieving records (could be large w/o clustering).
  - In example, assuming uniform distribution of names, about 10% of tuples qualify (100 pages, 10000 tuples). With a clustered index, cost is little more than 100 I/Os; if unclustered, upto 10000 I/Os!

```
SELECT * FROM Reserves R WHERE R.rname < 'C%
```
The Selection Operation

- **No Index, Unsorted Data**
  - Most selective access path is “file scan”. Cost is $O(M)$ where $M$ is the file size in pages

- **No Index, Sorted Data**
  - Most selective access path is “binary search”. Cost is $O(\log_2 M) +$ number of pages that contains qualifying tuples

- **Clustered B+-tree**
  - Using the clustered index would be best in case of range search. Cost is 2-3 I/Os to identify the start record + number of pages that contain qualifying tuples
  - Good for equality search in case hash index is not available. Cost is 2-3 I/Os

```sql
SELECT R.rating
FROM     Reserves R
WHERE R.attr op value
```
The Selection Operation

- **Unclustered B+-tree**
  - Works for equality search for keys in case hash index is not available. Cost is 2-3 I/Os. A worst case scenario is that every single qualified tuple results in one page I/O.
  - A refinement for the unclustered index:
    1. Find qualifying data entries.
    2. Sort the rid’s of the data entire based on the page identifiers.
    3. Fetch rids in order.

- **Clustered Hash Index**
  - Best for equality search. Cost is 1-2 I/Os + Number of pages with qualifying tuples.

- **Unclustered Hash Index**
  - Used for equality search. Cost is 1-2 I/Os + Number of qualifying tuples.
Projection

- Projection is: (1) Dropping unwanted columns, and (2) Removing duplicates
- The expensive part is removing duplicates.
  - SQL systems don’t remove duplicates unless the keyword DISTINCT is specified in a query.
- If no duplicate elimination is needed, an iteration is performed either on the table or an index whose key contains all the projection fields
Projection with duplicate elimination

- **Sorting Approach:** Sort on \(<\text{sid}, \text{bid}>\) and remove duplicates. (Can optimize this by dropping unwanted information while sorting.)

- **Hashing Approach:** Hash on \(<\text{sid}, \text{bid}>\) to create partitions. Load partitions into memory one at a time, build in-memory hash structure, and eliminate duplicates.

- If there is an index with both R.sid and R.bid in the search key, may be cheaper to sort data entries!
Discussion of Projection

- Sort-based approach is the standard; better handling of skew and result is sorted.
- If an index on the relation contains all wanted attributes in its search key, can do index-only scan.
  - Apply projection techniques to data entries (much smaller!)
- If an ordered (i.e., tree) index contains all wanted attributes as prefix of search key, can do even better:
  - Retrieve data entries in order (index-only scan), discard unwanted fields, compare adjacent tuples to check for duplicates.