Indexing

Introduction to Databases
CompSci 316 Fall 2017
Announcements (Thu., Nov. 9)

- Project milestone #2 due today
- Homework #3 sample solution to be posted on Sakai by this weekend
- Homework #4 to be assigned next Tuesday
What are indexes for?

• Given a value, locate the record(s) with this value
  
  SELECT * FROM R WHERE A = value;
  SELECT * FROM R, S WHERE R.A = S.B;

• Find data by other search criteria, e.g.
  
  • Range search
    
    SELECT * FROM R WHERE A > value;
  
  • Keyword search

Focus of this lecture
Dense and sparse indexes

- **Dense**: one index entry for each search key value
  - One entry may “point” to multiple records (e.g., two users named Jessica)
- **Sparse**: one index entry for each block
  - Records must be *clustered* according to the search key

```
Sparse index on uid
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>value</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>score</th>
<th>dist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Milhouse</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Bart</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679</td>
<td>Sherri</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>697</td>
<td>Terri</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>857</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>912</td>
<td>Windel</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>997</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```
Dense index on name
```
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Dense versus sparse indexes

• Index size
  • Sparse index is smaller

• Requirement on records
  • Records must be clustered for sparse index

• Lookup
  • Sparse index is smaller and may fit in memory
  • Dense index can directly tell if a record exists

• Update
  • Easier for sparse index
Primary and secondary indexes

• Primary index
  • Created for the primary key of a table
  • Records are usually clustered by the primary key
  • Can be sparse

• Secondary index
  • Usually dense

• SQL
  • PRIMARY KEY declaration automatically creates a primary index, UNIQUE key automatically creates a secondary index
  • Additional secondary index can be created on non-key attribute(s):
    CREATE INDEX UserPopIndex ON User(pop);
ISAM

• What if an index is still too big?
  • Put a another (sparse) index on top of that!

ISAM (Index Sequential Access Method), more or less

Example: look up 197
Updates with ISAM

Example: insert 107
Example: delete 129

- Worst case:
B⁺-tree

- A hierarchy of nodes with intervals
- Balanced (more or less): good performance guarantee
- Disk-based: one node per block; large fan-out

Max fan-out: 4
Sample $B^+$-tree nodes

Max fan-out: 4

Non-leaf

120
150
180

to keys
$t_0 \leq k$

Leaf

120
130

to next leaf node in sequence
to records with these $k$ values;
or, store records directly in leaves

to keys
$100 \leq k < 120$
to keys
$120 \leq k < 150$
to keys
$150 \leq k < 180$
to keys
$180 \leq k$
B\(^{+}\)-tree balancing properties

- Height constraint: all leaves at the same lowest level
- Fan-out constraint: all nodes at least half full (except root)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Max # pointers</th>
<th>Max # keys</th>
<th>Min # active pointers</th>
<th>Min # keys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-leaf</td>
<td>( f )</td>
<td>( f - 1 )</td>
<td>([f/2])</td>
<td>([f/2]) - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root</td>
<td>( f )</td>
<td>( f - 1 )</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaf</td>
<td>( f )</td>
<td>( f - 1 )</td>
<td>([f/2])</td>
<td>([f/2])</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lookups

- SELECT * FROM R WHERE $k = 179$;
- SELECT * FROM R WHERE $k = 32$;
Range query

• \texttt{SELECT * FROM R WHERE \( k > 32 \) AND \( k < 179 \);}

Max fan-out: 4

And follow next-leaf pointers until you hit upper bound
Insertion

- Insert a record with search key value 32

Look up where the inserted key should go...

And insert it right there
Another insertion example

• Insert a record with search key value 152

Max fan-out: 4

Oops, node is already full!
Node splitting

Max fan-out: 4

Oops, that node becomes full!

Need to add to parent node a pointer to the newly created node.
More node splitting

- In the worst case, node splitting can “propagate” all the way up to the root of the tree (not illustrated here)
  - Splitting the root introduces a new root of fan-out 2 and causes the tree to grow “up” by one level

Max fan-out: 4

Need to add to parent node a pointer to the newly created node
Deletion

• Delete a record with search key value 130

Look up the key to be deleted...

If a sibling has more than enough keys, steal one!

And delete it

Oops, node is too empty!
Stealing from a sibling

Remember to fix the key in the least common ancestor of the affected nodes.

Max fan-out: 4
Another deletion example

- Delete a record with search key value 179

```
100
```

Max fan-out: 4

```
120
156
180
```

```
100
101
110
```

```
120
150
```

```
156
```

```
180
200
```

Cannot steal from siblings

Then coalesce (merge) with a sibling!
Coalescing

- Deletion can “propagate” all the way up to the root of the tree (not illustrated here)
  - When the root becomes empty, the tree “shrinks” by one level

Remember to delete the appropriate key from parent

Max fan-out: 4
Performance analysis

• How many I/O’s are required for each operation?
  • $h$, the height of the tree (more or less)
  • Plus one or two to manipulate actual records
  • Plus $O(h)$ for reorganization (rare if $f$ is large)
  • Minus one if we cache the root in memory

• How big is $h$?
  • Roughly $\log_{\text{fanout}} N$, where $N$ is the number of records
  • $B^+$-tree properties guarantee that fan-out is least $f/2$ for all non-root nodes
  • Fan-out is typically large (in hundreds)—many keys and pointers can fit into one block
  • A 4-level $B^+$-tree is enough for “typical” tables
B$^+$-tree in practice

• Complex reorganization for deletion often is not implemented (e.g., Oracle)
  • Leave nodes less than half full and periodically reorganize

• Most commercial DBMS use B$^+$-tree instead of hashing-based indexes because B$^+$-tree handles range queries
The Halloween Problem

• Story from the early days of System R...

\[
\text{UPDATE Payroll}
\]
\[
\text{SET salary = salary} \times 1.1
\]
\[
\text{WHERE salary} \geq \text{100000};
\]
  • There is a B\textsuperscript{+}-tree index on \textit{Payroll(salary)}
  • The update never stopped (why?)

• Solutions?
B⁺-tree versus ISAM

• ISAM is more static; B⁺-tree is more dynamic
• ISAM can be more compact (at least initially)
  • Fewer levels and I/O’s than B⁺-tree
• Overtime, ISAM may not be balanced
  • Cannot provide guaranteed performance as B⁺-tree does
B⁺-tree versus B-tree

• B-tree: why not store records (or record pointers) in non-leaf nodes?
  • These records can be accessed with fewer I/O’s

• Problems?
Beyond ISAM, B-, and B⁺-trees

• Other tree-based indexes: R-trees and variants, GiST, etc.
  • How about binary tree?

• Hashing-based indexes: extensible hashing, linear hashing, etc.

• Text indexes: inverted-list index, suffix arrays, etc.

• Other tricks: bitmap index, bit-sliced index, etc.