

Query Optimization

Introduction to Databases

CompSci 316 Fall 2017




DUKE
COMPUTER SCIENCE

Announcements (Tue., Nov. 28)

- Homework #4 next Tuesday (12/05)
- Project milestone #2 feedback emailed
- Project demos 12/7-12/15
 - Sign-ups to begin next week


Query optimization

- One logical plan → “best” physical plan
- Questions
 - How to enumerate possible plans
 - How to estimate costs
 - How to pick the “best” one
- Often the goal is not getting the optimum plan, but instead avoiding the horrible ones



Plan enumeration in relational algebra


- Apply relational algebra equivalences
- ☞ Join reordering: \times and \bowtie are associative and commutative (except column ordering, but that is unimportant)



More relational algebra equivalences

- Convert σ_p - \times to/from \bowtie_p : $\sigma_p(R \times S) = R \bowtie_p S$
- Merge/split σ 's: $\sigma_{p_1}(\sigma_{p_2} R) = \sigma_{p_1 \wedge p_2} R$
- Merge/split π 's: $\pi_{L_1}(\pi_{L_2} R) = \pi_{L_1} R$, where $L_1 \subseteq L_2$
- Push down/pull up σ :
 $\sigma_{p \wedge p_r \wedge p_s}(R \bowtie_{p'} S) = (\sigma_{p_r} R) \bowtie_{p \wedge p'} (\sigma_{p_s} S)$, where
 - p_r is a predicate involving only R columns
 - p_s is a predicate involving only S columns
 - p and p' are predicates involving both R and S columns
- Push down π : $\pi_L(\sigma_p R) = \pi_L(\sigma_p(\pi_{L L'} R))$, where
 - L' is the set of columns referenced by p that are not in L
- Many more (seemingly trivial) equivalences...
 - Can be systematically used to transform a plan to new ones

Relational query rewrite example



Heuristics-based query optimization

- Start with a logical plan
- Push selections/projections down as much as possible
 - Why?
 - Why not?
- Join smaller relations first, and avoid cross product
 - Why?
 - Why not?
- Convert the transformed logical plan to a physical plan (by choosing appropriate physical operators)

SQL query rewrite

- More complicated—subqueries and views divide a query into nested “blocks”
 - Processing each block separately forces particular join methods and join order
 - Even if the plan is optimal for each block, it may not be optimal for the entire query
- Unnest query: convert subqueries/views to joins
- ☞ We can just deal with select-project-join queries
 - Where the clean rules of relational algebra apply

SQL query rewrite example

- `SELECT name
FROM User
WHERE uid = ANY (SELECT uid FROM Member);`
- `SELECT name
FROM User, Member
WHERE User.uid = Member.uid;`
 - Wrong
- `SELECT name
FROM (SELECT DISTINCT User.uid, name
FROM User, Member
WHERE User.uid = Member.uid);`
 - Right—assuming `User.uid` is a key

Dealing with correlated subqueries

- ```
SELECT gid FROM Group
WHERE name LIKE 'Springfield%'
AND min_size > (SELECT COUNT(*) FROM Member
 WHERE Member.gid = Group.gid);
```
- ```
SELECT gid
FROM Group, (SELECT gid, COUNT(*) AS cnt
             FROM Member GROUP BY gid) t
WHERE t.gid = Group.gid AND min_size > t.cnt
AND name LIKE 'Springfield%';
```

“Magic” decorrelation


- `SELECT gid FROM Group`
`WHERE name LIKE 'Springfield%'`
`AND min_size > (SELECT COUNT(*) FROM Member`
`WHERE Member.gid = Group.gid);`
- `WITH Supp_Group AS` Process the outer query without the subquery
`(SELECT * FROM Group WHERE name LIKE 'Springfield%'),`
`Magic AS` Collect bindings
`(SELECT DISTINCT gid FROM Supp_Group),`
`DS AS` Evaluate the subquery with bindings
`((SELECT Group.gid, COUNT(*) AS cnt`
`FROM Magic, Member WHERE Magic.gid = Member.gid`
`GROUP BY Member.gid) UNION`
`(SELECT gid, 0 AS cnt`
`FROM Magic WHERE gid NOT IN (SELECT gid FROM Member)))`
`SELECT Supp_Group.gid FROM Supp_Group, DS` Finally, refine
`WHERE Supp_Group.gid = DS.gid` the outer query
`AND min_size > DS.cnt;`

Heuristics- vs. cost-based optimization

- **Heuristics-based optimization**
 - Apply heuristics to rewrite plans into cheaper ones
- **Cost-based optimization**
 - **Rewrite** logical plan to combine “blocks” as much as possible
 - **Optimize** query block by block
 - Enumerate logical plans (already covered)
 - Estimate the cost of plans
 - Pick a plan with acceptable cost
 - Focus: select-project-join blocks

Cost estimation

Physical plan example:



- We have: cost estimation for each operator
 - Example: SORT(*gid*) takes $O(B(\text{input}) \times \log_M B(\text{input}))$
 - But what is $B(\text{input})$?
- We need: **size of intermediate results**

Cardinality estimation



Selections with equality predicates

- $Q: \sigma_{A=v}R$
- Suppose the following information is available
 - Size of R : $|R|$
 - Number of distinct A values in R : $|\pi_A R|$
- Assumptions
 - Values of A are uniformly distributed in R
 - Values of v in Q are uniformly distributed over all $R.A$ values
- $|Q| \approx \frac{|R|}{|\pi_A R|}$
 - Selectivity factor of $(A = v)$ is $\frac{1}{|\pi_A R|}$

Conjunctive predicates

- $Q: \sigma_{A=u} \wedge B=v R$
- Additional assumptions
 - $(A = u)$ and $(B = v)$ are independent
 - Counterexample: major and advisor
 - No “over”-selection
 - Counterexample: A is the key
- $|Q| \approx \frac{|R|}{|\pi_A R| \cdot |\pi_B R|}$
 - Reduce total size by all selectivity factors

Negated and disjunctive predicates

- $Q: \sigma_{A \neq v} R$
 - $|Q| \approx |R| \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{|\pi_{AR}|}\right)$
 - Selectivity factor of $\neg p$ is $(1 - \text{selectivity factor of } p)$
- $Q: \sigma_{A=u \vee B=v} R$
 - $|Q| \approx |R| \cdot \left(\frac{1}{|\pi_{AR}|} + \frac{1}{|\pi_{BR}|}\right)?$
 - No!
 - $|Q| \approx |R| \cdot \left(\frac{1}{|\pi_{AR}|} + \frac{1}{|\pi_{BR}|} - \frac{1}{|\pi_{AR}||\pi_{BR}|}\right)$
 - Inclusion-exclusion principle

Range predicates

- $Q: \sigma_{A > v} R$
- Not enough information!
 - Just pick, say, $|Q| \approx |R| \cdot 1/3$
- With more information
 - Largest R.A value: $\text{high}(R.A)$
 - Smallest R.A value: $\text{low}(R.A)$
 - $|Q| \approx |R| \cdot \frac{\text{high}(R.A) - v}{\text{high}(R.A) - \text{low}(R.A)}$
 - In practice: sometimes the **second** highest and lowest are used instead

Two-way equi-join

- $Q: R(A, B) \bowtie S(A, C)$
- Assumption: **containment of value sets**
 - Every tuple in the “smaller” relation (one with fewer distinct values for the join attribute) joins with some tuple in the other relation
 - That is, if $|\pi_A R| \leq |\pi_A S|$ then $\pi_A R \subseteq \pi_A S$
 - Certainly not true in general
 - But holds in the common case of foreign key joins
- $|Q| \approx \frac{|R| \cdot |S|}{\max(|\pi_A R|, |\pi_A S|)}$
 - Selectivity factor of $R.A = S.A$ is $1 / \max(|\pi_A R|, |\pi_A S|)$

Multiway equi-join

- $Q: R(A, B) \bowtie S(B, C) \bowtie T(C, D)$
- What is the number of distinct C values in the join of R and S ?
- Assumption: **preservation of value sets**
 - A non-join attribute does not lose values from its set of possible values
 - That is, if A is in R but not S , then $\pi_A(R \bowtie S) = \pi_A R$
 - Certainly not true in general
 - But holds in the common case of foreign key joins (for value sets from the referencing table)

Multiway equi-join (cont'd)

- $Q: R(A, B) \bowtie S(B, C) \bowtie T(C, D)$
- Start with the product of relation sizes
 - $|R| \cdot |S| \cdot |T|$
- Reduce the total size by the selectivity factor of each join predicate
 - $R.B = S.B: \frac{1}{\max(|\pi_B R|, |\pi_B S|)}$
 - $S.C = T.C: \frac{1}{\max(|\pi_C S|, |\pi_C T|)}$
 - $|Q| \approx \frac{|R| \cdot |S| \cdot |T|}{\max(|\pi_B R|, |\pi_B S|) \cdot \max(|\pi_C S|, |\pi_C T|)}$

Cost estimation: summary

- Using similar ideas, we can estimate the size of projection, duplicate elimination, union, difference, aggregation (with grouping)
- Lots of assumptions and very rough estimation
 - Accurate estimate is not needed
 - Maybe okay if we overestimate or underestimate consistently
 - May lead to very nasty optimizer “hints”


```
SELECT * FROM User WHERE pop > 0.9;  
SELECT * FROM User WHERE pop > 0.9 AND pop > 0.9;
```
- Not covered: better estimation using **histograms**

Search strategy




Search space

- Huge!
- “Bushy” plan example:



- Just considering different join orders, there are $\frac{(2n-2)!}{(n-1)!}$ bushy plans for $R_1 \bowtie \dots \bowtie R_n$
 - 30240 for $n = 6$
- And there are more if we consider:
 - Multiway joins
 - Different join methods
 - Placement of selection and projection operators


Left-deep plans



- Heuristic: consider only “left-deep” plans, in which only the left child can be a join
 - Tend to be better than plans of other shapes, because many join algorithms scan inner (right) relation multiple times—you will not want it to be a complex subtree
- How many left-deep plans are there for $R_1 \bowtie \dots \bowtie R_n$?

A greedy algorithm

- S_1, \dots, S_n
 - Say selections have been pushed down; i.e., $S_i = \sigma_p(R_i)$
- Start with the pair S_i, S_j with the smallest estimated size for $S_i \bowtie S_j$
- Repeat until no relation is left:
Pick S_k from the remaining relations such that the join of S_k and the current result yields an intermediate result of the smallest size



A dynamic programming approach

- Generate optimal plans **bottom-up**
 - Pass 1: Find the best single-table plans (for each table)
 - Pass 2: Find the best two-table plans (for each pair of tables) by combining best single-table plans
 - ...
 - Pass k : Find the best k -table plans (for each combination of k tables) by combining two smaller best plans found in previous passes
 - ...
- Rationale: Any subplan of an optimal plan must also be optimal (otherwise, just replace the subplan to get a better overall plan)

☞ Well, not quite...

The need for “interesting order”

- Example: $R(A, B) \bowtie S(A, C) \bowtie T(A, D)$
- Best plan for $R \bowtie S$: hash join (beats sort-merge join)
- Best overall plan: sort-merge join R and S , and then sort-merge join with T
 - Subplan of the optimal plan is not optimal!
- Why?
 - The result of the sort-merge join of R and S is sorted on A
 - This is an **interesting order** that can be exploited by later processing (e.g., join, dup elimination, GROUP BY, ORDER BY, etc.)!

Dealing with interesting orders

When picking the best plan

- Comparing their costs is not enough
 - Plans are not totally ordered by cost anymore
- Comparing interesting orders is also needed
 - Plans are now partially ordered
 - Plan X is better than plan Y if
 - Cost of X is lower than Y , and
 - Interesting orders produced by X “subsume” those produced by Y
- Need to keep a **set** of optimal plans for joining every combination of k tables
 - At most one for each interesting order

Summary

- Relational algebra equivalence
- SQL rewrite tricks
- Heuristics-based optimization
- Cost-based optimization
 - Need statistics to estimate sizes of intermediate results
 - Greedy approach
 - Dynamic programming approach