

Query Optimization

- Search Space Illustration
- Dynamic Programming
- Example: Four-Way Join Algorithm
- Discussion
- Left/Right-Deep vs. Bushy
- Greedy join enumeration

Chapter 10

Query Optimization


Exploring the Search Space of Alternative Query Plans

Architecture and Implementation of Database Systems

Winter 2010/11




Finding the “Best” Query Plan



Throttle or break?

SELECT ...
FROM ...
WHERE ...




Query Optimization

- Search Space Illustration
- Dynamic Programming
- Example: Four-Way Join Algorithm
- Discussion
- Left/Right-Deep vs. Bushy
- Greedy join enumeration


- We already saw that there may be more than one way to answer a given query.
 - Which one of the join operators should we pick? With which parameters (block size, buffer allocation, ...)?
- The task of **finding the best execution plan** is, in fact, the “holy grail” of any database implementation.

Plan Generation Process

Query compilation



- **Parser:** syntactical/semantical analysis
- **Rewriting: heuristic** optimizations independent of the current database state (table sizes, availability of indexes, etc.). For example:
 - Apply predicates early
 - Avoid unnecessary duplicate elimination
- **Optimizer:** optimizations that rely on a **cost model** and information about the current database state
- The resulting **plan** is then evaluated by the system's **execution engine**.





Impact on Performance


Finding the right plan can dramatically impact performance.

Sample query over TPC-H tables

```
1 SELECT L.L_PARTKEY, L.L_QUANTITY, L.L_EXTENDEDPRICE
2 FROM LINEITEM L, ORDERS O, CUSTOMER C
3 WHERE L.L_ORDERKEY = O.O_ORDERKEY
4 AND O.O_CUSTKEY = C.C_CUSTKEY
5 AND C.C_NAME = 'IBM Corp.'
```



- In terms of execution times, these differences can easily mean “seconds versus days.”




- Search Space Illustration
- Dynamic Programming
- Example: Four-Way Join
- Algorithm
- Discussion
- Left/Right-Deep vs. Bushy
- Greedy join enumeration

The SQL Parser


- Besides some analyses regarding the syntactical and semantical correctness of the input query, the parser creates an **internal representation** of the input query.
- This representation still resembles the original query:
 - Each SELECT-FROM-WHERE clause is translated into a **query block**.

Deriving a query block from a SQL SFW block

```
SELECT proj-list
FROM  $R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n$ 
WHERE predicate-list
GROUP BY groupby-list
HAVING having-list
```



- Each R_i can be a base relation or another query block.



Finding the “Best” Execution Plan

The parser output is fed into a **rewrite engine** which, again, yields a tree of query blocks.



It is then the **optimizer’s** task to come up with the optimal **execution plan** for the given query.

Essentially, the optimizer

- 1 **enumerates** all possible execution plans, (if this yields too many plans, at least enumerate the “promising” plan candidates)
- 2 determines the **quality** (cost) of each plan, then
- 3 **chooses** the best one as the final execution plan.

Before we can do so, we need to answer the question

- What is a “good” execution plan at all?




Cost Metrics

Database systems judge the quality of an execution plan based on a number of **cost factors**, *e.g.*,

- the number of **disk I/Os** required to evaluate the plan,
- the plan's **CPU cost**,
- the overall **response time** observable by the database client as well as the total **execution time**.

A cost-based optimizer tries to **anticipate** these costs and find the cheapest plan before actually running it.


- All of the above factors depend on one critical piece of information: the **size of (intermediate) query results**.
- Database systems, therefore, spend considerable effort into accurate **result size estimates**.



Result Size Estimation

Consider a query block corresponding to a simple SFW query Q .


SFW query block



We can estimate the result size of Q based on

- the size of the input tables, $|R_1|, \dots, |R_n|$, and
- the **selectivity** $sel(p)$ of the predicate *predicate-list*:

$$|Q| \approx |R_1| \cdot |R_2| \cdot \dots \cdot |R_n| \cdot sel(predicate-list) .$$





Join Optimization


- We've now translated the query into a graph of **query blocks**.
 - Query blocks essentially are a **multi-way** Cartesian product with a number of selection predicates on top.
- We can estimate the **cost** of a given **execution plan**.
 - Use result size estimates in combination with the cost for individual join algorithms discussed in previous chapters.

We are now ready to **enumerate** all possible execution plans, *i.e.*, all possible **2-way** join combinations for each query block.


Ways of building a 3-way join from two 2-way joins



How Many Such Combinations Are There?



- A join over $n + 1$ relations R_1, \dots, R_{n+1} requires n **binary joins**.
- Its **root-level operator** joins sub-plans of k and $n - k - 1$ join operators ($0 \leq k \leq n - 1$):



- Let C_i be the **number of possibilities** to construct a binary tree of i inner nodes (join operators):

$$C_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} C_k \cdot C_{n-k-1} \cdot$$

Catalan Numbers

This recurrence relation is satisfied by **Catalan numbers**:


$$C_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} C_k \cdot C_{n-k-1} = \frac{(2n)!}{(n+1)!n!} ,$$

describing the number of ordered binary trees with $n + 1$ leaves.

For **each** of these trees, we can **permute** the input relations (why?) R_1, \dots, R_{n+1} , leading to:

Number of possible join trees for an $(n + 1)$ -way relational join

$$\frac{(2n)!}{(n+1)!n!} \cdot (n+1)! = \frac{(2n)!}{n!}$$



- Search Space Illustration
- Dynamic Programming
- Example: Four-Way Join Algorithm
- Discussion
- Left/Right-Deep vs. Bushy
- Greedy join enumeration


Search Space

The resulting search space is **enormous**:

Possible bushy join trees joining n relations

number of relations n	C_{n-1}	join trees
2	1	2
3	2	12
4	5	120
5	14	1,680
6	42	30,240
7	132	665,280
8	429	17,297,280
10	4,862	17,643,225,600

- And we haven't yet even considered the use of k **different join algorithms** (yielding another factor of $k^{(n-1)}$)!



Dynamic Programming


The traditional approach to master this search space is the use of **dynamic programming**.

Idea:

- Find the cheapest plan for an n -way join in n **passes**.
- In each pass k , find the best plans for all k -relation **sub-queries**.
- **Construct** the plans in pass k from best i -relation and $(k - i)$ -relation sub-plans found in **earlier passes** ($1 \leq i < k$).

Assumption:

- To find the optimal **global plan**, it is sufficient to only consider the optimal plans of its **sub-queries** ("Principle of optimality").



Dynamic Programming

Example (Four-way join of tables $R_1, \dots, 4$)

Pass 1 (best 1-relation plans)

Find the best **access path** to each of the R_i individually (considers index scans, full table scans).

Pass 2 (best 2-relation plans)

For each **pair** of tables R_i and R_j , determine the best order to join R_i and R_j (use $R_i \bowtie R_j$ or $R_j \bowtie R_i$?):

$$\text{optPlan}(\{R_i, R_j\}) \leftarrow \text{best of } R_i \bowtie R_j \text{ and } R_j \bowtie R_i \text{ .}$$


→ 12 plans to consider.


Pass 3 (best 3-relation plans)

For each **triple** of tables R_i , R_j , and R_k , determine the best three-table join plan, using sub-plans obtained so far:

$$\text{optPlan}(\{R_i, R_j, R_k\}) \leftarrow \text{best of } R_i \bowtie \text{optPlan}(\{R_j, R_k\}), \\ \text{optPlan}(\{R_j, R_k\}) \bowtie R_i, R_j \bowtie \text{optPlan}(\{R_i, R_k\}), \dots \text{ .}$$

→ 24 plans to consider.





Example (Four-way join of tables R_1, \dots, R_4 (cont'd))

Pass 4 (best 4-relation plan)


For each set of **four** tables $R_i, R_j, R_k,$ and R_l , determine the best four-table join plan, using sub-plans obtained so far:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{optPlan}(\{R_i, R_j, R_k, R_l\}) \leftarrow & \text{best of } R_i \bowtie \text{optPlan}(\{R_j, R_k, R_l\}), \\ & \text{optPlan}(\{R_j, R_k, R_l\}) \bowtie R_i, \quad R_j \bowtie \text{optPlan}(\{R_i, R_k, R_l\}), \dots, \\ & \text{optPlan}(\{R_i, R_j\}) \bowtie \text{optPlan}(\{R_k, R_l\}), \dots \end{aligned}$$


→ 14 plans to consider.

- Overall, we looked at only **50** (sub-)plans (instead of the possible 120 four-way join plans; ↗ slide 12).
- All decisions required the evaluation of **simple** sub-plans only (**no need to re-evaluate** $\text{optPlan}(\cdot)$ for already known relation combinations \Rightarrow use lookup table).

Sharing Under the Optimality Principle



Sharing optimal sub-plans



Drawing by Guido Moerkotte, U Mannheim

Query Optimization

Search Space Illustration

Dynamic Programming

Example: Four-Way Join


Algorithm

Discussion

Left/Right-Deep vs. Bushy

Greedy join enumeration

Dynamic Programming Algorithm



Query Optimization

Search Space Illustration

Dynamic Programming

Example: Four-Way Join

Algorithm

Discussion

Left/Right-Deep vs. Bushy


Greedy join enumeration

Find optimal n -way bushy join tree via dynamic programming

```
1 Function: find_join_tree_dp ( $q(R_1, \dots, R_n)$ )
2 for  $i = 1$  to  $n$  do
3    $optPlan(\{R_i\}) \leftarrow access\_plans(R_i)$  ;
4    $prune\_plans(optPlan(\{R_i\}))$  ;
5 for  $i = 2$  to  $n$  do
6   foreach  $S \subseteq \{R_1, \dots, R_n\}$  such that  $|S| = i$  do
7      $optPlan(S) \leftarrow \emptyset$  ;
8     foreach  $O \subset S$  with  $O \neq \emptyset$  do
9        $optPlan(S) \leftarrow optPlan(S) \cup$ 
10        possible_joins  $\left[ \begin{array}{c} \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \otimes \\ \text{optPlan}(O) \quad \text{optPlan}(S \setminus O) \end{array} \right]$  ;
11        $prune\_plans(optPlan(S))$  ;
12 return  $optPlan(\{R_1, \dots, R_n\})$  ;
```

- possible_joins $[R \bowtie S]$ enumerates the possible joins between R and S (nested loops join, merge join, etc.).
- prune_plans (set) discards all but the best plan from set.

Dynamic Programming—Discussion



Query Optimization

Search Space Illustration
Dynamic Programming
Example: Four-Way Join
Algorithm

Discussion

Left/Right-Deep vs. Bushy
Greedy join enumeration

- Enumerate all non-empty true subsets of S (using C):

```
1   O = S & -S;  
2   do {  
3       /* perform operation on O */  
4       O = S & (O - S);  
5   } while (O != S);
```

- `find_join_tree_dp()` draws its advantage from **filtering** plan candidates early in the process.
 - In our example on slide 14, pruning in Pass 2 reduced the search space by a factor of 2, and another factor of 6 in Pass 3.
- Some **heuristics** can be used to prune even more plans:
 - Try to avoid **Cartesian products**.
 - Produce **left-deep plans** only (see next slides).
- Such heuristics can be used as a handle to balance plan quality and optimizer runtime.


DB2® Control optimizer investment

```
1   SET CURRENT QUERY OPTIMIZATION = n
```


Left/Right-Deep vs. Bushy Join Trees

The algorithm on slide 17 explores all possible shapes a join tree could take:


Join tree shapes



left-deep



bushy
(everything else)




right-deep

Actual systems often prefer **left-deep** join trees.¹



- The **inner** (rhs) relation always is a **base relation**.
- Allows the use of **index nested loops join**.
- Easier to implement in a **pipelined** fashion.

¹The seminal **System R** prototype, *e.g.*, considered only left-deep plans.



Join Order Makes a Difference

- XPath location step evaluation over relationally encoded XML data.²
- n -way self-join with a range predicate.



² ↗ Grust *et al.* Accelerating XPath Evaluation in Any RDBMS. *TODS 2004*.
<http://www.pathfinder-xquery.org/>

Joining Many Relations

Dynamic programming still has **exponential** resource requirements:


(↗ K. Ono, G.M. Lohman, *Measuring the Complexity of Join Enumeration in Query Optimization*, VLDB 1990)


- time complexity: $\mathcal{O}(3^n)$
- space complexity: $\mathcal{O}(2^n)$

This may still be too expensive

- for joins involving many relations (~ 10 – 20 and more),
- for simple queries over well-indexed data (where the right plan choice should be easy to make).

The **greedy join enumeration** algorithm jumps into this gap.






Query Optimization

- Search Space Illustration
- Dynamic Programming
- Example: Four-Way Join
- Algorithm
- Discussion
- Left/Right-Deep vs. Bushy
- Greedy join enumeration

Greedy join enumeration for n -way join

```
1 Function: find_join_tree_greedy ( $q(R_1, \dots, R_n)$ )
2  $worklist \leftarrow \emptyset$  ;
3 for  $i = 1$  to  $n$  do
4    $worklist \leftarrow worklist \cup \text{best\_access\_plan}(R_i)$  ;
5 for  $i = n$  downto 2 do
6   //  $worklist = \{P_1, \dots, P_i\}$ 
7   find  $P_j, P_k \in worklist$  and  $\bowtie \dots$  such that  $\text{cost}(P_j \bowtie \dots P_k)$  is minimal ;
8    $worklist \leftarrow worklist \setminus \{P_j, P_k\} \cup \{(P_j \bowtie \dots P_k)\}$  ;
9 //  $worklist = \{P_1\}$ 
10 return single plan left in  $worklist$  ;
```

- In each iteration, choose the **cheapest** join that can be made over the remaining sub-plans at that time (this is the “greedy” part).
- Observe that `find_join_tree_greedy()` operates similar to finding the optimum binary tree for **Huffman coding**.



Greedy join enumeration:

- The greedy algorithm has $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ time complexity:
 - The loop has $\mathcal{O}(n)$ iterations.
 - Each iteration looks at all remaining pairs of plans in *worklist*. An $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ task.

Other join enumeration techniques:

- **Randomized algorithms:** randomly rewrite the join tree one rewrite at a time; use **hill-climbing** or **simulated annealing** strategy to find optimal plan.
- **Genetic algorithms:** explore plan space by **combining** plans (“creating offspring”) and **altering** some plans randomly (“mutations”).

Physical Plan Properties

Consider the simple equi-join query

Join query over TPC-H tables

```
1 SELECT O.O_ORDERKEY
2    FROM ORDERS O, LINEITEM L
3    WHERE O.O_ORDERKEY = L.L_ORDERKEY
```

where table ORDERS is indexed with a **clustered index** OK_IDX on column O_ORDERKEY.


Possible table access plans (1-relation plans) are:

ORDERS


- **full table scan:** estimated I/Os: N_{ORDERS}
- **index scan:** estimated I/Os: $N_{\text{OK_IDX}} + N_{\text{ORDERS}}$.

LINEITEM

- **full table scan:** estimated I/Os: N_{LINEITEM} .



Physical Plan Properties



Query Optimization

- Search Space Illustration
- Dynamic Programming
- Example: Four-Way Join Algorithm
- Discussion
- Left/Right-Deep vs. Bushy
- Greedy join enumeration

- Since the **full table scan** is the cheapest access method for both tables, our join algorithms will select them as the best 1-relation plans in Pass 1.³

To **join** the two scan outputs, we now have the choices

- **nested loops join**,
- **hash join**, or
- **sort** both inputs, then use **merge join**.

Hash join or sort-merge join are probably the preferable candidates, incurring a cost of $\approx 2 \cdot (N_{\text{ORDERS}} + N_{\text{LINEITEM}})$.

⇒ **Overall cost:**

$$N_{\text{ORDERS}} + N_{\text{LINEITEM}} + 2 \cdot (N_{\text{ORDERS}} + N_{\text{LINEITEM}}).$$

³Dynamic programming and the greedy algorithm happen to do the same in this example.


Physical Plan Properties—A Better Plan

It is easy to see, however, that there is a better way to evaluate the query:

- 1 Use an **index scan** to access ORDERS. This guarantees that the scan output is already **in O_ORDERKEY order**.
- 2 Then only **sort** LINEITEM and
- 3 join using **merge join**.


$$\Rightarrow \text{Overall cost: } \underbrace{(N_{OK_IDX} + N_{ORDERS})}_{1} + \underbrace{2 \cdot N_{LINEITEM}}_{2/3}$$

Although more expensive as a standalone table access plan, the **use of the index (order enforcement) pays off later on** in the overall plan.




Physical Plan Properties: Interesting Orders

- The advantage of the index-based access to ORDERS is that it provides beneficial **physical properties**.
 - Optimizers, therefore, keep track of such properties by **annotating** candidate plans.
 - System R introduced the concept of **interesting orders**, determined by
 - ORDER BY or GROUP BY clauses in the input query, or
 - join attributes of subsequent joins (\rightsquigarrow merge join).
- ⇒ In `prune_plans()`, retain
- the cheapest “unordered” plan **and**
 - the cheapest plan for each interesting order.



Query Rewriting

- Join optimization essentially takes a set of relations and a set of join predicates to find the best join order.
- By **rewriting** query graphs beforehand, we can improve the effectiveness of this procedure.
- The **query rewriter** applies **heuristic rules**, without looking into the actual database state (no information about cardinalities, indexes, etc.).
In particular, the optimizer
 - **relocates predicates** (predicate pushdown),
 - **rewrites predicates**, and
 - **unnests queries**.



Predicate Simplification

Rewrite

Example (Query against TPC-H table)

```
1 SELECT *  
2 FROM LINEITEM L  
3 WHERE L.L_TAX * 100 < 5
```


into

Example (Query after predicate simplification)

```
1 SELECT *  
2 FROM LINEITEM L  
3 WHERE L.L_TAX < 0.05
```

 **In which sense is the rewritten predicate simpler?**

Why would a RDBMS query optimizer rewrite the selection predicate as shown above?



Introducing Additional Join Predicates

Implicit join predicates as in

Implicit join predicate through transitivity

```
1 SELECT *
2   FROM A, B, C
3   WHERE A.a = B.b AND B.b = C.c
```

can be turned into explicit ones:


Explicit join predicate

```
1 SELECT *
2   FROM A, B, C
3   WHERE A.a = B.b AND B.b = C.c
4   AND A.a = C.c
```


This makes the following join tree feasible:

$$(A \bowtie C) \bowtie B .$$

(Note: $(A \bowtie C)$ would have been a Cartesian product before.)



Nested Queries and Correlation



SQL provides a number of ways to write **nested queries**.

- **Uncorrelated** sub-query:

No free variables in subquery

```
1 SELECT *
2   FROM ORDERS O
3   WHERE O_CUSTKEY IN (SELECT C_CUSTKEY
4                       FROM CUSTOMER
5                       WHERE C_NAME = 'IBM_Corp.')
```

- **Correlated** sub-query:

Row variable O occurs free in subquery

```
1 SELECT *
2   FROM ORDERS O
3   WHERE O.O_CUSTKEY IN
4         (SELECT C.C_CUSTKEY
5          FROM CUSTOMER C
6          WHERE C.C_ACCTBAL < O.O_TOTALPRICE)
```



Query Unnesting

- Taking query nesting literally might be **expensive**.
 - An uncorrelated query, *e.g.*, need not be re-evaluated for every tuple in the outer query.
- Oftentimes, sub-queries are only used as a syntactical way to express a **join** (or a semi-join).
- The query rewriter tries to detect such situations and **make the join explicit**.
- This way, the sub-query can become part of the regular **join order optimization**.

Turning correlation into joins

Reformulate the correlated query of slide 32 (use SQL syntax or relational algebra) to remove the correlation (and introduce a join).

↗ Won Kim. On Optimizing an SQL-like Nested Query. *ACM TODS*, vol. 7, no. 3, September 1982.



Summary

Query Parser

Translates input query into (SFW-like) **query blocks**.


Rewriter

Logical (database state-independent) optimizations; predicate simplification; query unnesting.


(Join) Optimization

Find “best” query execution plan based on a **cost model** (considering I/O cost, CPU cost, ...); data statistics (histograms); dynamic programming, greedy join enumeration; physical plan properties (interesting orders).


Database optimizers still are true pieces of art...



"Picasso" Plan Diagrams



Generated by "Picasso": SQL join query with filters of parameterizable selectivities (0...100) against both join inputs




Query Optimization



- Search Space Illustration
- Dynamic Programming
- Example: Four-Way Join Algorithm
- Discussion
- Left/Right-Deep vs. Bushy
- Greedy join enumeration

↗ Naveen Reddy and Jayant Haritsa. Analyzing Plan Diagrams of Database Query Optimizers. *VLDB 2005*.

"Picasso" Plan Diagrams



Generated by "Picasso": SQL join query with filters of parameterizable selectivities (0...100) against both join inputs





Query Optimization

- Search Space Illustration
- Dynamic Programming
- Example: Four-Way Join
- Algorithm
- Discussion
- Left/Right-Deep vs. Bushy
- Greedy join enumeration

↗ Naveen Reddy and Jayant Haritsa. Analyzing Plan Diagrams of Database Query Optimizers. *VLDB 2005*.


"Picasso" Plan Diagrams

Generated by "Picasso": each distinct color represent a distinct plan considered by the DBMS




- Search Space Illustration
- Dynamic Programming
- Example: Four-Way Join Algorithm
- Discussion
- Left/Right-Deep vs. Bushy
- Greedy join enumeration

“Picasso” Plan Diagrams



Generated by “Picasso”: each distinct color represent a distinct plan considered by the DBMS



Query Optimization

- Search Space Illustration
- Dynamic Programming
- Example: Four-Way Join Algorithm
- Discussion
- Left/Right-Deep vs. Bushy
- Greedy join enumeration

Download Picasso at

<http://dsl.serc.iisc.ernet.in/projects/PICASSO/index.html>.