

Offset-value coding in database query processing

Goetz Graefe

Google Inc

Madison, Wisconsin, USA

GoetzG@Google.com

Thanh Do*

Celonis Inc

Madison, Wisconsin, USA

T.Do@Celonis.com

ABSTRACT

Recent work [9, 10] measures how much offset-value coding speeds up database query operations. It speeds up not only sorting but also duplicate removal, grouping (aggregation) in sorted streams, order-preserving exchange (shuffle), and merge join. It already saves thousands of CPUs in Google’s Napa and F1 Query systems, e.g., in grouping algorithms and in log-structured merge-forests.

In order to achieve the full benefits of interesting orderings, however, query execution algorithms must not only consume and exploit offset-value codes but also provide offset-value codes to the next operation in the pipeline. This short paper describes in detail how order-preserving algorithms (from filter to merge join and even shuffle) can compute offset-value codes for their outputs. These calculations are surprisingly simple and very efficient.

1 INTRODUCTION

Offset-value coding [7, 19] is useful not only in merge sort but also in merge join as well as in-stream duplicate removal, grouping, and aggregation [9]. External merge sort with tree-of-losers priority queues [13, 21] in run generation and merging requires only 1-2% more row comparison than the theoretical lower bound of $\log_2(N!) \approx N \log_2(N/e)$ for N rows and Euler constant $e \approx 2.718$. Offset-value coding limits the count of column value comparisons to $N \times K$ for N rows and K keys per row, deciding the remainder of the $\log_2(N!)$ row comparisons by offset-value codes alone. (Note that hash-based algorithms require $N \times K$ column value accesses for the hash function alone.) Another part of the recent work [9] focuses on offset-value codes in the output of merge steps (of external merge sort) and how tree-of-losers priority queues enable both efficient merge logic and offset-value codes in the merge output, e.g., for compression by prefix truncation.

Sort-based query processing is particularly efficient if multiple operations focus on the same column or set of columns, well known as “interesting orderings” [27] in relational query optimization. For the full benefit of interesting orderings and offset-value coding, order-preserving query execution algorithms must not only consume but also produce offset-value codes, to be consumed and exploited by the next operation in the pipeline. The obvious gaps in recent work are techniques that compute offset-value codes for the output of merge join and all other order-preserving algorithms in database query execution. The following discussion fills this gap for filter, project, segmented sorting, duplicate removal, grouping, merge join (inner, outer, and semi joins), nested-loops join (lookup join), and order-preserving exchange (merging shuffle).

Mainframe computers provide two complementary CPU instructions for sorting [19, 25]: The UPT “update tree” instruction implements leaf-to-root passes in tree-of-losers priority queues [13, 21]

and the CFC “compare and form codeword” instruction implements offset-value coding. Iyer [19] sums up that “Together, the UPT and CFC instructions do the bulk of sorting in IBM’s commercial DBMS DB2 running on z/Architecture processors.” The present paper aims to let offset-value codes do the bulk of matching in relational query processing, i.e., joining, grouping, and many related operations.

2 RELATED PRIOR WORK

The context of our work are Google’s Napa [1] and F1 Query [26, 28] systems. Napa is a data warehouse that maintains thousands of materialized views in log-structured merge-forests [24]. F1 Query is a federated query processing platform that executes SQL queries over tables in various Google storage systems such as Spanner [8], BigTable [6], and Napa. Both Napa and F1 Query employ sort order for efficient data access and data manipulation.

Pioneering work on sorting established the benefits of tree-of-losers priority queues and of offset-value coding, both for run generation and external merge steps [7, 13, 19, 21]. Pioneering work in the database field established the value of sort-based query execution, most notably merge join but also duplicate removal and grouping [4, 11, 27]. Surveys on database query evaluation [15, 16] cover sorting and offset-value coding but fail to recognize offset-value coding as a significant opportunity throughout sort-based query execution. Recent work on offset-value coding in database query execution [9, 10] fills much of that gap but fails to detail derivation of offset-value codes for output rows of in-stream duplicate removal and grouping, merge join and intersection, and other sort-based or order-preserving query execution algorithms. The present short paper provides this last missing piece.

3 BACKGROUND: OFFSET-VALUE CODING AND TREE-OF-LOSERS PRIORITY QUEUES

A tree-of-losers priority queue [13, 21], also known as a tournament tree, embeds a balanced binary tree in an array, with the tree’s unary root in array slot 0. It is efficient due to leaf-to-root passes with one comparison per tree level; root-to-leaf passes with two comparisons per tree level are not required. The principal rules are that (i) two candidate key values compete at each node in the tree and (ii) after a comparison of two candidates, the loser remains in the node and the winner becomes a candidate in the next tree level. Thus, a new overall winner reaches the root after $\log_2(M)$ comparisons in a priority queue with M entries. When merging runs, a fixed pair of runs competes at each leaf node. Run generation merges M sorted runs of a single row each. Run generation by replacement selection can try to extract longer sorted runs from the unsorted input: one additional comparison per input row doubles the expected run size to $2M$, cuts the run count in half, and saves one comparison per row in the merge process.

*Work done at Google Inc.

Table 1: Offset-value codes in a sorted file or stream.

Rows and their column values				Descending OVC			Ascending OVC		
				<i>offset</i>	<i>domain - value</i>	OVC	<i>arity - offset</i>	<i>value</i>	OVC
5	7	3	9	0	95	95	4	5	405
5	7	3	12	3	88	388	1	12	112
5	8	4	6	1	92	192	3	8	308
5	9	2	7	1	91	191	3	9	309
5	9	2	7	4	-	400	0	-	0
5	9	3	4	2	97	297	2	3	203
5	9	3	7	3	93	393	1	7	107

With only leaf-to-root passes, run generation and merging with tree-of-losers priority queues guarantee near-optimal comparison counts. With excellent expected and worst-case run-time complexity yet very limited implementation complexity, some hardware architectures support tree-of-losers priority queues, e.g., the UPT “update tree” instruction of IBM’s 370- and z-series mainframes [19, 25].

Offset-value coding [7] encodes one row’s key value relative to another key that is earlier in the sort sequence. Offset-value codes are set after comparisons, specifically in the loser of a comparison. The loser’s new offset is the position where the keys first differ, e.g., a column index; the value is the loser’s data value at that offset.

Table 1 illustrates the derivation of descending and ascending offset-value codes in a stream of rows in ascending sort order on all columns, with each key encoded relative to its predecessor. With four sort columns, the arity of the sort key is 4; the domain of each column is 1...99. Descending offset-value codes take the actual offset but the negative of the column value. Ascending offset-value codes take the negative offset but the actual column value. Table 1 ignores that small key domains permit encoding multiple key columns together. Some hardware architectures support offset-value coding for normalized keys using byte counts as offsets and bytes of the normalized key as values, e.g., IBM’s CFC “compare and form codeword” instruction [19, 25].

If two rows and their key values A and B are encoded relative to the same key C , and if the offsets of A and B differ, then the one with the higher offset is earlier in the sort sequence. Otherwise, if the two data values at that offset differ, then these data values decide the comparison. Otherwise, additional data values in A and B must be compared. With offsets and values combined as shown in Table 1, often a single integer comparison can sort two keys A and B encoded relative to the same key C .

If A sorts lower (earlier) than B , then B is the loser in this comparison and can be encoded relative to the winner A . If offset-value codes decided the comparison, the offset-value code of B relative to C is also the offset-value code of B relative to A . Otherwise, the offset for B increases by the count of column comparisons required to determine winner and loser, and the value is taken at that new offset. Similar rules apply if A is the loser in the comparison.

In a tree-of-losers priority queue with offset-value coding, each tree node was a loser to the local winner and the local offset-value code is relative to the local winner. Along the overall winner’s leaf-to-root path, all key values are coded relative to its key value.

Merging sorted runs replaces a winner with its successor in the same merge input. With merge inputs’ fixed assignment to leaf

nodes, a successor retraces the leaf-to-root path of the prior overall winner. Since this successor as well as all keys on its leaf-to-root path are encoded relative to the prior overall winner, offset-value coding applies to all comparisons in a tree-of-losers priority queue.

Offset-value codes decide many comparisons in a tree-of-losers priority queue. Column value comparisons are required only if two rows have equal offset-value codes, with column comparisons starting at the offset. After such a row comparison is decided, the count of column value comparisons is added to the loser’s offset.

With K sort columns, the sum of all offset increments is limited to K in each row; in an input with N rows, the sum of all increments and thus the count of all column value comparisons are limited to $N \times K$. Importantly, there is no $\log(N)$ multiplier. Thus, tree-of-losers priority queue and offset-value coding guarantee that the effort for column value comparisons is linear in the count of rows and in the count of sort columns, quite like the effort for computing hash values in hash-based query execution.

Comparisons of offset-value codes are free if they are subsumed in other algorithm activities and data structures. In quicksort, for example, the inner-most loop not only compares key values but also looping indexes: when the loops from the left and the right meet, the current partitioning step is complete. In priority queues, the inner-most loop compares key values only after testing whether there even are key values. During queue construction, some entries might not have been filled yet; after the end of some merge inputs, some queue entries no longer have valid keys; and during run generation by merging many single-row runs, there practically is only queue build-up and tear-down.

A tree-of-losers priority queue for run generation by replacement selection may hold key values $-\infty$ and $+\infty$ as early and late fences, valid keys assigned to the current run, and valid keys for the next run. These cases need some indicator field in each queue entry, but they require only 2 bits. Even with multiple early and late fences, e.g., one for each merge input [16], 30 or 62 bits remain and can hold an offset-value code. A single comparison instruction can test whether the two relevant keys are valid and compare their offset-value codes: if two rows have the same 32- or 64-bit value, then they are both valid (neither early nor late fences), they go to the same output run, they differ from their shared base row (an earlier winner) at the same offset, they have the same value at that offset, and the next step must compare further columns. As the comparison of offset-value codes is already complete when the indicator fields have been inspected for administration of the inner-most loop, offset-value code comparisons are free.

This design also reduces CPU cache faults. If a tree-of-losers priority queue requires 8 bytes per entry, an L1 cache can retain a priority queue (an array) of 512 or 1,024 entries. The data records may or may not fit in a lower-level cache but offset-value codes can decide many comparisons without cache fault. Mini-runs of this size remain in memory until merged (with fan-in 512 or 1,024) to form initial runs on external storage [2, 12, 23].

Offset-value coding can speed up not only merge sort but also order-preserving exchange (merging shuffle), merge join, set operations such as intersection, and more. For example, in a query like “select ..., count (distinct ...) group by ...”, the sort can detect duplicate rows by offsets equal to the column count and, after the sort, in-stream aggregation can detect group boundaries by offsets smaller than the grouping key. What has been missing to-date are simple and efficient techniques for deriving offset-value codes in the output of operators and algorithms other than merge sort.

4 OFFSET-VALUE CODING IN RELATIONAL QUERY EXECUTION OPERATORS

For many execution algorithms in sort-based query processing, the derivation of offset-value codes for the output is surprisingly simple and efficient, with no additional column value comparisons beyond those required for computing output rows. A simple theorem and an even simpler lemma are fundamental for most operations.

Definitions: Let $A < B$ mean that key value A sorts lower (earlier) than key value B ; let $pre(A, B) \geq 0$ be the length of their maximal shared prefix; let $val(A, i)$ with $i \geq 0$ be the data at offset i within key value A ; let $val(A, B) = val(B, pre(A, B))$ be the first difference in key value B relative to key value A ; and let $ovc(A, B)$ with $A < B$ be the offset-value code of key value B relative to key value A , computed from $pre(A, B)$ and $val(A, B)$ as illustrated in Table 1.

Theorem: For key values $A < B < C$, in ascending offset-value coding $ovc(A, C) = \max(ovc(A, B), ovc(B, C))$ and in descending offset-value coding $ovc(A, C) = \min(ovc(A, B), ovc(B, C))$.

Proof (for ascending offset-value codes in an ascending sort, in three cases by the lengths of maximal shared prefixes): (i) If $pre(A, B) > pre(B, C)$, then $pre(A, C) = pre(B, C)$, $val(A, C) = val(B, C)$, and $ovc(A, C) = ovc(B, C)$. With $ovc(A, B) < ovc(B, C)$, the theorem holds. (ii) Otherwise, if $pre(A, B) < pre(B, C)$, then $pre(A, C) = pre(A, B)$, $val(A, C) = val(A, B)$, and $ovc(A, C) = ovc(A, B)$. With $ovc(A, B) > ovc(B, C)$, the theorem holds. (iii) Otherwise, $pre(A, B) = pre(B, C)$ and, by the lengths of maximal shared prefixes, $val(A, B) < val(B, C)$. Thus, $pre(A, C) = pre(B, C)$, $val(A, C) = val(B, C)$, and $ovc(A, C) = ovc(B, C)$. With $ovc(A, B) < ovc(B, C)$, the theorem holds.

For example, case (i) in the proof applies to the first three rows in Table 1. If the second row were removed, then the offset-value codes of the third row would change in neither ascending nor descending offset-value coding. As an example of case (ii), if the second-to-last row were removed in Table 1, the offset-value codes of the last row would be those of the removed row. As an example of case (iii), if the third row were removed in Table 1, the offset-value codes of the fourth row would remain unchanged.

Lemma (Iyer’s “unequal value” theorem [19]): For key values $A < B < C$, if $ovc(A, B) < ovc(A, C)$ then $ovc(B, C) = ovc(A, C)$.

Table 2: Offset-value codes after a filter.

Rows and their column values				Ascending OVC		
				<i>arity</i> – <i>offset</i>	<i>value</i>	OVC
5	7	3	9	4	5	405
5	9	3	7	3	9	309

Proof: The lemma’s precondition implies $ovc(A, C) \neq ovc(A, B)$; therefore, $ovc(A, C) = ovc(B, C)$.

Implication: If offset-value codes relative to base A decide the comparison between key values B and C , then the loser’s offset-value code relative to the winner is the same as its offset-value code relative to the old base A . There is no need to compute a new offset-value code for the loser relative to the winner.

Lemma: The theorem above extends to any number of intermediate key values B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n – the maximum offset-value code (in ascending offset-value coding) of key value C and of all key values B_i encodes key value A relative to key value C .

Proof (sketch): By repeated application of the theorem.

Implication: If a filter, semi-join, or other operation removes rows from a sorted input, simple and efficient integer calculations can derive offset-value codes for the output from offset-value codes of the input.

4.1 Filter

A filter with a predicate computes offset-value codes for its output in a direct application of the lemma above – an output row’s offset-value code is (in ascending offset-value coding) the maximum of its offset-value code in the input and of the offset-value codes of rows that failed the filter predicate since the prior output row. The same applies *mutatis mutandis* for descending offset-value coding and for offset-value coding using byte offsets within normalized keys.

Table 2 illustrates the calculation for ascending offset-value coding with the data of Table 1, assuming that only the first input row and the last input row satisfy the filter predicate.

4.2 Projection

Projection, i.e., removal of input columns as well as calculation of new columns from existing columns (all within a single row), typically does not change the sort order. “Relationally pure” projection, however, includes removal of duplicate rows, which of course might change the sequence of rows (see Section 4.4).

If all columns in the sort key survive the projection, offset-value codes in the output are the same as in the input. If not, the offset must be limited to the prefix (column count) that survives. Again, the latter case actually includes the former case.

4.3 Segmented sorting

Segmented query execution means that a single stream is divided into segments, one after another, that can be processed one at a time. A typical example is a stream sorted on (A, B) but required sorted on (A, C) – one can either sort the entire stream on (A, C) or one can segment the input on distinct values of (A) and sort each segment only on (C) . In this example, A, B , and C can be individual columns or lists of columns.

To segment a sorted stream with offset-value codes, inspection of these code values suffice: an offset smaller than the segmentation key indicates a segment boundary. All other offsets must be cut to the size of the segmentation key, to be extended again by the sort within each segment. In the example, all offsets within a segment are cut to the size of (A); the associated value is the first column value of (C). Sorting a segment on (C) refines these offset-value codes in the usual way to reflect the sort order on (A, C).

4.4 Duplicate removal

In a sorted stream with offset-value codes, duplicate removal suppresses input rows with offsets equal to the arity (count of columns). All other rows, i.e., the output rows, retain their offset-value codes from the input. In the duplicate-free output, no row has an offset equal to the arity. The same applies *mutatis mutandis* if the sort key is reduced based on functional dependencies [29].

4.5 Grouping and aggregation

In a stream with offset-value codes sorted on a “group by” list, grouping aggregates input rows with offsets equal to or larger than the “group by” list. In the aggregation output, no row has an offset equal to or larger than the “group by” list. The output rows retain the offset-value codes of the first row in each group of input rows.

4.6 Pivoting

Pivoting turns rows into columns, e.g., from (year, month, sales) to (year, january_sales... december_sales). In many aspects, in particular the set of appropriate algorithms, pivoting is like grouping and aggregation. This also applies to the benefit of offset-value codes in the input and the calculation of offset-value codes in the output.

4.7 Merge join

Minor variations of the merge algorithm for inner join can provide all join types as well as set operations such as intersection. The merge logic supports equality predicates among columns, e.g., a primary key and a foreign key; a subsequent filter can enforce other cross-table predicates (see Section 4.1, with caveats for semi joins and outer joins).

Semi joins (SQL “exists” sub-queries) and anti semi joins (SQL “not exists” sub-queries) select rows from one input based on a join predicate rather than an filter predicate within a row (see Section 4.1). Nonetheless, the rule for setting offset-value codes in the output is the same: the minimum offset among an output row and the recent rows that failed the predicate.

Inner joins are similar: the offset-value codes of one input are preserved in the output, rows without match affect the offset-value code of the next row with a match, and rows with duplicate matches must produce offset-value codes for duplicate keys.

A left outer join preserves the offset-value codes of the left input. The same logic as for inner join applies to a left row with multiple matches. This also works *mutatis mutandis* for right outer joins.

The sort order of full outer joins is unusual because join columns from both inputs can have null values in the output. A virtual column can be equal to both join columns for output rows that belong to the inner join; equal to the left join column for rows of the left anti semi join, i.e., the left outer join minus the inner join;

and *mutatis mutandis* for right outer joins. The approach using a virtual column also works for one-sided outer joins.

Among set operations, intersection proceeds mostly like an inner join, union like a full outer join, and difference like an anti semi join. Sort-based multi-set (bag) operations benefit from grouping on the input side (collapsing duplicate rows to a single row with a counter) and expansion on the output side. Query optimization can model the representation of duplicate rows (multiple copies, single copy with counter, multiple copies each with a counter) as a physical property, similar to sort order and partitioning. The same applies to the presence of offset-value codes in a stream of intermediate results, although it seems that offset-value codes are rather beneficial in any sorted stream, except of course the input of a sort operation (but also see Section 4.3 above).

In summary, the merge join logic might require comparisons of column values, somewhat similar to a merge step in an external merge sort, but the logic for offset-value codes in the output does not require any additional comparisons of column values.

4.8 Nested-loops join

Nested-loops join or lookup join can be order-preserving. Note that there is no requirement that the join predicate is an equality predicate. We ignore here right semi join, right anti semi join, right outer join, and full outer join, which leaves left semi join, left anti semi join, inner join, and left outer join; we assume that the left input is the outer input and the right input is the inner input.

If the outer input is sorted on the join key, offset-value codes in the output follow the merge join rules.

If each result from the inner input is also sorted (on any of its columns) and includes offset-value codes, the output rows of inner join and left outer join benefit from offset-value codes of matching inner rows, with the offset incremented by the size of the outer sort key. In a many-to-many join and in the case of duplicate outer join key values and multiple matching inner rows, each inner row joins all outer rows before processing the next inner row. In other words, maximum offsets in the output’s offset-value codes require that the roles of outer and inner loops are reversed within each many-to-many match.

4.9 Order-preserving shuffle

An order-preserving one-to-many (“splitting”) shuffle resembles a filter with respect to each output partition (see Section 4.1). An order-preserving many-to-one (“merging”) shuffle requires the standard merge logic, very similar to a merge step in an external merge sort. A tree-of-losers priority queue can map offset-value codes in the input streams to new offset-value codes in the output.

4.10 Ordered scans

Other than sorting, the most important operation to originate offset-value codes is data access.

Column storage is often sorted with the leading key columns compressed with run-length encoding. Fortunately, as described in recent work [9], such scans can produce row-by-row offset-value codes without sorting and even without any column value accesses or column value comparisons. Thus, these scans can provide offset-value codes practically for free.

Traditional b-trees readily support sorted scans. Page-wide prefix compression [3] gives offset-value coding a head start; compression within index leaves by next-neighbor difference, e.g., in Shore [5], provides offset-value codes practically for free.

Today’s ubiquitous log-structured merge-forests [24] and stepped-merge trees [20] support a sorted scan per partition, which can include offset-value codes; a merge of such scans benefits from offset-value codes and merge logic using a tree-of-losers priority queue readily produces offset-value codes for the merge output.

In non-unique secondary indexes, lists of row identifiers are usually sorted and compressed using one of the above compression techniques and thus can deliver such lists with offset-value codes. Range queries need to merge lists of row identifiers; again, the merge logic consumes, benefits from, and produces offset-value codes. Multi-dimensional b-tree access, e.g., MDAM [22], similarly merges sorted lists of row identifiers. Sorted lists of row identifiers are similarly useful for index intersection and index join, i.e., “covering” a query for “index-only retrieval” with multiple secondary indexes of the same table [18].

4.11 Summary of new techniques

In the sort-based and order-preserving query execution algorithms considered above, calculation of new offset-value codes in the operations’ output is simple and efficient. Offset-value codes in the output depend only on offset-value codes in the inputs. There is no need for additional column value comparisons beyond those performed in the preceding sort operation and in the operation itself, e.g., column value comparisons in the merge logic of merge join. Ordered storage structures, e.g., b-trees, can preserve the effort for comparisons spent during index creation – they can do so by storing offset-value codes explicitly, by prefix truncation (encoding each record relative to its immediate predecessor), or by run-length encoding of leading sort columns. Scans over either format can readily produce offset-value codes and, with the new techniques of this paper, sort-based operations can easily carry them forward, i.e., produce offset-value codes in their output derived from offset-value codes in their input.

5 IMPLEMENTATION EXPERIENCE

This section briefly summarizes how offset-value coding is used in F1 Query [26, 28]. At a high level, F1 Query employs offset-value coding in its sort operator and takes advantage of offset-value codes in intermediate results (e.g., spilled files) and across relational operators to further improve query performance.

The F1 sort operator uses external merge sort with tree-of-losers priority queues and offset-value coding for both run generation and merging. Each tree entry encodes offset and value bits in an unsigned 64-bit integer offset-value code. Invalid key values, e.g., after a merge input is exhausted, are also folded into this integer. In a sense, each comparison of offset-value codes is folded into a test whether or not a run is exhausted; thus, the comparison of offset-value codes is practically free.

Offset-value codes for rows in the sorted runs are a by-product of run generation. These offset-value codes later improve the efficiency of merging. For example, the merge logic inspects the offset-value code of the next row from the winner’s input. If this next key value




Figure 1: Group boundaries from offset-value codes.

has an offset equal to the number of key columns, it copies the row directly to the output buffer, bypassing the merge logic entirely.

Since many sort-based operators (e.g., in-stream aggregation, merge join, analytic functions, and order-preserving exchange) can leverage offset-value codes in their inputs, F1 Query supports carrying offset-value codes between operators. An artificial column for offset-value codes is introduced during query planning for order-producing physical operators. Each order-producing relational operator is modified with the logic described in this paper to produce offset-value codes in its output. The sorting techniques described in this paper are also employed in Napa [1].

6 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

This section tests two claims or hypotheses about offset-value coding, sort-based query processing, and interesting orderings:

- (1) Offset-value coding can speed up not only external merge sort but also its consumers, e.g., in-stream aggregation and merge join but also segmentation and order-preserving (merging) exchange.
- (2) Offset-value coding together with interesting orderings can be more efficient than hash-based query plans.

Some readers may think these claims are obviously true, but we nonetheless wish to dispel any conceivable remaining doubt. These hypotheses do not claim universally superior performance, merely new performance advantages for sort-based query processing due to offset-value coding in contexts beyond merge sort.

In order to focus on order-based operators and offset-value coding, all experiments use a single execution thread. The hardware is an engineering workstation; more detailed specifications are omitted on purpose. Each experiment starts with a warm cache, i.e., input data pre-fetched into memory. The measurements below come from Google’s public benchmark library [14]. Test data are synthetic yet similar to the actual data in our web analysis workload running in production every day. Thus, there are many rows with many key columns. Each key column is an 8-byte integer with only a few distinct values.

Figure 1, in a test of hypothesis 1, shows the effort of offset-value coding in in-stream aggregation. For fast detection of group boundaries, the operation exploits the offset-value codes from a




Figure 2: Query plans for an “intersect distinct” query.




Figure 3: Performance of “intersect distinct” query plans.

preceding sort operation. This is compared to using full comparisons of multiple key columns. The count of input rows is 1,000,000. The ratio of input rows and output rows varies. For example, a ratio of 1 indicates all input rows are distinct (i.e., all groups have size 1) and a ratio of 100 indicates that on average 100 input rows contribute to each output row. All queries of the type “select..., count (distinct...) group by...” require a two-step process. Figure 1 shows that, within the sorted output, testing the offset against the count of grouping columns is much faster than full comparisons of multiple key columns. Thus, offset-value codes benefit not only sorting but also other query execution algorithms.

Figure 2 shows two query evaluation plans, using hash-based and sort-based query execution, for a simple SQL query computing the intersection of two tables, e.g., “select B from T1 intersect select B from T2”. If column B is not a primary key in tables T1 and T2, correct execution requires duplicate removal plus a join algorithm. The query plans for “intersect all” would be practically the same, counting duplicates rather than removing them. In the hash-based plan, there are three blocking operators: two hash aggregation operators for duplicate removal and a hash join for set intersection. In contrast, in the sort-based plan, there are only two blocking operators: both are in-sort aggregation operators [10] for duplicate removal. The merge join computing the intersection exploits not only interesting ordering but also offset-value codes in the output of in-sort aggregation.

Figure 3 shows the performance of hash- and sort-based plans for this query. Each input table has 100,000,000 rows; the memory

for each blocking operator is 10,000,000 rows. In a hash-based plan, duplicate removal operations and the join spill to temporary storage; each input row is spilled twice. In contrast, a sort-based plan spills each input row only once. Thus, the effort for spilling is cut in half due to interesting orderings. Furthermore, offset-value codes carried from in-sort aggregation operators speed up row comparisons in the merge join.

In summary, while the queries in these experiments are simple and common, the experiments support our two claims about the benefits of offset-value coding in database query processing.

7 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Computing offset-value codes in order-preserving query execution algorithms is surprisingly simple and efficient. Importantly, there is no need for column value comparisons beyond those required to compute output rows. Offset-value coding throughout sort-based query execution takes “interesting orderings” to their full potential, not only in query optimization but also in query execution, because offset-value codes decide many or most row comparisons by compiled-in integers and thus by a single machine instruction.

Offset-value coding already saves thousands of CPUs in Google’s Napa and F1 Query systems, because ingestion (run generation), compaction (merging), and query processing in log-structured merge-forests rely heavily on sorting and merging. We anticipate that offset-value coding can enable further savings in the future, because sorting and merging are essential in many more data processing pipelines and many more storage formats.

A broader perspective on the problem space suggests the following observations. In hash-based query execution, a single compiled-in integer comparison of hash values can determine that two rows or their key values are different. In sort-based query execution, a single compiled-in integer comparison of offset-value codes can do the same; in addition, it sometimes can determine that two rows or their keys are equal. Hash-based query execution requires accessing $N \times K$ column values just for the hash function; cases of hash conflicts or duplicate key values require K column value comparisons. In contrast, sort-based query execution accesses only those columns truly required to establish a difference between rows or keys. In an extreme case with a unique first column, the entire operation accesses not $N \times K$ but only N column values, each only once to prime offset-value codes in a tree-of-losers priority queue. If storage structures are sorted on column values, if query optimization considers interesting orderings, and if query execution fully employs offset-value coding plus some techniques from earlier work [9, 17], then sort-based query processing can be consistently at least as efficient as hash-based query processing. Hash-partitioning remains recommended for parallel and distributed query execution unless further innovations can ensure efficient, well-balanced, and failure-tolerant range-partitioning.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ankur Agiwal, Kevin Lai, Gokul Nath Babu Manoharan, Indrajit Roy, Jagan Sankaranarayanan, Hao Zhang, Tao Zou, Min Chen, Zongchang (Jim) Chen, Ming Dai, Thanh Do, Haoyu Gao, Haoyan Geng, Raman Grover, Bo Huang, Yanlai Huang, Zhi (Adam) Li, Jianyi Liang, Tao Lin, Li Liu, Yao Liu, Xi Mao, Yalan (Maya) Meng, Prashant Mishra, Jay Patel, Rajesh S. R., Vijayshankar Raman, Sourashis Roy, Mayank Singh Shishodia, Tianhang Sun, Ye (Justin) Tang, Junichi Tatemura, Sagar Trehan, Ramkumar Vadali, Prasanna Venkatasubramanian, Gensheng Zhang, Keifei Zhang, Yupu Zhang, Zeleng Zhuang, Goetz Graefe, Divyakant Agrawal, Jeff Naughton, Sujata Kosalge, and Hakan Hacigümüş. 2021. Napa: Powering Scalable Data Warehousing with Robust Query Performance at Google. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 14, 12 (jul 2021), 2986–2997. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3476311.3476377>
- [2] Jean-Loup Baer and Yi-Bing Lin. 1989. Improving Quicksort Performance with a Codeword Data Structure. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* 15, 5 (1989), 622–631. <https://doi.org/10.1109/32.24711>
- [3] Rudolf Bayer and Karl Unterauer. 1977. Prefix B-Trees. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* 2, 1 (1977), 11–26. <https://doi.org/10.1145/320521.320530>
- [4] Mike W. Blasgen and Kapali P. Eswaran. 1977. Storage and Access in Relational Data Bases. *IBM Syst. J.* 16, 4 (1977), 362–377. <https://doi.org/10.1147/sj.164.0363>
- [5] Michael J. Carey, David J. DeWitt, Michael J. Franklin, Nancy E. Hall, Mark L. McAuliffe, Jeffrey F. Naughton, Daniel T. Schuh, Marvin H. Solomon, C. K. Tan, Odysseas G. Tsatalos, Seth J. White, and Michael J. Zwilling. 1994. Shoring Up Persistent Applications. In *Proceedings of the 1994 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA, May 24-27, 1994*, Richard T. Snodgrass and Marianne Winslett (Eds.). ACM Press, 383–394. <https://doi.org/10.1145/191839.191915>
- [6] Fay Chang, Jeffrey Dean, Sanjay Ghemawat, Wilson C. Hsieh, Deborah A. Wallach, Mike Burrows, Tushar Chandra, Andrew Fikes, and Robert E. Gruber. 2008. Bigtable: A Distributed Storage System for Structured Data. *ACM Trans. Comput. Syst.* 26, 2, Article 4 (jun 2008), 26 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1365815.1365816>
- [7] W. M. Conner. 1977. Offset-value coding. In *IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin*.
- [8] James C. Corbett, Jeffrey Dean, Michael Epstein, Andrew Fikes, Christopher Frost, J. J. Furman, Sanjay Ghemawat, Andrey Gubarev, Christopher Heiser, Peter Hochschild, Wilson Hsieh, Sebastian Kanthak, Eugene Kogan, Hongyi Li, Alexander Lloyd, Sergey Melnik, David Mwaura, David Nagle, Sean Quinlan, Rajesh Rao, Lindsay Rolig, Yasushi Saito, Michal Szymaniak, Christopher Taylor, Ruth Wang, and Dale Woodford. 2013. Spanner: Google’s Globally Distributed Database. *ACM Trans. Comput. Syst.* 31, 3, Article 8 (aug 2013), 22 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2491245>
- [9] Thanh Do and Goetz Graefe. 2022. Robust and Efficient Sorting with Offset-Value Coding. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2209.08420> Submitted for publication in ACM TODS.
- [10] Thanh Do, Goetz Graefe, and Jeffrey Naughton. 2020. Efficient sorting, duplicate removal, grouping, and aggregation. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2010.00152> Accepted for publication in ACM TODS.
- [11] Robert Epstein. 1979. Techniques for processing of aggregates in relational database systems. In *Univ. of California at Berkeley, UCB/ERL Memorandum M79/8*.
- [12] Edward H. Friend. 1956. Sorting on Electronic Computer Systems. *J. ACM* 3, 3 (1956), 134–168. <https://doi.org/10.1145/320831.320833>
- [13] Martin A. Goetz. 1963. Internal and Tape Sorting Using the Replacement-Selection Technique. *Commun. ACM* 6, 5 (May 1963), 201–206. <https://doi.org/10.1145/366552.366556>
- [14] Google. [n.d.]. A microbenchmark support library. <https://github.com/google/benchmark>
- [15] Goetz Graefe. 1993. Query Evaluation Techniques for Large Databases. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 25, 2 (1993), 73–170. <https://doi.org/10.1145/152610.152611>
- [16] Goetz Graefe. 2006. Implementing sorting in database systems. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 38, 3 (2006), 10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1132960.1132964>
- [17] Goetz Graefe. 2011. A Generalized Join Algorithm. In *Datenbanksysteme für Business, Technologie und Web (BTW), 14. Fachtagung des GI-Fachbereichs "Datenbanken und Informationssysteme" (DBIS), 2.-4.3.2011 in Kaiserslautern, Germany (LNI)*, Theo Härder, Wolfgang Lehner, Bernhard Mitschang, Harald Schöning, and Holger Schwarz (Eds.), Vol. P-180. GI, 267–286. <https://dl.gi.de/20.500.12116/19583>
- [18] Goetz Graefe, Ross Bunker, and Shaun Cooper. 1998. Hash Joins and Hash Teams in Microsoft SQL Server. In *VLDB’98, Proceedings of 24th International Conference on Very Large Data Bases, August 24-27, 1998, New York City, New York, USA*, Ashish Gupta, Oded Shmueli, and Jennifer Widom (Eds.). Morgan Kaufmann, 86–97. <http://www.vldb.org/conf/1998/p086.pdf>
- [19] Bala R. Iyer. 2005. Hardware Assisted Sorting in IBM’s DB2 DBMS. In *International Conference on Management of Data (COMAD)*.
- [20] H. V. Jagadish, P. P. S. Narayan, S. Seshadri, S. Sudarshan, and Rama Kanneganti. 1997. Incremental Organization for Data Recording and Warehousing. In *VLDB’97, Proceedings of 23rd International Conference on Very Large Data Bases, August 25-29, 1997, Athens, Greece*, Matthias Jarke, Michael J. Carey, Klaus R. Dittrich, Frederick H. Lochovsky, Pericles Loucopoulos, and Manfred A. Jausfeld (Eds.). Morgan Kaufmann, 16–25. <http://www.vldb.org/conf/1997/P016.PDF>
- [21] Donald E. Knuth. 1998. *The Art of Computer Programming, Volume 3: Sorting and Searching (2nd ed.)*. Addison Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., USA.
- [22] Harry Leslie, Rohit Jain, Dave Birdsall, and Hedieh Yaghmai. 1995. Efficient Search of Multi-Dimensional B-Trees. In *VLDB’95, Proceedings of 21th International Conference on Very Large Data Bases, September 11-15, 1995, Zurich, Switzerland*, Umeshwar Dayal, Peter M. D. Gray, and Shojiro Nishio (Eds.). Morgan Kaufmann, 710–719. <http://www.vldb.org/conf/1995/P710.PDF>
- [23] Chris Nyberg, Tom Barclay, Zarka Cvetanovic, Jim Gray, and David B. Lomet. 1995. AlphaSort: A Cache-Sensitive Parallel External Sort. *VLDB J.* 4, 4 (1995), 603–627. <http://www.vldb.org/journal/VLDBJ4/P603.pdf>
- [24] Patrick E. O’Neil, Edward Cheng, Dieter Gawlick, and Elizabeth J. O’Neil. 1996. The Log-Structured Merge-Tree (LSM-Tree). *Acta Informatica* 33, 4 (1996), 351–385. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002360050048>
- [25] IBM publication SA22-7200-0. 1988. Enterprise system architecture/370, principles of operation. UPT “update tree” and CFC “compare and form codeword” instructions.
- [26] Bart Samwel, John Cieslewicz, Ben Handy, Jason Govig, Petros Venetis, Chanjun Yang, Keith Peters, Jeff Shute, Daniel Tenedorio, Himani Apte, Felix Weigel, David Wilhite, Jiacheng Yang, Jun Xu, Jiexing Li, Zhan Yuan, Craig Chasseur, Qiang Zeng, Ian Rae, Anurag Biyani, Andrew Harn, Yang Xia, Andrey Gubichev, Amr El-Helw, Orri Erling, Zhepeng Yan, Mohan Yang, Yiqun Wei, Thanh Do, Colin Zheng, Goetz Graefe, Somayeh Sardashti, Ahmed M. Aly, Divy Agrawal, Ashish Gupta, and Shiv Venkataraman. 2018. F1 Query: Declarative Querying at Scale. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 11, 12 (Aug. 2018), 1835–1848. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3229863.3229871>
- [27] P. Griffiths Selinger, M. M. Astrahan, D. D. Chamberlin, R. A. Lorie, and T. G. Price. 1979. Access Path Selection in a Relational Database Management System. In *Proceedings of the 1979 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data (Boston, Massachusetts) (SIGMOD ’79)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 23–34. <https://doi.org/10.1145/582095.582099>
- [28] Jeff Shute, Radek Vingralek, Bart Samwel, Ben Handy, Chad Whipkey, Eric Rollins, Mircea Oancea, Kyle Littlefield, David Menestrina, Stephan Ellner, John Cieslewicz, Ian Rae, Traian Stancescu, and Himani Apte. 2013. F1: A Distributed SQL Database That Scales. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 6, 11 (Aug. 2013), 1068–1079. <https://doi.org/10.14778/2536222.2536232>
- [29] David E. Simmen, Eugene J. Shekita, and Timothy Malkemus. 1996. Fundamental Techniques for Order Optimization. In *Proceedings of the 1996 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, June 4-6, 1996*, H. V. Jagadish and Inderpal Singh Mumick (Eds.). ACM Press, 57–67. <https://doi.org/10.1145/233269.233320>