

Erasing-based lossless compression method for streaming floating-point time series

Ruiyuan Li¹ · Zheng Li¹ · Yi Wu¹ · Chao Chen¹ · Songtao Guo¹ ·
Ming Zhang² · Yu Zheng^{3,4}

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract There are a prohibitively large number of floating-point time series data generated at an unprecedentedly high rate. An efficient, compact and lossless compression for time series data is of great importance for a wide range of scenarios. Most existing lossless floating-point compression methods are based on the XOR operation, but they do not fully exploit the trailing zeros, which usually results in an unsatisfactory compression ratio. This paper proposes an Erasing-based Lossless Floating-point compression algorithm, i.e., *Elf*. The main idea of *Elf* is to erase the last few bits (i.e., set them to zero) of floating-point values, so the XORed values are supposed to contain many trailing zeros. The challenges of the erasing-based method are three-fold.

Ruiyuan Li
E-mail: ruiyuan.li@cqu.edu.cn

Zheng Li
E-mail: zhengli@cqu.edu.cn

Yi Wu
E-mail: wu_yi@cqu.edu.cn

Chao Chen
E-mail: cschaochen@cqu.edu.cn

Songtao Guo
E-mail: guosongtao@cqu.edu.cn

Ming Zhang
E-mail: ming.zhang@gzpi.com.cn

Yu Zheng
E-mail: msyuzheng@outlook.com

¹ Chongqing University, Chongqing, China

² Guangzhou Urban Planning & Design Survey Research Institute, Guangzhou, China

³ JD Intelligent Cities Research, Beijing, China

⁴ Xidian University, Xi'an, China

First, how to quickly determine the erased bits? Second, how to losslessly recover the original data from the erased ones? Third, how to compactly encode the erased data? Through rigorous mathematical analysis, *Elf* can directly determine the erased bits and restore the original values without losing any precision. To further improve the compression ratio, we propose a novel encoding strategy for the XORed values with many trailing zeros. Furthermore, observing the values in a time series usually have similar significand counts, we propose an upgraded version of *Elf* named *Elf+* by optimizing the significand count encoding strategy, which improves the compression ratio and reduces the running time further. Both *Elf* and *Elf+* work in a streaming fashion. They take only $\mathcal{O}(N)$ (where N is the length of a time series) in time and $\mathcal{O}(1)$ in space, and achieve a notable compression ratio with a theoretical guarantee. Extensive experiments using 22 datasets show the powerful performance of *Elf* and *Elf+* compared with 9 advanced competitors for both double-precision and single-precision floating-point values. Moreover, *Elf+* outperforms *Elf* by an average relative compression ratio improvement of 7.6% and compression time improvement of 20.5%.

Keywords Time series compression · Streaming compression · Lossless float-point compression

1 Introduction

The advance of sensing devices and Internet of Things [36, 48] has brought about the explosion of time series data. A significant portion of time series data are floating-point values produced at an unprecedentedly high rate in a streaming fashion. For example, there are over ten thousand sensors in a 600,000-kilowatt medium-sized thermal power generating unit, which produce

Table 1 Symbols and Their Meanings

Symbols	Meanings
$TS = \langle (t_1, v_1), (t_2, v_2), \dots \rangle$	Floating-point time series, where t_i is a timestamp and v_i is a floating-point value
v, v'	Original floating-point value, erased floating-point value with long trailing zeros
$DF(v) = \pm(d_{h-1}d_{h-2}\dots d_0.d_{-1}d_{-2}\dots d_l)_{10}$	Decimal format of v , where $d_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 9\}$. “+” is usually omitted if $v > 0$
$BF(v) = \pm(b_{\bar{h}-1}b_{\bar{h}-2}\dots b_0.b_{-1}b_{-2}\dots b_{\bar{l}})_2$	Binary format of v , where $b_i \in \{1, 2\}$. “+” is usually omitted if $v > 0$
$DP(v), DS(v), SP(v)$	Decimal place count, decimal significand count, start decimal significand position of v
$s, \vec{e} = \langle e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{11} \rangle, \vec{m} = \langle m_1, m_2, \dots, m_{52} \rangle$	Sign bit, exponent bits, mantissa bits under IEEE 754 format, where $s, e_i, m_j \in \{0, 1\}$
$e, \alpha, \beta, \beta^*$	Decimal value of \vec{e} , alias of $DP(v)$, alias of $DS(v)$, modified β

2.1 Definitions

Definition 1 Floating-Point Time Series. A floating-point time series $TS = \langle (t_1, v_1), (t_2, v_2), \dots \rangle$ is a sequence of pairs ordered by the timestamps in an ascending order, where each pair (t_i, v_i) represents that the floating-point value v_i is recorded in timestamp t_i .


To compress floating-point time series compactly, one of the best ways is to compress the timestamps and floating-point values separately [16, 37, 49]. For the timestamp compression, existing methods such as delta encoding and delta-of-delta encoding [49] can achieve rather good performance, but for the floating-point compression, there is still much room for improvement. To this end, this paper primarily focuses on the compression for floating-point values, particularly for double-precision floating-point values (abbr. **double values**) in time series (i.e., if not specified, the “value” refers to a double value). Single-precision floating-point compression is extended in Section 7.

Definition 2 Decimal Format and Binary Format. The decimal format of a double value v is $DF(v) = \pm(d_{h-1}d_{h-2}\dots d_0.d_{-1}d_{-2}\dots d_l)_{10}$, where $d_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, 9\}$ for $l \leq i \leq h-1$, $d_{h-1} \neq 0$ unless $h = 1$, and $d_l \neq 0$ unless $l = -1$. That is, $DF(v)$ would not start with “0” except that $h = 1$, and would not end with “0” except that $l = -1$. Similarly, the binary format of v is $BF(v) = \pm(b_{\bar{h}-1}b_{\bar{h}-2}\dots b_0.b_{-1}b_{-2}\dots b_{\bar{l}})_2$, where $b_j \in \{0, 1\}$ for $\bar{l} \leq j \leq \bar{h}-1$. We have the following relation:

$$v = \pm \sum_{i=l}^{h-1} d_i \times 10^i = \pm \sum_{j=\bar{l}}^{\bar{h}-1} b_j \times 2^j \quad (1)$$

Here, “ \pm ” (which means “+” or “-”) is the sign of v . If $v \geq 0$, “+” is usually omitted. For example, $DF(0) = (0.0)_{10}$, $DF(5.20) = (5.2)_{10}$, and $BF(-3.125) = -(11.001)_2$.

Definition 3 Decimal Place Count, Decimal Significand Count and Start Decimal Significand Position. Given v with its decimal format $DF(v) = \pm(d_{h-1}d_{h-2}\dots d_0.d_{-1}d_{-2}\dots d_l)_{10}$, $DP(v) = |l|$ is called

**Fig. 3** Double-Precision Floating-Point Format.

its decimal place count. If for all $l < n \leq i \leq h-1$, $d_i = 0$ but $d_{n-1} \neq 0$ (i.e., d_{n-1} is the first digit that is not equal to 0), $SP(v) = n-1$ is called the start decimal significand position¹, and $DS(v) = n-l = SP(v)+1-l$ is called the decimal significand count. For the case of $v = 0$, we let $DS(v) = 0$ and $SP(v) = \text{undefined}$.

For example, $DP(3.14) = 2$, $DS(3.14) = 3$, and $SP(3.14) = 0$; $DP(-0.0314) = 4$, $DS(-0.0314) = 3$, and $SP(-0.0314) = -2$; $DP(314.0) = 1$, $DS(314.0) = 4$, and $SP(314.0) = 2$.

2.2 IEEE 754 Floating-Point Format

In accordance with IEEE 754 Standard [28], a double value v is stored with 64 binary bits, where 1 bit is for the sign s , 11 bits for the exponent $\vec{e} = \langle e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{11} \rangle$, and 52 bits for the mantissa $\vec{m} = \langle m_1, m_2, \dots, m_{52} \rangle$, as shown in Figure 3. When v is positive, $s = 0$, otherwise $s = 1$. According to the values of \vec{e} and \vec{m} , a double value v can be categorized into two main types: **normal numbers** and **special numbers**. As normal numbers are the most cases of time series, this paper mainly describes the proposed algorithm for normal numbers. However, our proposed algorithm can be easily extended to special numbers, which will be discussed in Section 6.5. If v is a normal number (or a normal), its value satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} v &= (-1)^s \times 2^{e-1023} \times (1.m_1m_2\dots m_{52})_2 \\ &= (-1)^s \times 2^{e-1023} \times \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{52} m_i \times 2^{-i}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where e is the decimal value of \vec{e} ², i.e., $e = \sum_{i=1}^{11} e_i \times 2^{11-i}$. If let $m_0 = 1$ and $BF(v) = (-1)^s(b_{\bar{h}-1}b_{\bar{h}-2}\dots b_0)$.

¹ We have $SP(v) = \lfloor \log_{10}|v| \rfloor$.

² We also have $e = \lfloor \log_2|v| \rfloor + 1023$.

```

0:100000000000:1001010111000010100011110101110000101000111101011100
3.17
0:100000000000:100101011100001010001110000000000000000000000000000
3.169999837875366
0:100000000000:100101010000000000000000000000000000000000000000000
3.1640625
0:100000000000:100100000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000
3.125

```

Fig. 4 Examples of Mantissa Prefix Number.

$b_{-1}b_{-2}\dots b_{\bar{l}})_2$, we have:

$$b_{-i} = m_{i+e-1023}, i > 0 \quad (3)$$

As shown in Figure 3, in the mantissa $\vec{m} = \langle m_1, m_2, \dots, m_{52} \rangle$ of a double value v , m_i is more significant than m_j for $1 \leq i < j \leq 52$, since m_i contributes more to the value of v than m_j .

3 Elf Eraser and Restorer

In this section, we introduce *Elf* Eraser and Restorer since they are strongly correlated.

3.1 Elf Eraser

The main idea of *Elf* compression is to erase some less significant mantissa bits (i.e., set them to zeros) of a double value v . As a result, v itself and the XORed result of v with its previous value are expected to have many trailing zeros. Note that v and its opposite number $-v$ have the same double-precision floating-point formats except the different values of their signs. That is to say, the compression process for $-v$ can be converted into the one for v if we reverse its sign bit only, and vice versa. To this end, in the rest of the paper, if not specified, we assume v to be **positive** for the convenience of description. Before introducing the details of *Elf* Eraser, we first give the definition of mantissa prefix number.

Definition 4 Mantissa Prefix Number. Given a double value v with $\vec{m} = \langle m_1, m_2, \dots, m_{52} \rangle$, the double value v' with $\vec{m}' = \langle m'_1, m'_2, \dots, m'_{52} \rangle$ is called the mantissa prefix number of v if and only if there exists a number $n \in \{1, 2, \dots, 51\}$ such that $m'_i = m_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $m'_j = 0$ for $n+1 \leq j \leq 52$, denoted as $v' = MPN(v, n)$.

For example, as shown in Figure 4, we give four mantissa prefix numbers of 3.17, i.e., $3.17 = MPN(3.17, 50)$, $3.169999837875366 = MPN(3.17, 23)$, $3.1640625 = MPN(3.17, 8)$ and $3.125 = MPN(3.17, 4)$.

3.1.1 Observation

Our proposed *Elf* compression algorithm is based on the following observation: given a double value v with its decimal format $DF(v) = (d_{h-1}d_{h-2}\dots d_0.d_{-1}d_{-2}\dots d_l)_{10}$, we can find one of its mantissa prefix numbers v' and a minor double value δ , $0 \leq \delta < 10^l$, such that $v' = v - \delta$. If we retain the information of v' and δ , we can recover v without losing any precision.

On one hand, there could be many mantissa prefix numbers. Since we aim to maximize the number of trailing zeros of the XORed results, we should select the optimal mantissa prefix number that has the most trailing zeros. Considering the case of $v = 3.17$ shown in Figure 4, there are many satisfied pairs of (v', δ) , e.g., $(3.17, 0)$, $(3.169999837875366, 0.000000162124634)$ and $(3.1640625, 0.0059375)$. As 3.1640625 has more trailing zeros than 3.169999837875366 and 3.17, the mantissa prefix number 3.1640625 is the most suitable v' .

On the other hand, we find it even unnecessary to figure out and store δ . If $\delta \neq 0$ (we will talk about the case when $\delta = 0$ in Section 3.1.4) and the decimal place count $DP(v)$ is known, we can easily recover v from v' losslessly. Suppose $\alpha = DP(v)$ and $DF(v') = (d_{h'-1}d_{h'-2}\dots d_0.d_{-1}d_{-2}\dots d_{l'})_{10}$, we have ³:

$$v = LeaveOut(v', \alpha) + 10^{-\alpha} \quad (4)$$

where $LeaveOut(v', \alpha) = (d_{h'-1}d_{h'-2}\dots d_0.d_{-1}d_{-2}\dots d_{-\alpha} \overline{d_{-(\alpha+1)}\dots d_{l'}})_{10}$ is the operation that leaves out the digits after $d_{-\alpha}$ in $DF(v')$. For example, given $\alpha = DP(3.17) = 2$ and $v' = 3.1640625$, we have $v = LeaveOut(v', \alpha) + 10^{-\alpha} = (3.1640625)_{10} + 10^{-2} = 3.17$.

With the observation above, in the process of compression, what we should do is to find the most appropriate mantissa prefix number v' of v and record $\alpha = DP(v)$. During the decompression process, we can recover v losslessly with the help of v' and α according to Equation (4). However, there are still two problems left to be addressed. **Problem I:** How to find the best mantissa prefix number v' of v with the minimum efforts? **Problem II:** How to store the decimal place count α with the minimum storage cost?

3.1.2 Mantissa Prefix Number Search

To address Problem I, one intuitive idea is to iteratively check all mantissa prefix numbers $v' = MPN(v, i)$ until $\delta = v - v'$ is greater than $10^{-\alpha}$, where i is sequentially from 52 to 1. However, this intuitive idea is rather time-consuming since we need to verify the mantissa prefix

³ Equation (4) can be implemented by $v = RoundUp(v', \alpha)$, where $RoundUp(v', \alpha)$ is the operation to round v' up to α decimal places.

numbers at most 52 times in the worst case. Although we can enhance the efficiency through a binary search strategy [15], the computation complexity $\mathcal{O}(\log_2 52)$ is still high. To this end, we propose a novel mantissa prefix number search method which only takes $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

Theorem 1 *Given a double value v with its decimal place count $DP(v) = \alpha$ and binary format $BF(v) = (b_{\bar{h}-1}b_{\bar{h}-2}\dots b_0.b_{-1}\dots b_{\bar{l}})_2$, $\delta = (0.0\dots 0b_{-(f(\alpha)+1)}b_{-(f(\alpha)+2)}\dots b_{\bar{l}})_2$ is smaller than $10^{-\alpha}$, where $f(\alpha) = \lceil \log_2 10^{-\alpha} \rceil = \lceil \alpha \times \log_2 10 \rceil$.*

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &= \sum_{i=f(\alpha)+1}^{\lceil \bar{l} \rceil} b_{-i} \times 2^{-i} \leq \sum_{i=f(\alpha)+1}^{\lceil \bar{l} \rceil} 2^{-i} < \sum_{i=f(\alpha)+1}^{+\infty} 2^{-i} \text{ knowing } v. \\ \text{Proof} \quad &= 2^{-f(\alpha)} = 2^{-\lceil \alpha \times \log_2 10 \rceil} \leq 2^{-\alpha \times \log_2 10} \\ &= (2^{\log_2 10})^{-\alpha} = 10^{-\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

Here, $f(\alpha) = \lceil \log_2 10^{-\alpha} \rceil$ means that the decimal value $10^{-\alpha}$ requires exactly $\lceil \log_2 10^{-\alpha} \rceil$ binary bits to represent. Suppose δ is obtained based on Theorem 1, $v - \delta$ can be regarded as erasing the bits after $b_{-f(\alpha)}$ in v 's binary format. Recall that for any b_{-i} in $BF(v)$ where $i > 0$, we can find a corresponding $m_{i+e-1023}$ according to Equation (3). Consequently, $v - \delta$ can be further deemed as erasing the mantissa bits after $m_{g(\alpha)}$ in v 's underlying floating-point format, in which $g(\alpha)$ is defined as:

$$g(\alpha) = f(\alpha) + e - 1023 = \lceil \alpha \times \log_2 10 \rceil + e - 1023 \quad (5)$$

where $\alpha = DP(v)$ and $e = (e_1 e_2 \dots e_{11})_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{11} e_i \times 2^{11-i}$.

As a result, we can directly calculate the best mantissa prefix number v' by simply erasing the mantissa bits after $m_{g(\alpha)}$ of v , which takes only $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

3.1.3 Decimal Place Count Calculation

To solve Problem II, the basic idea is to utilize $\lceil \log_2 \alpha_{max} \rceil$ bits for α storage, where α_{max} is the possible maximum value of a decimal place count. According to [28], the minimum value of the double-precision floating-point number is about 4.9×10^{-324} , so $\alpha_{max} = 324$ and $\lceil \log_2 \alpha_{max} \rceil = 9$, i.e., the basic method needs as many as 9 bits to store α during the compression process for each double value, which results in a large storage cost and low compression ratio.

Given a double value v with its decimal format $DF(v) = (d_{h-1}d_{h-2}\dots d_0.d_{-1}d_{-2}\dots d_{-l})_{10}$, we notice that its decimal place count $\alpha = DP(v)$ can be calculated by the decimal significand count $\beta = DS(v)$. Since the decimal significand count β of a double value would not be greater than 17 under the IEEE 754 Standard [28, 37],

$$\begin{array}{r} DF(v): (d_{h-1} d_{h-2} \dots d_0 . d_{-1} d_{-2} \dots d_{-(\alpha-1)} d_{-\alpha})_{10} \\ - DF(\delta): (\quad \quad \quad 0 . 0 \quad 0 \quad \dots \quad 0 \quad \quad \quad 0 \quad d_{-(\alpha+1)} d_{-(\alpha+2)} \dots)_{10} \\ \hline DF(v'): (d'_{h-1} d'_{h-2} \dots d'_0 . d'_{-1} d'_{-2} \dots d'_{-(\alpha-1)} (d_{-\alpha-1}) d'_{-(\alpha+1)} d'_{-(\alpha+2)} \dots)_{10} \end{array}$$

Fig. 5 Subtraction in Vertical Form.

it requires much fewer bits to store β . According to Definition 3, we have $\alpha = DP(v) = |l| = -l$ and $\beta = DS(v) = SP(v) + 1 - l$, so we have:

$$\alpha = \beta - (SP(v) + 1) \quad (6)$$

Next, we discuss how to get $SP(v)$ without even

Theorem 2 *Given a double value v and its best mantissa prefix number v' , if $v \neq 10^{-i}$, $i > 0$, then $SP(v) = SP(v')$.*

Proof Suppose $\alpha = DP(v)$ and $v' = v - \delta$, where $0 \leq \delta < 10^{-\alpha}$.

If $\delta = 0$, i.e., $v = v'$, $DF(v)$ and $DF(v')$ undoubtedly have the same start decimal significant position.

If $\delta \neq 0$, we let $DF(v) = (d_{h-1}d_{h-2}\dots d_0.d_{-1}\dots d_{-\alpha})_{10}$, $DF(\delta) = (0.0\dots 0d_{-(\alpha+1)}d_{-(\alpha+2)}\dots)_{10}$ and $DF(v') = (d'_{h-1}d'_{h-2}\dots d'_0.d'_{-1}d'_{-2}\dots d'_{-\alpha}\dots)_{10}$. Figure 5 shows the vertical form of the calculation for $v' = v - \delta$, from which we can clearly conclude that $d_i = d'_i$ for $-(\alpha - 1) \leq i \leq h - 1$, and that $d'_{-\alpha} = d_{-\alpha} - 1$. There are two cases: $SP(v) = -\alpha$ and $SP(v) \neq -\alpha$. For the former, we have $d_i = 0$ for $-(\alpha - 1) \leq i \leq h - 1$ and $d_{-\alpha} \neq 0$ according to the definition of the start decimal significant position. Since $v \neq 10^{-i}$, i.e., $d_{-\alpha} \neq 1$, we have $d'_{-\alpha} = d_{-\alpha} - 1 \neq 0$, i.e., $SP(v') = -\alpha = SP(v)$. For the latter, as $v \neq 0$ and $SP(v) \neq -\alpha$, there must exist $j \in \{h-1, h-2, \dots, -(\alpha-1)\}$ such that $d_j \neq 0$. Suppose d_{j^*} is the first one for $d_j \neq 0$, i.e., $SP(v) = j^*$. Because $d'_i = d_i$ for $-(\alpha - 1) \leq i \leq h - 1$, d'_{j^*} is also the first one for $d'_j \neq 0$, i.e., $SP(v') = j^* = SP(v)$.

When $v = 10^{-i}$, $i > 0$, Theorem 2 does not hold. Figure 6(a) gives an example of $v = 0.1$ with $SP(v) = -1$. If performing the erasing operation on v , we get $v' = 0.0625$ with $SP(v') = -2$.

Theorem 3 *Given a double value $v = 10^{-i}$, $i > 0$, and its best mantissa prefix number v' , we have $SP(v) = SP(v') + 1$.*

Proof Suppose $\alpha = DP(v)$, we have $\alpha > 0$ and $v = 10^{-\alpha}$. The exponent value of the v 's underlying storage is $e = \lfloor \log_2 |v| \rfloor + 1023 = \lfloor -\alpha \times \log_2 10 \rfloor + 1023$. Based on Equation (5), we have $g(\alpha) = \lceil \alpha \times \log_2 10 \rceil + \lfloor -\alpha \times \log_2 10 \rfloor = 0$. That is, we will erase all of the mantissa bits, so $v' = (-1)^s \times 2^{\lfloor \log_2 |v| \rfloor} = 2^{\lfloor \log_2 10^{-\alpha} \rfloor}$. Let $v \div v' = 10^{-\alpha} \div 2^{\lfloor \log_2 10^{-\alpha} \rfloor} = 2^{\log_2 10^{-\alpha}} \div 2^{\lfloor \log_2 10^{-\alpha} \rfloor} =$




Fig. 6 Corner Cases of *Elf* Eraser.

Algorithm 1: *ElfEraser*(v, out)

```

1  $\alpha \leftarrow DP(v), \beta^* \leftarrow DS^*(v); // \text{Equation (9)}$ 
2  $\delta \leftarrow \sim(0\text{xffffffffffL} \ll (52 - g(\alpha))) \& v;$ 
3 if  $\beta^* < 16$  and  $\delta \neq 0$  and  $52 - g(\alpha) > 4$  then
  // perform erasing
4    $out.writeBit("1"); out.write(\beta^*, 4);$ 
5    $v' \leftarrow (0\text{xffffffffffL} \ll (52 - g(\alpha))) \& v;$ 
6 else // do not perform erasing
7    $out.writeBit("0"); v' \leftarrow v;$ 
8  $XOR_{cmp}(v', out);$ 

```

$2^{\log_2 10^{-\alpha} - \lfloor \log_2 10^{-\alpha} \rfloor}$. Since $\log_2 10^{-\alpha} - \lfloor \log_2 10^{-\alpha} \rfloor \in (0, 1)$, we have $v \div v' \in (1, 2)$. Further $v' \in (0.5 \times 10^{-\alpha}, 10^{-\alpha})$. Consequently, $SP(v) = SP(v') + 1$.

According to Theorem 2 and Theorem 3, Equation (6) can be rewritten as:

$$\alpha = \begin{cases} \beta - (SP(v') + 1) & v \neq 10^{-i}, i > 0 \\ \beta - (SP(v') + 2) & v = 10^{-i}, i > 0 \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

For any normal number v , its decimal significand count β will not be zero. Besides, if we know $v = 10^{SP(v)}$, $SP(v) < 0$, we can easily get v from v' by the following equation:

$$v = 10^{SP(v')+1} \quad (8)$$

To this end, we can record a modified decimal significand count β^* for the calculation of α .

$$\beta^* = DS^*(v) = \begin{cases} 0 & v = 10^{-i}, i > 0 \\ \beta & \text{others} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Although there are 18 possible different values of β^* , i.e., $\beta^* \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 17\}$, we do not consider the situations when $\beta^* = 16$ or 17 , because for these two situations, we can only erase a small number of bits but need more bits to record β^* , which leads to a negative gain (more details will be discussed in Section 6.2). For example, as shown in Figure 6(b), given $v = 3.141592653589792$ with $\beta = 16$, we can erase one bit only. In our implementation, we leverage 4 bits to record β^* for $0 \leq \beta^* \leq 15$. To ensure a positive gain, when $52 - g(\alpha) \leq 4$, we do not perform the erasing operation.

3.1.4 When δ is Zero

As shown in Figure 6(c), given $v = 0.75$, we get $v' = v$ and $\delta = 0$. In this situation, we cannot recover v from v' according to Equation (4). In fact, $\delta = 0$ indicates that v itself has long trailing zeros. Therefore, once $\delta = 0$, we will keep v as it is.

3.1.5 Summary of *Elf* Eraser

Elf Eraser [34] utilizes one bit to indicate whether we have erased v or not. As shown in Algorithm 1, it takes as input a double value v and an output stream out .

We first calculate the decimal place count α and modified decimal significand count β^* based on Equation (9), and get δ by extracting the least $52 - g(\alpha)$ significant mantissa bits of v (Lines 1-2).

If the three conditions (i.e., $\beta^* < 16$, $\delta \neq 0$ and $52 - g(\alpha) > 4$) hold simultaneously, the output stream out writes one bit of "1" to indicate that v should be transformed, followed by 4 bits of β^* for the recovery of v . We get v' by erasing the least $52 - g(\alpha)$ significant mantissa bits of v (Lines 4-5). Otherwise, the output stream out writes one bit of "0", and v' is assigned v without any modification (Line 7).

Finally, the obtained v' is passed to an XOR-based compressor together with out for further compression (Line 8).

3.2 *Elf* Restorer

Elf Restorer is an inverse process of *Elf* Eraser. Algorithm 2 depicts the pseudo-code of *Elf* Restorer [34], which takes in an input stream in . First, we read one bit from the input stream in to get the modification flag $flag$ (Line 1), which has two cases:

(1) If $flag$ equals to 0, it means that we have not modified the original value, so we get a value from the XOR-based decompressor and assign it to v directly (Line 3).




Fig. 7 Equal Modified Significant Counts VS Unequal Modified Significant Counts of Two Consecutive Values.

Algorithm 2: *ElfRestorer*(*in*)

```

1 flag ← in.read(1);
2 if flag = 0 then // no restoration required
3   v ← XORdcmp(in);
4 else // perform restoring
5    $\beta^* \leftarrow \text{in.read}(4); v' \leftarrow \text{XOR}_{dcmp}(\text{in});$ 
6   if  $\beta^* = 0$  then
7     v ←  $10^{SP(v')+1}$ ; // Equation (8)
8   else
9      $\alpha \leftarrow \beta^* - (SP(v') + 1)$ ; // Equation (7)
10    v ← LeaveOut(v',  $\alpha$ ) +  $10^{-\alpha}$ ;
        // Equation (4)
11 return v;

```

(2) Otherwise, we read 4 bits from *in* to get the modified decimal significant count β^* , and then get a value *v'* from an XOR-based decompressor. If β^* equals to 0, *v* has a format of 10^{-i} , where $-i = SP(v') + 1$ (Line 7). If $\beta^* \neq 0$, we can recover *v* from β^* and *v'* based on Equation (7) and Equation (4) (Lines 9-10).

Finally, the recovered *v* is returned (Line 11).

4 *Elf+* Eraser and Restorer

In this section, we propose to optimize the significant count encoding strategy, which introduces *Elf+* Eraser and its corresponding Restorer.

4.1 Observation

We observe that the values in a time series usually have similar significant counts; therefore, their modified significant counts are also similar (we may interchange the terms of significant count and modified significant count in the following of this section). In Algorithm 1, if a value *v* is to be erased, we always use four bits to record its β^* , which is not quite effective. One possible method is to record a global β_g^* of a time series, so the significant count β^* of each value *v* can be represented by β_g^* . However, this method has several drawbacks. First, it requires to know the global significant count

before compressing a time series, but this usually cannot be achieved in streaming scenarios. Note that the significant counts of values in a time series are not always the same, so selecting an appropriate β_g^* is not easy. Second, using β_g^* to stand for β^* might lead to insufficient compression when $\beta^* < \beta_g^*$, or lossy compression when $\beta^* > \beta_g^*$.

To this end, this paper proposes to make the utmost of the modified significant count of the previous one value, which is not only suitable for streaming scenarios and adaptive to dynamic significant counts, but also retains the characteristics of lossless compression. The intuition behind this is that the modified significant count of each value in a time series is likely to be exactly the same as that of the previous value. Figure 7 presents the ratio of equal cases and unequal cases of two consecutive values' modified significant counts in 22 datasets (for more details please see Section 8) respectively, from which we can see that the equal cases are far more than unequal cases for almost all datasets.

4.2 *Elf+* Eraser

We can optimize the modified significant count encoding as follows. If the three conditions (i.e., $C_1: \beta^* < 16$, $\delta \neq 0$ and $52 - g(\alpha) > 4$) in Algorithm 1 hold simultaneously, we further check whether the modified significant count β^* of the current value is equal to that of the previous one β_{pre}^* . If $\beta^* = \beta_{pre}^*$, instead of writing the value of β^* with 4 bits, we write only one bit of '0', because we can recover β^* from β_{pre}^* , which saves 3 bits. If $\beta^* \neq \beta_{pre}^*$, we would write one more bit of '1' followed by 4 bits of β^* . As a result, the eraser in Algorithm 1 (shown in Figure 8(a)) is converted into the eraser shown in Figure 8(b). Suppose the ratio of equal cases in a time series is r_e . Let $r_e \times 3 - (1 - r_e) > 0$, we have $r_e > 0.25$. That is, if the ratio of equal cases is greater than 0.25, we can always guarantee a positive gain through the above optimization.

We also notice that the case of " C_1 and $\beta^* = \beta_{pre}^*$ " has the largest proportion among the three cases in Figure 8(b) for almost all datasets, but we use 2 bits (i.e.,




Fig. 8 Evolutionary Process of *Elf+* Eraser.

Algorithm 3: *ElfPlusEraser*(v, out)

```

1  $\alpha \leftarrow DP(v), \beta^* \leftarrow DS^*(v); // \text{Equation (9)}$ 
2  $\delta \leftarrow \sim(0x\text{ffffffffffff}\lll (52 - g(\alpha))) \& v;$ 
3 if  $\beta^* < 16$  and  $\delta \neq 0$  and  $52 - g(\alpha) > 4$  then
4   if  $\beta^* = \beta_{pre}^*$  then
5      $out.writeBit("0");$ 
6   else
7      $out.writeBit("11"); out.write(\beta^*, 4);$ 
8      $\beta_{pre}^* \leftarrow \beta^*;$ 
9    $v' \leftarrow (0x\text{ffffffffffff}\lll (52 - g(\alpha))) \& v;$ 
10 else
11    $out.writeBit("10"); v' \leftarrow v;$ 
12  $XOR_{cmp}(v', out);$ 

```

'10') to represent this case. According to the coding theory [24], more frequent cases are encoded with fewer bits. Therefore, we propose to switch the flag codes (i.e., '10' and '0') of case " C_1 and $\beta^* = \beta_{pre}^*$ " and case "Not C_1 " in Figure 8(b). Finally, the eraser is transformed into the one shown in Figure 8(c).

Algorithm 3 presents *Elf+* Eraser, which is similar to Algorithm 1 except two aspects. (1) We further check if $\beta^* = \beta_{pre}^*$ when v is to be erased (Lines 4-9). If $\beta^* = \beta_{pre}^*$, we only write one bit of '0'. Otherwise, we write two bits of '11' and four bits of β^* . Moreover, we assign β^* to β_{pre}^* for the compression of the next value (Line 8). (2) The flag codes are different from those in Algorithm 1. For example, in Algorithm 1, we use one bit of '0' to indicate the case that v would not be erased, but in Algorithm 3 we leverage two bits of '10' for this case (Line 11).

4.3 *Elf+* Restorer

Correspondingly, *Elf* Restorer needs to make some adjustments. As depicted in Algorithm 4, we first read one bit of flag code from the input stream in . If the flag code equals to '0', it means that the significand count β^* of the current value is the same as that of the previous one, so we set β^* as β_{pre}^* , get the erased value v' from the decompressor, and restore v from v' with the help of β^* (Lines 1-3). If the flag code does not equal to

Algorithm 4: *ElfPlusRestorer*(in)

```

1 if  $in.read(1) = 0$  then
2    $\beta^* \leftarrow \beta_{pre}^*; v' \leftarrow XOR_{dcmp}(in);$ 
3    $v \leftarrow restore(\beta^*, v');$ 
4 else if  $in.read(1) = 0$  then
5    $v \leftarrow XOR_{dcmp}(in);$ 
6 else
7    $\beta^* \leftarrow in.read(4); v' \leftarrow XOR_{dcmp}(in);$ 
8    $v \leftarrow restore(\beta^*, v'); \beta_{pre}^* \leftarrow \beta^*;$ 
9 return  $v;$ 
10 Function  $restore(\beta^*, v')$ 
11   if  $\beta^* = 0$  then
12      $v \leftarrow 10^{SP(v')+1}; // \text{Equation (8)}$ 
13   else
14      $\alpha \leftarrow \beta^* - (SP(v') + 1); // \text{Equation (7)}$ 
15      $v \leftarrow LeaveOut(v', \alpha) + 10^{-\alpha};$ 
16      $// \text{Equation (4)}$ 
17   return  $v;$ 

```

'0', we further read one bit of flag code from in . If the new flag code is equal to '0', we just obtain v from in (Line 5). Otherwise, we get β^* by reading four bits from in , obtain the erased value v' from the decompressor, and restore v from v' with β^* (Lines 7-8). Note that we need also to update β_{pre}^* for the decompression of the next value (Line 8). The function of $restore$ (Lines 10-16) has the same logic with that in Algorithm 2.

5 XOR_{cmp} and XOR_{dcmp}

Theoretically, any existing XOR-based compressor such as Gorilla [49] and Chimp [37] can be utilized in *Elf*. Since the erased value v' tends to contain long trailing zeros, to compress the time series compactly, in this section, we propose a novel XOR-based compressor and the corresponding decompressor. Note that both *Elf* and *Elf+* use the same XOR_{cmp} and XOR_{dcmp} .




Fig. 9 Evolutionary Process of *Elf XOR_{cmp}* for v'_t ($t \neq 1$).

5.1 *Elf XOR_{cmp}*

5.1.1 First Value Compression

Existing XOR-based compressors store the first value v'_1 of a time series using 64 bits. However, after being erased some insignificant mantissa bits, v'_1 tends to have a large number of trailing zeros. As a result, we leverage $\lceil \log_2 65 \rceil = 7$ bits to record the number of trailing zeros $trail$ of v'_1 (note that $trail$ can be assigned a total of 65 values from 0 to 64), and store v'_1 's non-trailing bits with $64 - trail$ bits. In all, we utilize $71 - trail$ bits to record the first value, which is usually less than 64 bits.

5.1.2 Other Values Compression

For each value v'_t that $t > 1$, we store $xor_t = v'_t \oplus v'_{t-1}$ as most existing XOR-based compressors did. Our proposed XOR-based compressor is extended from Gorilla [49] and at the same time borrows some ideas from Chimp [37].

Gorilla Compressor. As shown in Figure 9(a), Gorilla compressor checks whether xor_t is equal to 0 or not. If $xor_t = 0$ (i.e., $v'_t = v'_{t-1}$), Gorilla writes one bit of “0”, and thus it can save many bits without actually storing v'_t . If $xor_t \neq 0$, Gorilla writes one bit of “1” and further checks whether the condition C_1 is satisfied. Here C_1 is “ $lead_t \geq lead_{t-1}$ and $trail_t \geq trail_{t-1}$ ”, meaning that the leading zeros count and trailing zeros count of xor_t are greater than or equal to those of xor_{t-1} , respectively. If C_1 does not hold, after writing a bit of “1”, Gorilla stores the leading zeros count and center bits count with 5 bits and 6 bits respectively, followed by the actual center bits. Otherwise, xor_t shares the information of leading zeros count and center bits count with xor_{t-1} , which is expected to save some bits.

Leading Code Optimization. Observing that the leading zeros count of an XORed value is rarely more than 30 or less than 8, Chimp [37] proposes to use only $\log_2 8 = 3$ bits to represent up to 24 leading zeros. In particular, Chimp leverages 8 exponentially decaying steps (i.e., 0, 8, 12, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24) to approximately

represent the leading zeros count. If the actual leading zeros count is between 0 and 7, Chimp approximates it to be 0; if it is between 8 and 11, Chimp regards it as 8; and so on. The condition of C_1 is therefore converted into C_2 , i.e., “ $lead_t = lead_{t-1}$ and $trail_t \geq trail_{t-1}$ ”. By applying this optimization to the Gorilla compressor, we can get a compressor shown in Figure 9(b).

Center Code Optimization. Both v'_t and v'_{t-1} are supposed to have many trailing zeros, which results in an XORed value with long trailing zeros. Besides, v'_t would not differentiate much from v'_{t-1} in most cases, contributing to long leading zeros in the XORed value. That is, the XORed value tends to have a small number of center bits (usually not more than 16). To this end, if the center bits count is less than or equal to 16, we use only $\log_2 16 = 4$ bits to encode it. Although we need one more flag bit, we can usually save one bit in comparison with the original solution. After optimizing the center code, we get a compressor shown in Figure 9(c).

Flag Code Reassignment. Figure 9(c) shows that we use only 1 flag bit for the case of $xor_t = 0$, but 2 or 3 flag bits for the cases of $xor_t \neq 0$. As pointed out by Chimp [37], identical consecutive values are not very frequent in floating-point time series. Thus, using only 1 bit to indicate the case of $xor_t = 0$ is not particularly effective. To this end, we reassign the flag codes to the four cases. Therefore, each case uses only 2 bits of flag, as illustrated in Figure 9(d).

5.1.3 Summary of *Elf XOR_{cmp}*

Algorithm 5 depicts the pseudo-code of *Elf XOR_{cmp}*, which is self-explanatory. In Lines 1-4, we deal with the first value of a time series, and in Lines 6-22, we handle the four cases shown in Figure 9(d) respectively. Note that the function $binNumOfLeadingZeros(xor)$ in Line 11 calculates the approximate leading zeros count of xor , as discussed above.

Algorithm 5: $ElfXOR_{cmp}(v'_t, out)$

```

1 if  $v'_t$  is the first value then // compress the first
  value
2    $lead_t \leftarrow \infty; trail_t \leftarrow numOfTrailingZeros(v'_t);$ 
3    $out.write(trail_t, 7);$ 
4    $out.write(nonTrailingBits(v'_t), 64 - trail_t);$ 
5 else // compress other values
6    $xor \leftarrow v'_t \oplus v'_{t-1};$ 
7   if  $xor = 0$  then // case 01
8      $out.writeBit("01");$ 
9      $lead_t \leftarrow lead_{t-1}; trail_t \leftarrow trail_{t-1};$ 
10  else
11     $lead_t \leftarrow binNumOfLeadingZeros(xor);$ 
12     $trail_t \leftarrow numOfTrailingZeros(xor);$ 
13     $center \leftarrow 64 - lead_t - trail_t;$ 
14    if  $lead_t = lead_{t-1}$  and  $trail_t \geq trail_{t-1}$ 
15      then
16         $out.writeBit("00");$  // case 00
17      else if  $center \leq 16$  then // case 10
18         $out.writeBit("10");$ 
19         $out.write(lead_t, 3); out.write(center, 4);$ 
20      else // case 11
21         $out.writeBit("11");$ 
22         $out.write(lead_t, 3); out.write(center, 6);$ 
23         $out.write(centerBits(v'_t), center);$ 

```

5.2 $ElfXOR_{dcmp}$

The decompressor takes opposite actions of the compressor. As shown in Algorithm 6, $ElfXOR_{dcmp}$ takes an input stream in as input. We decompress the first value in Lines 1-3, and cope with the four cases respectively in Lines 5-19. For case 01, the algorithm sets the current value v'_t as the previous one v'_{t-1} . For case 00, case 10 and case 11, we first update the leading zeros count $lead_t$, center bits count $center$ and trailing zeros count $trail_t$ respectively, and then get the current value v'_t (Line 19). At last, v'_t is returned to Elf Restorer (Line 20).

6 Discussion

In this section, we first report the implementation details, and then analyze the effectiveness and complexity of Elf algorithm. Next, we investigate a possible variant. Finally, we extend Elf to the special numbers of double values. If not specified, the discussion for Elf is also applicable to $Elf+$.

Algorithm 6: $ElfXOR_{dcmp}(in)$

```

1 if it is the first value then // decompress the
  first value
2    $lead_t \leftarrow \infty; trail_t \leftarrow in.read(7);$ 
3    $v'_t \leftarrow in.read(64 - trail_t) \ll trail_t;$ 
4 else // decompress other values
5    $flag \leftarrow in.read(2);$ 
6   if  $flag = "01"$  then // case 01
7      $lead_t \leftarrow lead_{t-1}; trail_t \leftarrow trail_{t-1};$ 
8      $v'_t \leftarrow v'_{t-1};$ 
9   else
10    if  $flag = "00"$  then // case 00
11       $lead_t \leftarrow lead_{t-1}; trail_t \leftarrow trail_{t-1};$ 
12       $center \leftarrow 64 - lead_t - trail_t;$ 
13    else if  $flag = "10"$  then // case 10
14       $lead_t \leftarrow in.read(3); center \leftarrow in.read(4);$ 
15       $trail_t \leftarrow 64 - lead_t - center;$ 
16    else // case 11
17       $lead_t \leftarrow in.read(3); center \leftarrow in.read(6);$ 
18       $trail_t \leftarrow 64 - lead_t - center;$ 
19     $v'_t \leftarrow (in.read(center) \ll trail_t) \oplus v'_{t-1};$ 
20 return  $v'_t;$ 

```

6.1 Implementation Details

6.1.1 Significand Count Calculation

During the implementation, we find that the most time-consuming step of Elf compression is to calculate the significand counts of floating-point values. Currently, most programming languages do not provide out-of-the-box statements for calculating the significand counts of floating-point values efficiently. The naive method is to first transform a floating-point value into a string, and then calculate its significand count by scanning the string. However, this method runs very slowly since the data type transformation is quite expensive. Other methods, such as `BigDecimal` in Java language, perform even worse as these high-level classes implement many complex but unnecessary logics, which are not suitable for the calculation of significand counts.

Elf Implementation. We adopt a trial-and-error approach. In particular, for our basic Elf Eraser (i.e., Algorithm 1) [34], we iteratively check if the condition " $v \times 10^i = \lfloor v \times 10^i \rfloor$ " holds (only when the result of $v \times 10^i$ does not have the fractional part, does the condition hold), where i is sequentially from sp^* to at most $sp^* + 17$ (note that the maximum significand count of a double value is 17 [28, 37]). Here, sp^* is calculated by:

$$sp^* = \begin{cases} 1 & SP(v) \geq 0 \\ -SP(v) & SP(v) < 0 \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

The value i (denoted as i^*) that first makes the equation " $v \times 10^i = \lfloor v \times 10^i \rfloor$ " hold can be deemed as the decimal

Algorithm 7: *ElfPlusBetaCalculation*(v, β_{pre}^*)

```

1  $i \leftarrow \max(\beta_{pre}^* - SP(v) - 1, 1)$ ; // Equation (6)
  // Case 1:  $\beta \geq \beta_{pre}^*$ 
2 while  $v \times 10^i \neq \lfloor v \times 10^i \rfloor$  do
3    $i \leftarrow i + 1$ ;
  // Case 2:  $\beta < \beta_{pre}^*$ 
4 while  $i > 1$  and  $v \times 10^{i-1} = \lfloor v \times 10^{i-1} \rfloor$  do
5    $i \leftarrow i - 1$ ;
6 return  $SP(v) + i + 1$ ; // Equation (6)

```

place count α ⁴. At last, we can get the significand count $\beta = i^* + SP(v) + 1$ according to Equation (6).

Elf+ Implementation. The verification of the condition “ $v \times 10^i = \lfloor v \times 10^i \rfloor$ ” is expected to take $\mathcal{O}(\beta)$ in terms of time complexity. To expedite this process, we take full advantage of the fact that most values in a time series have the same significand count. Particularly, as depicted in Algorithm 7, we start the verification at $i = \max(\beta_{pre}^* - SP(v) - 1, 1)$ based on Equation (6). There are two cases. Case 1: $\beta \geq \beta_{pre}^*$. For this case, if “ $v \times 10^i = \lfloor v \times 10^i \rfloor$ ” does not hold, we repetitively increase i by 1 until the condition is satisfied (Lines 2-3). Case 2: $\beta < \beta_{pre}^*$. For this case, we should constantly adjust i by decreasing it until the condition “ $i > 1$ and $v \times 10^{i-1} = \lfloor v \times 10^{i-1} \rfloor$ ” does not hold (Lines 4-5). Finally, the significand count is obtained and returned according to Equation (6) (Line 6).

Algorithm 7 is expected to take only $\mathcal{O}(1)$, since the values in a time series have similar significand counts.

6.1.2 Start Position Calculation

Another time-consuming operation is calculating the start position $SP(v)$ of a value v . In our initial implementation of *Elf* [34], we achieve this through $SP(v) = \lfloor \log_{10}|v| \rfloor$ directly. However, logarithmic operations are relatively expensive. In *Elf+*, we leverage two sorted exponential arrays, i.e., $\log Arr_1 = \{10^0, 10^1, \dots, 10^i, \dots\}$ and $\log Arr_2 = \{10^0, 10^{-1}, \dots, 10^{-j}, \dots\}$, to accelerate this process. Particularly, we sequentially scan these two arrays firstly. If $v \geq 1$ and $10^i \leq v < 10^{i+1}$, then $SP(v) = i$; if $v < 1$ and $10^{-j} \leq v < 10^{-(j-1)}$, then $SP(v) = -j$. In *Elf+* implementation, we set $|\log Arr_1| = |\log Arr_2| = 10$, because this can meet the requirements of most time series. If $v \geq 10^{10}$ or $v \leq 10^{-10}$, we call $\lfloor \log_{10}|v| \rfloor$ to get $SP(v)$ finally.

We want to emphasize that our *Elf* compression algorithm is orthogonal to the ways of significand count

⁴ It is not exactly true for floating-point calculation. We may get an $i^* > DP(v)$. For example, we get 55.00000000000001 for 0.55×10^2 but 550.0 for 0.55×10^3 , so $i^* = 3$. However, this will not lead to lossy compression.

calculation and start position calculation. In the future, we may design a special computer instruction or special hardware for these two calculations, which can potentially enhance the efficiency further.

6.2 Effectiveness Analysis

Elf Eraser transforms a floating-point value to another one with more trailing zeros under a guaranteed bound (see Theorem 4), so it can potentially improve the compression ratio of most XOR-based compression methods tremendously.

Theorem 4 *Given a double value v with its decimal significand count $\beta = DS(v)$, we can erase x bits in its mantissa, where $51 - \beta \log_2 10 < x < 53 - (\beta - 1) \log_2 10$.*

Proof Suppose $\alpha = DP(v)$, we have:

$$DF(v) = \begin{cases} (d_{\beta-\alpha-1}d_{\beta-\alpha-2}\dots d_0.d_{-1}\dots d_{-\alpha})_{10} & \text{if } v \geq 1 \\ (0.00\dots d_{\beta-\alpha-1}d_{\beta-\alpha-2}\dots d_{-\alpha})_{10} & \text{if } v < 1 \end{cases}$$

$$\implies 10^{\beta-\alpha-1} \leq v < 10^{\beta-\alpha}$$

$$\implies \log_2 10^{\beta-\alpha-1} \leq \log_2 v < \log_2 10^{\beta-\alpha}$$

$$\implies \lfloor (\beta - \alpha - 1) \log_2 10 \rfloor \leq \lfloor \log_2 v \rfloor \leq \lfloor (\beta - \alpha) \log_2 10 \rfloor$$

$$\implies \lceil \alpha \log_2 10 \rceil + \lfloor (\beta - \alpha - 1) \log_2 10 \rfloor \leq \lceil \alpha \log_2 10 \rceil + \lfloor \log_2 v \rfloor = g(\alpha) \leq \lceil \alpha \log_2 10 \rceil + \lfloor (\beta - \alpha) \log_2 10 \rfloor$$

$$\implies \alpha \log_2 10 + (\beta - \alpha - 1) \log_2 10 - 1 < g(\alpha) < \alpha \log_2 10 + 1 + (\beta - \alpha) \log_2 10$$

$$\implies (\beta - 1) \log_2 10 - 1 < g(\alpha) < \beta \log_2 10 + 1$$

$$\implies 51 - \beta \log_2 10 < 52 - g(\alpha) = x < 53 - (\beta - 1) \log_2 10.$$

According to Theorem 4, the number of erased bits is dependent merely on the decimal significand count β of the double value. A bigger β usually means fewer bits erased. If $\beta \leq 14$, we can erase at least $\lceil 51 - 14 \times \log_2 10 \rceil = 5$ bits, which always guarantees a positive gain. But if $\beta \geq 16$, we can only erase at most $\lceil 53 - (16 - 1) \times \log_2 10 \rceil = 3$ bits, leading to a negative gain as it requires at least 4 bits to record β^* . As a consequence, *Elf* compression algorithm keeps v as it is when $DS(v) \geq 16$. *Elf+* usually has a better compression ratio than *Elf*, since it uses fewer bits to record β^* .

6.3 Complexity Analysis

6.3.1 Time Complexity

For each value, *Elf* Eraser (i.e., Algorithm 1) can directly determine the erased bits in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ and perform the erasing operation by efficient bitwise manipulations. In *Elf XOR_{cmp}* (i.e., Algorithm 5), all operations can

be performed in $\mathcal{O}(1)$. For *Elf* Decompressor, Restorer (i.e., Algorithm 2) and XOR_{dcmp} (i.e., Algorithm 6) sequentially read data from an input stream and perform all operations in $\mathcal{O}(1)$. Overall, the time complexity of *Elf* is $\mathcal{O}(N)$, where N is the length of a time series.

Our proposed *Elf* compression algorithm performs an extra erasing step before actually compressing the data. It is reasonable that the overall computation complexity of *Elf* compression algorithm is a little bit higher than that of other XOR-based compression methods, e.g., Gorilla and Chimp.

Elf+ has the same time complexity with *Elf*, but it usually runs faster than *Elf*, because it calculates the significand counts of values by making full use of that of the previous one value.

6.3.2 Space Complexity

Neither *Elf* Eraser nor *Elf* Restorer stores any data, while both *Elf+* Eraser and *Elf+* Restorer only record the modified significand count of the previous value. Besides, both XOR_{cmp} and XOR_{dcmp} only store the previous leading zeros count $lead_{t-1}$, trailing zeros count $trail_{t-1}$ and value v'_{t-1} . To this end, the space complexity of *Elf* and *Elf+* is both $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

6.4 A Possible Variant Discussion

In the erasing process, we let $v' = v - \delta$ where $0 \leq \delta < 10^{-\alpha}$. Can we let $0 \leq \delta < k \times 10^{-\alpha}$, $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, 9\}$, which is supposed to make v' have more trailing zeros?

The decimal value $k \times 10^{-\alpha}$ can be represented by $f_k(\alpha) = \lceil \log_2(k \times 10^{-\alpha}) \rceil = \lceil \log_2 k - \alpha \log_2 10 \rceil$ binary bits. Since $k < 10$ and $\alpha \geq 1$, $f_k(\alpha) = \lceil \alpha \log_2 10 - \log_2 k \rceil$. According to Theorem 1, $\delta = \sum_{i=f_k(\alpha)+1}^{\lceil l \rceil} b_i \times 2^{-i} \leq \sum_{i=f_k(\alpha)+1}^{\lceil l \rceil} 2^{-i} < \sum_{i=f_k(\alpha)+1}^{+\infty} 2^{-i} = 2^{-f_k(\alpha)} = 2^{-\lceil \alpha \log_2 10 - \log_2 k \rceil} \leq 2^{-(\alpha \log_2 10 - \log_2 k)} = 2^{\log_2(k \times 10^{-\alpha})} = k \times 10^{-\alpha}$. That is to say, if we erase the bits after $b_{-f_k(\alpha)}$ in $BF(v)$, we can still recover v by $LeaveOut(v', \alpha) + k' \times 10^{-\alpha}$, where $LeaveOut$ has the same meaning with that in Equation (4), and $k' \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. But it requires $\lceil \log_2 k \rceil$ bits to store k' . We call this method *Elf_k*.

Theorem 5 *Elf_k will not achieve a better gain than Elf.*

Proof Suppose y is the additional number of bits that *Elf_k* can erase over *Elf* (i.e., *Elf₁*), then $y - \lceil \log_2 k \rceil$ is the gain of *Elf_k* over *Elf*. We have: $y = (52 - g_k(\alpha)) - (52 - g_1(\alpha)) = \lceil \alpha \log_2 10 \rceil - \lceil \alpha \log_2 10 - \log_2 k \rceil \implies \alpha \log_2 10 - (\alpha \log_2 10 - \log_2 k + 1) < y < (\alpha \log_2 10 + 1) - (\alpha \log_2 10 - \log_2 k) \implies \log_2 k - 1 < y < \log_2 k +$

$1 \implies \log_2 k - 1 - \lceil \log_2 k \rceil < y - \lceil \log_2 k \rceil < \log_2 k + 1 - \lceil \log_2 k \rceil \implies -2 < y - \lceil \log_2 k \rceil < 1$. It means that *Elf_k* would consume the same bits with or one more bit than *Elf*.

6.5 Elf for Special Numbers

As shown in Figure 3, according to the values of \vec{e} and \vec{m} , there are four types of special numbers:

(1) **Zero.** If $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 11\}$, $e_i = 0$ and $\forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, 52\}$, $m_j = 0$, then v represents a zero.

(2) **Infinity.** If $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 11\}$, $e_i = 1$ and $\forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, 52\}$, $m_j = 0$, then v stands for an infinity.

(3) **Not a Number.** If $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 11\}$, $e_i = 1$ and $\exists j \in \{1, 2, \dots, 52\}$, $m_j = 1$, then v is not a number (i.e., $v = NaN$).

(4) **Subnormal Number.** If $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 11\}$, $e_i = 0$ and $\exists j \in \{1, 2, \dots, 52\}$, $m_j = 1$, then v is a subnormal number (or a subnormal). In this case, we have the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} v &= (-1)^s \times 2^{-1022} \times (0.m_1 m_2 \dots m_{52})_2 \\ &= (-1)^s \times 2^{-1022} \times \sum_{i=1}^{52} m_i \times 2^{-i} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

For these four special numbers, their restorers, compressors and decompressors are the same with that of normal numbers, but their erasers need to be tailored carefully.

Zero and Infinity Eraser. If v is a zero or infinity, we do not perform *Elf* erasing because all its mantissa bits are already 0s.

NaN Eraser. If v is NaN, in order to make its trailing zeros as many as possible, we perform the NaN_{norm} operation on it, which sets $m_1 = 1$ and $m_i = 0$ for $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, 52\}$, i.e.,

$$v' = NaN_{norm}(v) = 0xffff800000000000L \& v \quad (12)$$

Subnormal Number Eraser. According to Equation (2) and Equation (11), subnormal numbers can be regarded as the special cases of normal numbers by setting $e = 1$ and $m_0 = 0$. As a result, we can compress subnormal numbers in the same way of normal numbers using *Elf* Eraser.

7 Extension to Single Values

A single-precision floating-point value (abbr. **single value**) has a similar underlying storage layout to that of a double value, but it takes up only 32 bits, where 1 bit is for the sign, 8 bits for the exponent, and 23 bits for

the mantissa. To this end, when applying *Elf* to single values, we should make the following modifications.

Modifications for equations. We change “1023” in Equation (2), Equation (3) and Equation (5) to “127”, and “52” in Equation (2) and Equation (11) to “23”. We should also change “1022” in Equation (11) to “126”. For Equation (12), we let $NaN_{norm}(v) = 0xffc00000 \& v$.

Modifications for Eraser and Restorer. First, we change “ $\delta \leftarrow \sim(0xffffffffffffL \ll (52 - g(\alpha))) \& v$ ” (i.e., Line 2 in Algorithm 1 and Line 2 in Algorithm 3) to “ $\delta \leftarrow \sim(0xffffffff \ll (23 - g(\alpha))) \& v$ ”. Similarly, we change “ $v' \leftarrow (0xffffffffffffL \ll (52 - g(\alpha))) \& v$ ” (i.e., Line 5 in Algorithm 1 and Line 9 in Algorithm 3) to “ $v' \leftarrow (0xffffffff \ll (23 - g(\alpha))) \& v$ ”.

Second, since the maximum significand count of a single value is 7 [28, 37], we need only $\lceil \log_2 7 \rceil = 3$ bits to store β^* . Consequently, we change “*out.write*($\beta^*, 4$)” (i.e., Line 4 in Algorithm 1 and Line 7 in Algorithm 3) to “*out.write*($\beta^*, 3$)”. Correspondingly, we change “ $\beta^* \leftarrow \textit{in.read}(4)$ ” (i.e., Line 5 in Algorithm 2 and Line 7 in Algorithm 4) to “ $\beta^* \leftarrow \textit{in.read}(3)$ ”.

Third, for single values, the erasing condition “ $\beta^* < 16$ and $\delta \neq 0$ and $52 - g(\alpha) > 4$ ” (i.e., Line 3 in Algorithm 1 and Line 3 in Algorithm 3) should be converted into “ $\beta^* < 8$ and $\delta \neq 0$ and $23 - g(\alpha) > 3$ ”. Here, β^* will always be less than $2^3 = 8$, so the condition “ $\beta^* < 8$ ” can be omitted.

Modifications for XOR_{cmp} and XOR_{dcmp}. For the first place, as a single value occupies only 32 bits, we should change all “64” in Algorithm 5 and Algorithm 6 into “32” for single values.

Second, the number of trailing zeros of a single value would not be greater than 32, so we can use only $\lceil \log_2(32 + 1) \rceil = 6$ bits to record $trail_t$ in Line 3 of Algorithm 5. Similarly, in Line 2 of Algorithm 6, we only read 6 bits from *in* to obtain $trail_t$.

Third, in *Elf* for double values, we leverage 3 bits for 8 exponentially decaying steps (i.e., 0, 8, 12, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24) to approximately represent the leading zeros count, and 4 or 6 bits to store the number of center bits. As a single value takes up only 32 bits, the leading zeros count and center bits count of two consecutive single values will be much less than that of two consecutive double values, respectively. To this end, in *Elf* for single values, although we still utilize 3 bits to approximately represent the leading zeros count, the exponentially decaying steps would be 0, 6, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 20 (corresponding to Line 11 in Algorithm 5), which provides a fine-grained representation of leading zeros count. Furthermore, for single values, after the erasing and XORing operations, the center bits count of an XORed value is likely to be less than 8. In view of that, if the center bits count is less than 8,

Table 2 Details of Datasets

Dataset		#Records	β	Time Span	
Time Series	Small β	City-temp (CT)	2,905,887	3	25 years
		IR-bio-temp (IR)	380,817,839	3	7 years
		Wind-speed (WS)	199,570,396	2	6 years
		PM10-dust (PM10)	222,911	3	5 years
	Medium β	Stocks-UK (SUK)	115,146,731	5	1 year
		Stocks-USA (SUSA)	374,428,996	4	1 year
		Stocks-DE (SDE)	45,403,710	6	1 year
		Dewpoint-temp (DT)	5,413,914	4	3 years
		Air-pressure (AP)	137,721,453	7	6 years
		Basel-wind (BW)	124,079	8	14 years
Large β	Basel-temp (BT)	124,079	9	14 years	
	Bitcoin-price (BP)	2,741	9	1 month	
	Bird-migration (BM)	17,964	7	1 year	
Non Time Series	Air-sensor (AS)	8,664	17	1 hour	
Non Time Series	Small β	Food-price (FP)	2,050,638	3	-
		Vehicle-charge (VC)	3,395	3	-
	Medium β	Blockchain-tr (BTR)	231,031	5	-
		SD-bench (SB)	8,927	4	-
		City-lat (CLat)	41,001	6	-
	Large β	City-lon (CLon)	41,001	7	-
		POI-lat (PLat)	424,205	16	-
		POI-lon (PLon)	424,205	16	-

we use only $\log_2 8 = 3$ bits to encode it (corresponding to Line 16 and Line 18 in Algorithm 5, and Line 15 in Algorithm 6); otherwise, we use $\log_2 32 = 5$ bits (corresponding to Line 21 in Algorithm 5 and Line 18 in Algorithm 6).

8 Experiments

8.1 Datasets and Experimental Settings

8.1.1 Datasets

To verify the performance of *Elf* compression algorithm, we adopt 22 datasets including 14 time series and 8 non time series, which are further divided into three categories respectively according to their average decimal significand counts (as described in Table 2). Apart from the datasets used by Chimp [37], we also add three datasets (i.e., Vehicle-charge, City-lat and City-lon) to enrich the non time series with small and medium decimal significand counts. Each time series is ordered by the timestamps, while each non time series is in a random order given by its data publisher.

City-temp [2], collected by the University of Dayton to record the temperature of major cities around the world.

IR-bio-temp [46], which exhibits the changes in the temperature of infrared organisms.

Wind-speed [43], which describes the wind speed.

PM10-dust [45], which records near real-time measurements of PM10 in the atmosphere.

Stocks-UK, Stocks-USA and Stocks-DE [5], which contain the stock exchange prices of UK, USA and German respectively.

Dewpoint-temp [47], which records relative dew point temperature observed by sensors floating on rivers and lakes.

Air-pressure [44], which shows Barometric pressure corrected to sea level and surface level.

Basel-wind and Basel-temp [7], which respectively record the historical wind speed and temperature of Basel, Switzerland.

Bitcoin-price [8], which includes the price of Bitcoin in dollar exchange rate.

Bird-migration [8], an online dataset of animal tracking data that records the position of birds and the vegetation.

Air-sensor [8], a synthetic dataset recording air sensor data with random noise.

Food-price [6], global food prices data from the World Food Programme.

Vehicle-charge [3], which records the total energy use and charge time of a collection of electric vehicles.

Blockchain-tr [1], which records the transaction value of Bitcoin for a single day.

SD-bench [10], which describes the performance of multiple storage drives through a standardized series of tests.

City-lat, City-lon [11], which records the latitude and longitude of the cities and towns all over the world.

POI-lat, POI-lon [9], the coordinates in radian of Position-of-Interests (POI) extracted from Wikipedia.

8.1.2 Baselines

We compare *Elf* compression algorithm with **four** state-of-the-art lossless floating-point compression methods (i.e., Gorilla [49], Chimp [37], Chimp₁₂₈ [37] and FPC [17]) and **five** widely-used general compression methods (i.e., Xz [12], Brotli [13], LZ4 [20], Zstd [19] and Snappy [22]). The initial implementation [34] of the proposed method is termed as *Elf*, and the one that adopts significant count optimization and start position optimization is termed as *Elf+*. By regarding *Elf* Eraser (or *Elf+*Eraser) as a preprocessing step, we also compare **three** variants of Gorilla, Chimp and Chimp₁₂₈, denoted as Gorilla+Eraser, Chimp+Eraser and Chimp₁₂₈+Eraser (or Gorilla+Eraser⁺, Chimp+Eraser⁺ and Chimp₁₂₈+Eraser⁺) respectively, to verify the effectiveness of the erasing and XOR_{cmp} strategies. Most implementations of these competitors are extended from [37]. To make a fair comparison, we optimize the stream implementation of Gorilla as the same as Chimp [37], which improves the efficiency of Gorilla tremendously. All source codes and datasets are publicly available [4].

8.1.3 Metrics

We verify the performance of various methods in terms of three metrics: compression ratio, compression time and decompression time. Note that the compression ratio is defined as the ratio of the compressed data size to the original one.

8.1.4 Settings

As Chimp [37] did, we regard 1,000 records of each dataset as a block. Each compression method is executed on up to 100 blocks per dataset, and the average metrics of one block are finally reported. By default, we regard each value as a double value. All experiments are conducted on a personal computer equipped with Windows 11, 11th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-11400 @ 2.60GHz CPU and 16GB memory. The JDK (Java Development Kit) version is 1.8.

8.2 Overall Comparison for Double Values

Table 3 shows the performance of different compression algorithms on all datasets. We group the datasets into two categories (i.e., Time Series and Non Time Series), and investigate the performance of floating-point compression algorithms and general compression algorithms on each group of datasets, respectively.

8.2.1 Compression Ratio

With regard to the compression ratio, we have the following observations from Table 3.

(1) ***Elf* VS floating-point compression algorithms.** Among all the floating-point compression algorithms, *Elf* has the best compression ratio on almost all datasets (excluding *Elf+*). In particular, for the time series datasets, compared with Gorilla and FPC, *Elf* has an average relative improvement of $(0.76 - 0.37)/0.76 \approx 51\%$. Chimp has optimized the coding of Gorilla, and its upgraded version Chimp₁₂₈ resorts to a hash table (up to 33KB memory occupation) for fast searching an appropriate value in previous 128 data records. Therefore, they can achieve a significant improvement over Gorilla. However, thanks to the erasing technique and elaborate XOR_{cmp}, *Elf* can still achieve relative improvement of 47% and 12% over Chimp and Chimp₁₂₈ respectively on the time series datasets. Note that *Elf* has a lower memory footprint (i.e., $\mathcal{O}(1)$) in comparison with Chimp₁₂₈. For the non time series datasets, *Elf* is also relatively $(0.63 - 0.55)/0.63 \approx 12.7\%$ better than the best competitor Chimp₁₂₈. We notice that there are few datasets that Chimp₁₂₈ is slightly better than *Elf* in terms of

Table 3 Overall comparison with baselines for double values (the best values in each group are marked in **bold**). The compression ratio, compression time and decompression time are the average measurements on one block (i.e., 1,000 values).

Dataset		Time Series														Non Time Series											
		Small β				Medium β						Large β				Avg.	Small β			Medium β				Large β			Avg.
		CT	IR	WS	PM10	SUK	SUSA	SDE	DT	AP	BW	BT	BP	BM	AS	Avg.	FP	VC	BTR	SB	CLat	CLon	PLat	PLon	Avg.		
Compression Ratio	Floating	Gorilla	0.85	0.64	0.83	0.48	0.58	0.68	0.72	0.83	0.73	0.99	0.94	0.84	0.79	0.82	0.76	0.58	1.00	0.74	0.63	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	0.88	
		Chimp	0.64	0.59	0.81	0.46	0.52	0.64	0.67	0.77	0.65	0.88	0.85	0.77	0.72	0.77	0.70	0.47	0.86	0.67	0.55	0.92	0.98	0.90	0.99	0.79	
		Chimp ₁₂₈	0.32	0.24	0.23	0.21	0.29	0.23	0.27	0.35	0.54	0.71	0.47	0.72	0.50	0.77	0.42	0.34	0.36	0.55	0.27	0.78	0.85	0.90	0.99	0.63	
		FPC	0.75	0.61	0.85	0.50	0.74	0.70	0.73	0.82	0.67	0.92	0.90	0.81	0.75	0.82	0.75	0.62	0.91	0.69	0.59	0.96	1.00	0.95	1.00	0.84	
		Elf	0.25	0.21	0.25	0.16	0.22	0.24	0.26	0.31	0.31	0.59	0.58	0.56	0.42	0.85	0.37	0.23	0.34	0.36	0.27	0.56	0.63	0.96	1.06	0.55	
	Elf+	0.22	0.15	0.20	0.11	0.19	0.18	0.23	0.26	0.25	0.56	0.52	0.50	0.38	0.86	0.33	0.22	0.29	0.30	0.23	0.51	0.60	0.98	1.07	0.52		
	General	Xz	0.18	0.16	0.15	0.11	0.16	0.17	0.19	0.27	0.47	0.57	0.35	0.63	0.43	0.79	0.33	0.23	0.23	0.40	0.13	0.60	0.63	0.93	0.96	0.51	
		Brotli	0.20	0.18	0.17	0.12	0.19	0.20	0.22	0.32	0.51	0.61	0.39	0.71	0.47	0.85	0.37	0.26	0.28	0.43	0.14	0.65	0.68	0.94	0.96	0.54	
		LZ4	0.36	0.36	0.37	0.27	0.39	0.39	0.41	0.52	0.69	0.69	0.54	0.87	0.61	1.01	0.53	0.41	0.47	0.53	0.30	0.79	0.82	1.00	1.00	0.67	
		Zstd	0.22	0.24	0.19	0.14	0.22	0.24	0.26	0.38	0.58	0.61	0.41	0.75	0.51	0.91	0.40	0.30	0.34	0.45	0.17	0.68	0.71	0.94	0.96	0.57	
Snappy		0.29	0.30	0.27	0.21	0.32	0.32	0.35	0.51	0.73	0.75	0.54	0.99	0.61	1.00	0.51	0.39	0.42	0.54	0.25	0.83	0.87	1.00	1.00	0.66		
Compression Time (μ s)	Floating	Gorilla	18	21	17	15	17	17	17	18	20	21	20	19	18	20	18	16	19	18	16	19	19	19	19	18	
		Chimp	23	21	22	18	23	22	23	24	20	26	25	24	25	27	23	21	24	22	20	26	26	23	26	23	
		Chimp ₁₂₈	23	23	22	20	24	22	25	26	38	47	35	48	38	50	32	27	27	39	23	48	48	45	46	38	
		FPC	34	40	40	40	28	28	28	31	40	42	47	27	30	38	35	39	43	43	41	42	48	40	48	43	
		Elf	51	53	59	50	54	56	58	57	51	73	69	63	65	87	60	52	55	62	48	64	70	71	72	62	
	Elf+	34	35	53	30	40	39	43	39	59	72	54	42	51	82	48	41	42	43	35	51	63	48	66	49		
	General	Xz	948	1106	810	1056	877	836	900	1045	1959	1527	1100	1531	1444	2146	1235	898	1636	1036	1040	1252	1516	1476	1351	1276	
		Brotli	1639	1685	1557	1449	1584	1611	1693	1702	2074	1792	1715	1729	1827	1798	1704	1741	1674	1755	1522	1692	1712	1628	1633	1669	
		LZ4	1082	1106	963	984	966	976	952	1091	1285	1013	1010	1001	1000	1026	1032	985	974	1060	976	988	986	966	957	987	
		Zstd	209	212	112	208	177	112	117	218	317	259	291	271	256	277	217	211	227	251	202	236	245	206	113	211	
Snappy		195	236	52	214	169	56	172	195	179	189	200	169	261	158	175	188	250	190	200	207	238	178	149	200		
Decompression Time (μ s)	Floating	Gorilla	16	18	17	21	16	17	17	17	18	23	18	17	20	18	16	18	17	16	17	17	17	17	17		
		Chimp	24	22	24	19	22	24	24	54	19	30	26	27	25	25	26	21	26	24	21	26	26	24	26	24	
		Chimp ₁₂₈	17	16	16	15	18	16	18	18	22	28	21	26	22	25	20	18	19	22	17	26	26	23	24	22	
		FPC	28	28	26	29	25	24	25	25	32	27	31	24	26	34	28	28	29	29	29	30	36	28	35	31	
		Elf	38	44	46	43	37	45	44	45	41	58	53	48	48	29	44	33	44	49	39	52	57	31	33	42	
	Elf+	27	28	38	27	28	29	31	30	44	41	45	34	36	35	33	30	33	33	30	41	49	33	36	36		
	General	Xz	161	147	114	125	156	133	148	226	435	427	284	479	345	629	272	196	194	312	126	434	461	664	663	381	
		Brotli	61	58	36	53	41	43	69	70	109	97	79	93	87	100	71	103	70	86	58	243	85	86	77	101	
		LZ4	40	35	18	37	19	18	42	56	42	38	40	38	44	35	36	37	39	37	38	37	35	19	35		
		Zstd	46	48	30	42	31	31	50	45	99	66	113	72	62	68	57	45	47	60	44	47	48	43	32	46	
Snappy		38	54	20	38	19	21	20	39	49	40	42	41	46	48	37	40	39	39	36	42	37	32	43	38		

compression ratio. For the datasets of WS, SUSA and BT, we find that there are many duplicate values within 128 consecutive records. In this case, Chimp₁₂₈ can use only 9 bits to represent the same value. For the datasets of AS, PLat and PLon, since they have large decimal significand counts, *Elf* does not perform erasing but still consumes some flag bits. As pointed out by [37], real-world floating point measurements often have a decimal place count of one or two, which usually results in small or medium β . To this end, *Elf* can achieve good performance in most real-world scenarios.

(2) *Elf* VS general compression algorithms. Most of the general compression algorithms have a good compression ratio. However, upon most occasions, *Elf* is still better than LZ4, Zstd and Snappy (with average relative improvement of 30.2%, 7.5% and 27.5% respectively for the time series datasets, and 18%, 3.5% and 16.7% respectively for the non time series datasets), and shows a similar performance to Xz and Brotli in terms of compression ratio. Moreover, in comparison with non time series datasets, *Elf* can achieve more improvement over general compression algorithms for time series datasets (e.g., 30.2% v.s. 18% for LZ4). It is because non time series datasets do not have a time-based

ordering, which reduces the usefulness of exploiting previous values.

(3) **Different decimal significand counts.** As shown in Table 3, with a larger β , both general and floating-point compression algorithms suffer from a lower compression ratio, since a larger β means a more complex data layout. To this end, the poor compression ratio on datasets with a large β is not just a problem for *Elf*. It is a common and interesting problem worthy of further exploration.

(4) *Elf+* VS *Elf*. Table 3 shows that for both time series and non-time series with small and medium β , *Elf+* always performs better than *Elf* with regard to compression ratio. This is because *Elf+* takes full advantage of the fact that most values in a time series have the same significand count, and thus it encodes β^* with fewer bits. Thanks to this optimization, *Elf+* even outperforms the best competitor Chimp₁₂₈ for datasets WS and SUSA, in which Chimp₁₂₈ has a slightly better compression ratio than *Elf*. On the contrary, for values with big β , *Elf+* performs a bit worse than *Elf*, since *Elf+* utilizes two bits to indicate the case of not erasing, while *Elf* only takes up one bit for this case.

8.2.2 Compression Time and Decompression Time

As shown in the lower parts of Table 3, we have the following observations.

(1) The general compression algorithms take one or two orders of magnitude of more compression time than floating-point compression algorithms on average. For example, although Xz can achieve a slightly better compression ratio than *Elf*, it takes as much as 200 times longer than *Elf*. Even for the fastest general compression algorithms Zstd and Snappy, they still take about 3 times longer than *Elf*, which prevents them from being applied to real-time scenarios.

(2) *Elf* takes a little more time than other floating-point compression algorithms during both compression and decompression processes. Compared with other floating-point compression algorithms, *Elf* adds an erasing step and a restoring step, which inevitably takes more time. However, the difference is not obvious, since they are all on the same order of magnitude. Gorilla has the least compression time and decompression time, because it considers fewer cases (see Figure 9(a)) compared with Chimp and Chimp₁₂₈.

(3) Compared with compression time, the distinction of decompression time among different algorithms (except for Xz) is insignificant, since most algorithms sequentially read the decompression stream directly. As a result, most algorithms focus more on the trade-off between compression ratio and compression time.

(4) For almost all datasets, *Elf+* takes less time than *Elf* during both compression and decompression processes. For example, on average, *Elf+* takes about 79.5% of the compression time of *Elf*, and this ratio turns into 80.2% for decompression time. These improvements owe to two reasons. First, when compressing a value, *Elf+* leverages the significand count of its previous value, which avoids iteratively trying to get the decimal place count from scratch. Second, in the processes of compression and decompression, to get the start position $SP(v)$, *Elf+* adopts more efficient numerical checks instead of expensive logarithmic operations. We also notice that for values with larger β , the efficiency improvement of *Elf+* is not so significant (sometimes it is even slightly worse than *Elf* due to experimental errors). This is because if $\beta^* \geq 16$, *Elf+* will not store β^* ; therefore, the optimization of significand counts will not take effect.

8.2.3 Summary

In summary, *Elf* can usually achieve remarkable compression ratio improvement for both time series datasets and non time series datasets, with the affordable cost of

more time. Furthermore, *Elf+* performs better than *Elf* in terms both of compression ratio and running time.

One interesting question is how much efficiency gain can we benefit from *Elf* or *Elf+* over the best competitor, i.e., Chimp₁₂₈? Consider a scenario of data transmission. Suppose the raw data size is D , the compression ratio is η , and the rates of compression, decompression and transmission are r_{cmp} , r_{dcmp} and r_{tr} , respectively. The latency of the whole data from sending to receiving is: $t = D/r_{cmp} + D/r_{dcmp} + D \times \eta / r_{tr}$. According to Table 3, in terms of the average metrics for time series, we have $r_{cmp}^{Elf} = 1000 \times 64 / (60 \times 10^{-6}) \approx 1.07 \times 10^9$ bits/s, $r_{dcmp}^{Elf} = 1000 \times 64 / (44 \times 10^{-6}) \approx 1.45 \times 10^9$ bits/s, and $\eta^{Elf} = 0.37$. Similarly, $r_{cmp}^{Chimp_{128}} = 2 \times 10^9$ bits/s, $r_{dcmp}^{Chimp_{128}} = 3.2 \times 10^9$ bits/s, and $\eta^{Chimp_{128}} = 0.42$. Therefore, $t^{Elf} / t^{Chimp_{128}} \approx (1.62 + 0.37 \times 10^9 / r_{tr}) / (0.81 + 0.42 \times 10^9 / r_{tr})$, where $r_{tr}^{Elf} = r_{tr}^{Chimp_{128}} = r_{tr}$. Let $t^{Elf} / t^{Chimp_{128}} < 1$, we have $r_{tr} < 6.17 \times 10^7$ bits/s. That is, when the transmission rate is smaller than 6.17×10^7 bits/s, the overall performance of *Elf* is supposed to be better than that of Chimp₁₂₈. By adopting the same approach, we can draw a conclusion that the overall performance of *Elf+* is supposed to be better than that of Chimp₁₂₈ if the transmission rate is smaller than 1.96×10^8 bits/s.

We want to emphasize two points here. First, in a typical client-server architecture, the bandwidth and memory in the server are rather precious resources, and the bandwidth for a connection rarely exceeds 6.17×10^7 bits/s (let alone 1.96×10^8 bits/s). Moreover, for each connection, Chimp₁₂₈ would allocate 33KB memory, which is unaffordable for high concurrency scenarios. Second, we find that the most time-consuming part of *Elf* or *Elf+* is to calculate β or the start position of a floating-point value. If we could calculate them faster, the efficiency would be further enhanced tremendously. Maybe in the future we can design a special hardware or a special computer instruction to achieve this.

8.3 Performance with Different β for Double Values

To further investigate the effect of β , we conduct a set of experiments by gradually reducing the decimal significand counts of a time series dataset AS and a non time series dataset PLoN. We select Chimp₁₂₈ and Snappy as baselines, since they achieve the best trade-off between the compression ratio and compression time among the floating-point competitors and general competitors respectively.

As shown in Figure 10(a) and Figure 10(b), with an increasing β from 1 to 15, the compression ratio of *Elf* increases linearly, which is consistent with Theorem 4.




Fig. 10 Performance with Different β (Double Values).

When β is greater than 15, the compression ratio of *Elf* keeps stable, because *Elf* does not perform the erasing step if $\beta > 15$. For Chimp₁₂₈ and Snappy, with the increase of β , their compression ratios first increase steeply and then keep stable when $\beta > 6$. On both AS and PLoN, *Elf* always has the best compression ratio compared with Chimp₁₂₈ and Snappy if β is between 3 and 13. When $\beta = 6$, the compression ratio gain of *Elf* over Chimp₁₂₈ and Snappy achieves the highest (33% and 55% relative improvement in AS, and 40.2% and 41.6% relative improvement in PLoN, respectively). For the time series dataset AS, *Elf* always performs better than Snappy, because *Elf* can capture the time ordering characteristic. *Elf+* has a similar compression ratio trend to *Elf*. When $\beta < 15$, *Elf+* always performs better than *Elf* on both datasets. When $\beta \geq 15$, *Elf+* performs slightly worse than *Elf*, as *Elf+* utilizes two bits to indicate the case of not erasing, while *Elf* uses only one bit for this case.

Figures 10(c-f) present the compression time and decompression time of the four algorithms on the two datasets, respectively. With a larger β that $\beta < 15$, the compression time and decompression time of both *Elf* and Chimp₁₂₈ get larger, because they need to write or read more streams. Things have changed for Snappy




Fig. 11 Compression Ratio Improvement of Erasing and XOR_{cmp} Strategies (Double Values).

because it contains a complex dictionary building step. When $\beta \geq 15$, the decompression time of *Elf* drops sharply, because it skips the restoring step. On both datasets, *Elf* takes slightly more compression time than Chimp₁₂₈, but much less than Snappy. Besides, although *Elf* takes about double decompression time of Chimp₁₂₈, it is still less than $60\mu\text{s}$ for all values of β . *Elf+* shows similar trends to *Elf* in terms both of compression time and decompression time, but it takes less time for almost all values of β .

8.4 Validation of Erasing and XOR_{cmp} Strategies

To verify the effectiveness of the erasing strategy, we regard *Elf* Eraser (or *Elf+* Eraser) as a preprocessing operation on Gorilla, Chimp and Chimp₁₂₈. Figures 11(a-f) present the average compression ratio improvement over the native methods in three groups of β . It is observed that:

(1) For both time series datasets and non time series datasets with small or medium β , both of our proposed erasing strategies can improve the compression ratio of Gorilla and Chimp dramatically. In particular, if β is small, with the equipment of *Elf* Eraser (or *Elf+* Eraser), Gorilla can obtain a relative improvement of

62.2% and 51.6% (or 73% and 56.1%) on the time series datasets and non-time series datasets, respectively, while Chimp can also enjoy a relative improvement of 56.8% and 49.5% (or 66.9% and 53.8%), respectively.

(2) Chimp₁₂₈ can be hardly enhanced by *Elf* Eraser and *Elf+* Eraser. This is because Chimp₁₂₈ leverages the least 14 significant mantissa bits as its hash key. After erasing the mantissa, it is hard for Chimp₁₂₈ to find an appropriate previous value, which might result in an XORed value with a small number of leading zeros. Besides, keeping track of the positions of the chosen values consumes additional bits. As a result, unlike Chimp₁₂₈, *Elf* and *Elf+* consider only the neighboring values.

(3) For datasets with large β , *Elf* Eraser and *Elf+* Eraser cannot enhance the XOR-based compressors, because for large β , *Elf* Eraser and *Elf+* Eraser give up erasing to avoid a negative gain.

(4) If β is not large, *Elf* (or *Elf+*) is still 8.7%~33.3% (or 10.3%~49.3%) better than the Eraser-enhanced (or Eraser⁺-enhanced) Gorilla and Chimp, which verifies the effectiveness of the optimization for XOR_{cmp}.

8.5 Performance for Single Values

We also conduct a set of experiments to verify the performance of the proposed algorithms on single values. For this set of experiments, we use only the datasets with $\beta \leq 7$, since the significand count of a single value would not be greater than 7. FPC does not provide a version of single values, so we do not compare it.

As shown in Table 4, although *Elf* has a similar compression ratio with that of the best floating-point competitor Chimp₁₂₈, *Elf+* still enjoys the best compression ratio among all the floating-point compression methods. Specifically, compared with Chimp₁₂₈, *Elf+* achieves an average relative compression ratio improvement of 12.8% and 5.5% on time series datasets and non time series datasets respectively. Besides, compared with the general compression algorithms, *Elf+* has a better compression ratio than most of them (i.e., LZ4, Zstd and Snappy) and takes significantly less time than all of them. Moreover, like for double values, *Elf+* outperforms *Elf* in terms all of compression ratio, compression time and decompression time for single values.

It is also observed that the compression ratios of *Elf* and *Elf+* for single values are slightly worse than those of them for double values, respectively, but their compression/decompression times are not much different. For example, the average compression ratio of *Elf+* is 0.33 for time series of double values, but it turns into 0.41 for time series of single values. This is because single values take up much fewer mantissa bits than double

Table 4 Average performance for single values (the best values in each group are in **bold**). The compression ratio (CR), compression time (CT) and decompression time (DT) are the average measurements on one block (i.e., 1,000 values).

Dataset		Time Series			Non Time Series		
		CR	CT (μ s)	DT (μ s)	CR	CT (μ s)	DT (μ s)
Floating	Gorilla	0.66	18.0	15.3	0.85	19.3	15.8
	Chimp	0.57	19.8	16.9	0.78	23.4	19.0
	Chimp ₁₂₈	0.47	26.4	17.6	0.73	33.3	20.1
	Elf	0.46	56.4	43.1	0.74	63.6	47.9
	Elf+	0.41	41.4	32.0	0.69	51.5	37.1
General	Xz	0.36	979.5	175.6	0.60	1054.0	247.2
	Brotli	0.40	1660.5	89.3	0.63	1588.8	80.0
	LZ4	0.72	1064.5	42.6	0.80	1004.6	39.3
	Zstd	0.44	229.7	66.2	0.65	226.2	55.1
	Snappy	0.69	187.1	41.9	0.83	183.7	36.4

values, and thus we can only erase fewer bits for single values. In fact, other methods including floating-point specific compression algorithms and general compression algorithms show the same results.

9 Related Works

9.1 General Compression

There are a wide range of impressive compression methods for general purposes, such as Xz [12], Brotli [13], LZ4 [20], Zstd [19] and Snappy [22]. Zstd combines a dictionary-matching stage with a fast entropy-coding stage. The dictionary is trainable and can be generated from a set of samples. Snappy also refers to a dictionary and stores the shift from the current position back to uncompressed stream. Both Zstd and Snappy can achieve a good trade-off between compression ratio and efficiency. Most general compression methods are lossless and can achieve a good compression ratio, but they do not leverage the characteristics of floating-point values and cannot be applied directly to streaming scenarios [30] either.

9.2 Lossy Floating-Point Compression

Since floating-point data is stored in a complex format, it is challenging to compress floating-point data without losing any precision. To this end, many lossy floating-point compression methods are proposed [29, 38–41, 57, 58]. For example, the representative method ZFP [39] compresses regularly gridded data with a certain loss guarantee. MDZ [58] is an adaptive error-bounded lossy compression framework that optimizes the compression for two execution models of molecular dynamics. However, these lossy compression methods are usually application specific. Moreover, many scenarios, especially in the fields of scientific calculation

and databases [14, 31, 53, 55], do not tolerate any loss of precision.

9.3 Lossless Floating-Point Compression

Most lossless floating-point compression algorithms are based on prediction. The distinction among them lies in two aspects: 1) How does the predictor work? 2) How to handle the difference between the predicted value and the real one?

Based on the former, lossless floating-point compression algorithms can be further divided into model-based methods [16–18, 26, 27, 50, 54] and previous-value methods [37, 49]. DFCM [50] maps floating-point values to unsigned integers and predicts the values by a DFCM (differential finite context method) predictor. However, DFCM only works well for smoothly changing data. FPC [17, 18] sequentially predicts each value in a streaming fashion using two context-based predictors, i.e., FCM predictor [51] and DFCM predictor (which is quite different from that in DFCM [50]). Among the predicted values obtained by the two predictors, FPC chooses the closer one, and thus it can achieve a better prediction performance. Some other model-based methods [26, 27, 54] capture the characteristics of different series using machine learning models, and eventually choose the best compression approach. Due to the high cost of prediction, Gorilla [49] and Chimp [37] directly regard the previous one value as the predicted one, based on the observation that two consecutive values do not change much. Chimp₁₂₈ is an upgraded version of Chimp, which exploits 128 earlier values to find the best matched value. To expedite the computation efficiency, Chimp₁₂₈ maintains a hash table with size of 33KB, which might be not applicable in edge computing scenarios [42, 52].

Based on the latter, a small number of methods [21] first map the differences between the predicted values and actual values to integers, and then compress the integers using integer-oriented compression techniques such as Delta encoding [49]. On the contrary, a majority of methods [18, 37, 49] encode their XORed values instead of the differences. Gorilla [49] assumes that the XORed values would contain both long leading zeros and long trailing zeros with high probability, so it uses 5 bits to record the number of leading zeros and 6 bits to store the number of trailing zeros. Chimp [37] points out the fact that the XORed values rarely have long trailing zeros, so it is ineffective for Gorilla to take up to 6 bits to record the number of trailing zeros. Therefore, Chimp optimizes the encoding strategy for the XORed values and can use fewer bits.

As a lossless compression solution, *Elf* belongs to a previous-value method and encodes the XORed values. However, different from Gorilla and Chimp, *Elf* performs an erasing operation on the floating-point values before XORing them, which makes the XORed values contain many trailing zeros. Besides, *Elf* designs a novel encoding strategy for the XORed values with many trailing zeros, which achieves a notable compression ratio.

10 Conclusion and Future Work

This paper first puts forward a novel, compact and efficient erasing-based lossless floating-point compression algorithm *Elf*, and then proposes an upgraded version of it named *Elf+* by optimizing the significand count encoding strategy. Extensive experiments using 22 datasets verify the powerful performance of *Elf* and *Elf+* for both double values and single values. In particular, for double values, *Elf* achieves average relative compression ratio improvement of 12.4% and 43.9% over Chimp₁₂₈ and Gorilla, respectively. Besides, *Elf* has a similar compression ratio to the best compared general compression algorithm but with much less time. Furthermore, *Elf+* outperforms *Elf* by an average relative compression ratio improvement of 7.6% and compression time improvement of 20.5%. In our future work, we plan to optimize *Elf* for specific data types, such as trajectories.

Acknowledgements This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (62202070, 61976168, 62172066, 62076191) and China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (2022M720567).

References

1. Blockchair database dumps (2023). Retrieved March 19, 2023 from <https://gz.blockchair.com/bitcoin/transactions/>
2. Daily temperature of major cities (2023). Retrieved March 19, 2023 from <https://www.kaggle.com/sudalairajkumar/daily-temperature-of-major-cities>
3. Electric vehicle charging dataset (2023). Retrieved March 19, 2023 from <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/michaelbryantds/electric-vehicle-charging-dataset>
4. Elf floating-point compression (2023). Retrieved March 19, 2023 from <https://github.com/Spatio-Temporal-Lab/elf>

5. Financial data set used in infore project (2023). Retrieved March 19, 2023 from <https://zenodo.org/record/3886895>
6. Global food prices database (wfp) (2023). Retrieved March 19, 2023 from <https://data.humdata.org/dataset/wfp-food-prices>
7. Historical weather data download (2023). Retrieved March 19, 2023 from https://www.meteoblue.com/en/weather/archive/export/basel_switzerland
8. Influxdb 2.0 sample data (2023). Retrieved March 19, 2023 from <https://github.com/influxdata/influxdb2-sample-data>
9. Points of interest poi database (2023). Retrieved March 19, 2023 from <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/ehallmar/points-of-interest-poi-database>
10. Ssd and hdd benchmarks (2023). Retrieved March 19, 2023 from <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/alanjo/ssd-and-hdd-benchmarks>
11. World city (2023). Retrieved March 19, 2023 from <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/kuntalmaity/world-city>
12. The .xz file format (2023). Retrieved March 19, 2023 from <https://tukaani.org/xz/xz-file-format.txt>
13. Alakuijala, J., Ferragina, A., Ferragina, P., Kliuchnikov, E., Obryk, R., Szabadka, Z., Vandevenne, L.: Brotli: A general-purpose data compressor. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)* **37**(1), 1–30 (2018)
14. Bao, J., Li, R., Yi, X., Zheng, Y.: Managing massive trajectories on the cloud. In: *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGSPATIAL International Conference on Advances in Geographic Information Systems*, pp. 1–10 (2016)
15. Bentley, J.L.: Multidimensional binary search trees used for associative searching. *Communications of the ACM* **18**(9), 509–517 (1975)
16. Blalock, D., Madden, S., Guttag, J.: Sprintz: Time series compression for the internet of things. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies* **2**(3), 1–23 (2018)
17. Burtscher, M., Ratanaworabhan, P.: High throughput compression of double-precision floating-point data. In: *2007 Data Compression Conference (DCC'07)*, pp. 293–302. IEEE (2007)
18. Burtscher, M., Ratanaworabhan, P.: Fpc: A high-speed compressor for double-precision floating-point data. *IEEE Transactions on Computers* **58**(1), 18–31 (2008)
19. Collet, Y.: Zstd github repository from facebook (2016). Retrieved March 19, 2023 from <https://github.com/facebook/zstd>
20. Collet, Y., et al.: Lz4: Extremely fast compression algorithm. *code.google.com* (2013). Retrieved March 19, 2023 from <https://github.com/lz4/lz4>
21. Engelson, V., Fritzon, D., Fritzon, P.: Lossless compression of high-volume numerical data from simulations. In: *Proc. Data Compression Conference* (2000)
22. Google: Snappy — a fast compressor/decompressor (2023). Retrieved March 19, 2023 from <https://github.com/google/snappy>
23. He, H., Li, R., Ruan, S., He, T., Bao, J., Li, T., Zheng, Y.: Trass: Efficient trajectory similarity search based on key-value data stores. In: *2022 IEEE 38th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*, pp. 2306–2318. IEEE (2022)
24. Huffman, D.A.: A method for the construction of minimum-redundancy codes. *Proceedings of the IRE* **40**(9), 1098–1101 (1952)
25. Jensen, S.K., Pedersen, T.B., Thomsen, C.: Time series management systems: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* **29**(11), 2581–2600 (2017)
26. Jensen, S.K., Pedersen, T.B., Thomsen, C.: Modelardb: Modular model-based time series management with spark and cassandra. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* **11**(11), 1688–1701 (2018)
27. Jensen, S.K., Pedersen, T.B., Thomsen, C.: Scalable model-based management of correlated dimensional time series in modelardb+. In: *2021 IEEE 37th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*, pp. 1380–1391. IEEE (2021)
28. Kahan, W.: Ieee standard 754 for binary floating-point arithmetic. *Lecture Notes on the Status of IEEE* **754**(94720-1776), 11 (1996)
29. Lazaridis, I., Mehrotra, S.: Capturing sensor-generated time series with quality guarantees. In: *Proceedings 19th International Conference on Data Engineering (Cat. No. 03CH37405)*, pp. 429–440. IEEE (2003)
30. Li, R., Bao, J., He, H., Ruan, S., He, T., Hong, L., Jiang, Z., Zheng, Y.: Discovering real-time reachable area using trajectory connections. In: *International Conference on Database Systems for Advanced Applications*, pp. 36–53. Springer (2020)
31. Li, R., He, H., Wang, R., Huang, Y., Liu, J., Ruan, S., He, T., Bao, J., Zheng, Y.: Just: Jd urban spatio-temporal data engine. In: *2020 IEEE 36th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*, pp. 1558–1569. IEEE (2020)
32. Li, R., He, H., Wang, R., Ruan, S., He, T., Bao, J., Zhang, J., Hong, L., Zheng, Y.: Trajmesa: A dis-

- tributed nosql-based trajectory data management system. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* **35**(1), 1013–1027 (2021)
33. Li, R., He, H., Wang, R., Ruan, S., Sui, Y., Bao, J., Zheng, Y.: Trajmesa: A distributed nosql storage engine for big trajectory data. In: 2020 IEEE 36th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE), pp. 2002–2005. IEEE (2020)
 34. Li, R., Li, Z., Wu, Y., Chen, C., Zheng, Y.: Elf: Erasing-based lossless floating-point compression. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* **16** (2023)
 35. Li, R., Zhang, L., Pan, J., Liu, J., Wang, P., Sun, N., Wang, S., Chen, C., Gu, F., Guo, S.: Apache shardingSphere: A holistic and pluggable platform for data sharding. In: 2022 IEEE 38th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE), pp. 2468–2480. IEEE (2022)
 36. Li, S., Xu, L.D., Zhao, S.: The internet of things: a survey. *Information systems frontiers* **17**(2), 243–259 (2015)
 37. Liakos, P., Papakonstantinou, K., Kotidis, Y.: Chimp: efficient lossless floating point compression for time series databases. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* **15**(11), 3058–3070 (2022)
 38. Liang, X., Zhao, K., Di, S., Li, S., Underwood, R., Gok, A.M., Tian, J., Deng, J., Calhoun, J.C., Tao, D., et al.: Sz3: A modular framework for composing prediction-based error-bounded lossy compressors. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data* **9**(2), 485–498 (2022)
 39. Lindstrom, P.: Fixed-rate compressed floating-point arrays. *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics* **20**(12), 2674–2683 (2014)
 40. Liu, C., Jiang, H., Paparrizos, J., Elmore, A.J.: Decomposed bounded floats for fast compression and queries. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* **14**(11), 2586–2598 (2021)
 41. Liu, T., Wang, J., Liu, Q., Alibhai, S., Lu, T., He, X.: High-ratio lossy compression: Exploring the autoencoder to compress scientific data. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data* **9**(1), 22–36 (2021)
 42. Mao, Y., You, C., Zhang, J., Huang, K., Letaief, K.B.: A survey on mobile edge computing: The communication perspective. *IEEE communications surveys & tutorials* **19**(4), 2322–2358 (2017)
 43. National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON): 2d wind speed and direction (dp1.00001.001) (2022). DOI 10.48443/77N6-EH42. Retrieved March 19, 2023 from <https://data.neonscience.org/data-products/DP1.00001.001/RELEASE-2022>
 44. National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON): Barometric pressure (dp1.00004.001) (2022). DOI 10.48443/ZR37-0238. Retrieved March 19, 2023 from <https://data.neonscience.org/data-products/DP1.00004.001/RELEASE-2022>
 45. National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON): Dust and particulate size distribution (dp1.00017.001) (2022). DOI 10.48443/RDZ9-XR84. Retrieved March 19, 2023 from <https://data.neonscience.org/data-products/DP1.00017.001/RELEASE-2022>
 46. National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON): Ir biological temperature (dp1.00005.001) (2022). DOI 10.48443/7RS6-FF56. Retrieved March 19, 2023 from <https://data.neonscience.org/data-products/DP1.00005.001/RELEASE-2022>
 47. National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON): Relative humidity above water on-buoy (dp1.20271.001) (2022). DOI 10.48443/1W06-WM51. Retrieved March 19, 2023 from <https://data.neonscience.org/data-products/DP1.20271.001/RELEASE-2022>
 48. Nguyen, D.C., Ding, M., Pathirana, P.N., Seneviratne, A., Li, J., Niyato, D., Dobre, O., Poor, H.V.: 6g internet of things: A comprehensive survey. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* **9**(1), 359–383 (2021)
 49. Pelkonen, T., Franklin, S., Teller, J., Cavallaro, P., Huang, Q., Meza, J., Veeraraghavan, K.: Gorilla: A fast, scalable, in-memory time series database. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* **8**(12), 1816–1827 (2015)
 50. Ratanaworabhan, P., Ke, J., Burtscher, M.: Fast lossless compression of scientific floating-point data. In: *Data Compression Conference (DCC'06)*, pp. 133–142. IEEE (2006)
 51. Sazeides, Y., Smith, J.E.: The predictability of data values. In: *Proceedings of 30th Annual International Symposium on Microarchitecture*, pp. 248–258. IEEE (1997)
 52. Shi, W., Cao, J., Zhang, Q., Li, Y., Xu, L.: Edge computing: Vision and challenges. *IEEE internet of things journal* **3**(5), 637–646 (2016)
 53. Xiao, J., Huang, Y., Hu, C., Song, S., Huang, X., Wang, J.: Time series data encoding for efficient storage: a comparative analysis in apache iotdb. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* **15**(10), 2148–2160 (2022)
 54. Yu, X., Peng, Y., Li, F., Wang, S., Shen, X., Mai, H., Xie, Y.: Two-level data compression using machine learning in time series database. In: 2020 IEEE 36th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE), pp. 1333–1344. IEEE (2020)
 55. Yu, Z., Li, R., Guo, Y., Jiang, Z., Bao, J., Zheng, Y.: Distributed time series similarity search method

- based on key-value data stores. *Journal of Software* **33**(3), 950–967 (2021)
56. Zhan, X., Xu, H., Zhang, Y., Zhu, X., Yin, H., Zheng, Y.: Deepthermal: Combustion optimization for thermal power generating units using offline reinforcement learning. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 36, pp. 4680–4688 (2022)
 57. Zhao, K., Di, S., Dmitriev, M., Tonellot, T.L.D., Chen, Z., Cappello, F.: Optimizing error-bounded lossy compression for scientific data by dynamic spline interpolation. In: *2021 IEEE 37th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*, pp. 1643–1654. IEEE (2021)
 58. Zhao, K., Di, S., Perez, D., Liang, X., Chen, Z., Cappello, F.: Mdz: An efficient error-bounded lossy compressor for molecular dynamics. In: *2022 IEEE 38th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*, pp. 27–40. IEEE (2022)