

# ByteCard: Enhancing ByteDance’s Data Warehouse with Learned Cardinality Estimation

Yuxing Han\*  
Data Platform, ByteDance  
Shanghai, China  
hanyuxing@bytedance.com

Haoyu Wang  
Lixiang Chen  
Data Platform, ByteDance  
Shanghai, China  
East China Normal University  
Shanghai, China  
wanghaoyu.0428@bytedance.com  
chenlixiang.3608@bytedance.com

Yifeng Dong  
Xing Chen  
Data Platform, ByteDance  
Beijing, China  
dongyifeng@bytedance.com  
chenxing.xc@bytedance.com

Benquan Yu  
Data Platform, ByteDance  
Shanghai, China  
james.yu@bytedance.com

Chengcheng Yang\*  
East China Normal University  
Shanghai, China  
ccyang@dase.ecnu.edu.cn

Weining Qian  
East China Normal University  
Shanghai, China  
wnqian@dase.ecnu.edu.cn

## ABSTRACT

Cardinality estimation is a critical component and a longstanding challenge in modern data warehouses. ByteHouse, ByteDance’s cloud-native engine for extensive data analysis in exabyte-scale environments, serves numerous internal decision-making business scenarios. With the increasing demand of ByteHouse, cardinality estimation becomes the bottleneck for efficiently processing queries. Specifically, the existing query optimizer of ByteHouse uses the traditional Selinger-like cardinality estimator, which can produce substantial estimation errors, resulting in sub-optimal query plans.

To improve cardinality estimation accuracy while maintaining a practical inference overhead, we develop ByteCard framework that enables efficient training/updating and integration of learned cardinality estimators. Furthermore, ByteCard adapts recent advances in cardinality estimation to build models that can balance accuracy and practicality (e.g., inference latency, model size, training/updating overhead). We observe significant query processing speed-up in ByteHouse after replacing the existing cardinality estimator with ByteCard for several optimization strategies. Evaluations on real-world datasets show the integration of ByteCard leads to an improvement of up to 30% in the 99th quantile of latency. At last, we share our valuable experience in engineering advanced cardinality estimators. This experience can help ByteHouse integrate more learning-based solutions on the critical query execution path.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

ByteHouse, ByteDance’s advanced cloud-native big data analysis engine, plays a pivotal role in processing exabyte-scale internal business analytics. Serving as a foundational tool for various business decisions, it offers applications ranging from in-depth trend analysis to strategic marketing. Building on the collective research insights and engineering endeavors of predecessors [2, 10, 26, 44, 48], ByteHouse has demonstrated robust performance across a range of business workloads. In its consistent pursuit of excellence, ByteHouse continually seeks to evolve and improve, particularly in addressing cardinality estimation (CardEst) challenges—a critical aspect

of query optimization that has received extensive attention from academia and industry. Cardinality estimation aims to estimate query operator results size without actual execution, consisting of COUNT and COUNT-DISTINCT (NDV) estimations. Precise CardEst methodologies are vital for enhancing the quality of query plans, which is one of ByteHouse’s most notable performance bottlenecks.

In its initial stages, ByteHouse employed traditional CardEst methods like other modern data warehouses. However, the inherent data skewness in real-world datasets, coupled with the simplified assumptions of these methods, hindering ByteHouse from achieving reliable estimates. This problem is further exacerbated when encountering large volumes of customer data and rapid data updates. Traditional sketch-based methods [15, 39] often require full data scans, creating considerable pressure on ByteHouse’s storage layer. Meanwhile, the sample-based approaches face inherent challenges in balancing accuracy with the sampling rate.

The evaluation report in Table 1 shows the inadequacy of traditional CardEst methods in handling modern analytical workloads. This report evaluates various quantiles of the Q-Error<sup>1</sup>, which is a commonly used metric in CardEst method evaluation [28, 29]. Specifically, the datasets under consideration include two renowned benchmarks, IMDB [24] and STATS [18], as well as AEOLUS, an internal business workload from ByteHouse that comprises 200 complex queries from customers. The results indicate that for both COUNT and COUNT-DISTINCT queries, the estimation errors provided by traditional methods deviate far from the theoretical optimal lower bound across various quantiles, often by several orders of magnitude. This discrepancy highlights a significant potential in enhancing these estimation methodologies.

Recently, learning-based CardEst methods [9, 14, 22, 24, 32, 35, 54–56, 58, 59, 62] have drawn much attention due to their superior accuracy [18, 46, 50]. The prosperity of these CardEst research work naturally raises a question: *Could we replace traditional methods in ByteHouse with state-of-the-art learning-based methods to get more accurate cardinality estimation, thereby enhancing query optimization?* After a deep survey of the learned methods, we identify three

\*Corresponding authors

<sup>1</sup>The theoretical lower bound of Q-Error is 1.

**Table 1: Estimation Errors of Traditional CardEst Methods in ByteHouse**

CardEst	IMDB				STATS			AEOLUS		
	50%	90%	99%	50%	90%	99%	50%	90%	99%	
COUNT Est.	3.06	1145	$1 \cdot 10^6$	493	$3 \cdot 10^4$	$3 \cdot 10^7$	7.45	$3 \cdot 10^6$	$8 \cdot 10^6$	
NDV Est.	15	984	$3 \cdot 10^4$	134	$1 \cdot 10^4$	$6 \cdot 10^4$	598	4912	$2 \cdot 10^4$	

challenges of integrating learning-based CardEst estimators into the existing architecture of ByteHouse: (1) *How to discern the appropriate models that balance precision and practicability?* Although the academic community has proposed numerous learned CardEst methods, most focus on improving accuracy. The overarching objective of ByteCard is estimation accuracy and enhancing ByteHouse’s end-to-end query performance with a sustainable resource. (2) *How to manage the training process and integrate the inference algorithms of these models in the query processing?* Considering the constraints on system resources and the imperative not to disrupt customers’ online queries, conducting training directly on large-scale data volumes stored in ByteHouse is impractical. Furthermore, deploying existing inference algorithms within multi-threaded query processing environments poses another challenge. (3) *How to utilize the models’ estimation to enable enhanced query optimization for ByteHouse?* Identifying optimization strategies in ByteHouse that suffer from inaccurate cardinality estimation and applying precise estimations from ByteCard for enhanced query optimization presents a non-trivial challenge.

In this paper, we present ByteCard, an enhanced CardEst framework designed to integrate learning-based methods into ByteHouse seamlessly. To balance precision and practicality, ByteCard meticulously considers the inference latency, model size, and training/updating overhead when selecting CardEst models for different optimization strategies in ByteHouse. Then, ByteCard introduces an inference engine to ease the integration of inference algorithms for different models. Moreover, the engine could also help identify inference algorithms’ immutable data structures, which would further avoid data races and enable high-frequency inference invocations in the multi-thread query processing environment. In addition, ByteCard also proposes a dedicated service for isolated training to ensure no disruption on the online queries. Furthermore, ByteCard employs auxiliary modules for discreet model loading and estimation-accuracy monitoring to sustain its effectiveness. Consequently, by leveraging ByteCard’s cardinality estimation within ByteHouse’s optimization strategies, the query processing has been notably speeded up. Presently, ByteCard is responsible for millions of cardinality estimations within ByteHouse’s online clusters, providing substantial benefits to various analytical workloads.

ByteCard is remarkably designed with adaptability, paving the way for future advancements in learning-based technology that extend beyond cardinality estimation. As a pioneer in integrating learning-based cardinality estimators into a production-scale data warehouse, ByteCard demonstrates the immense potential of machine learning to enhance query optimization and data management in large-scale systems.

In summary, our main contributions are listed as follows:

- We introduce ByteCard, a framework designed to integrate learning-based CardEst methods in ByteDance’s industrial data warehouse, ByteHouse. The framework features a carefully crafted inference abstraction and a specialized training

service, which facilitate the integration of selected models from multiple candidates.

- The precise cardinality estimates provided by ByteCard are employed to augment multiple optimization strategies within ByteHouse, thereby improving its query processing performance.
- We share lessons derived from the design, development, and deployment experience of ByteCard, along with our future efforts to integrate more learning-based techniques to further augment ByteHouse’s query optimization.

## 2 RELATED WORK

**Learning-Based CardEst Methods:** The research community has proposed a diverse set of learned models [9, 14, 22, 32, 34, 54–56, 62] for both COUNT and COUNT-DISTINCT estimation. Based on recent studies [18, 62], they can be broadly classified into query-driven and data-driven methods. The ML-based query-driven methods [14, 24, 32, 45] typically reply on the query workload to make estimations. They analyze the queries to make predictions about the data. These methods don’t require access to the actual data, and estimations are based on query patterns and statistics. In contrast, the ML-based data-driven methods [22, 52, 56, 58, 59, 62] use actual data to characterize data distributions. The strength of these methods lies in their ability to capture and model the underlying data distributions effectively, which in turn aids in producing accurate cardinality estimates. The predominant models employed in the field include deep auto-regression [58, 59], Bayesian networks [56], and Sum-Product Networks [22, 62]. Another notable model, RBX<sup>2</sup> [54], offers a workload-independent approach for NDV estimation. Selecting the most suitable models for ByteCard’s requirements is a crucial focus (details of which will be provided in Section 3).

**ML-enhanced Components of Databases:** Recent academic and industry efforts have focused on harnessing machine learning to boost database system performance. SageDB [12] is a data analytics prototype that utilizes learned components to self-tune for optimal performance across various datasets and queries, focusing on machine learning techniques like partial materialized views and global optimization algorithms. Bourbon [11], a learned index for LSM trees, uses piecewise linear regression for key distribution learning to enhance the lookup efficiency. It also offers guidance for integrating learned indexes into LSM trees tailored to specific levels and workloads. Xindex [49] is a concurrent ordered index optimized for quick queries, employing a hierarchical structure that adapts to real-time workloads, outperforming traditional index structures in efficiency. OpenGauss [30] integrates machine learning for various self-management tasks, including query rewriting, cost estimation, and plan generation. Auto-WLM [37] is a recent machine learning-based workload management system implemented in Amazon Redshift [2], which dynamically schedules workloads

<sup>2</sup>Derived from the initials of the surnames of the first three authors.

and adjusts to changes, using local query performance models to enhance overall cluster performance. We posit that ByteCard represents the first instance of integrating learning-based cardinality estimation models into an industrial data warehouse system.

### 3 BACKGROUND AND MODEL CHOICES

This section begins with an architectural overview of ByteHouse, followed by an analysis of current optimization strategies hindered by the weakness of traditional cardinality estimation methods. Lastly, we thoroughly discuss our selection process for ByteCard’s learned CardEst models.




Figure 1: The Architecture of ByteHouse

#### 3.1 Overview of ByteHouse

First, we present an overview of ByteHouse’s architecture and optimization strategies. Then, we highlight the limitations imposed by suboptimal cardinality estimations.

**3.1.1 Architecture.** As shown in 1, ByteHouse employs an architecture that separates storage from computation, encompassing three discrete layers: service, computing, and storage. This modular structure facilitates a clear division of responsibilities, enhancing scalability and efficiency within the system. The service layer parses queries, optimizes execution plans, and dispatches tasks to computing nodes. The computing layer dynamically allocates resources and executes query operators. The storage layer consists of a distributed key-value store for managing metadata and a distributed file system for storing business data. Core components include the Resource Manager, which orchestrates the allocation of computing resources; the Time Oracle, which ensures synchronized computation operations; the Data Ingestor, which manages data flow from multiple sources; and the Daemon Manager, which manages the lifecycle of background tasks. In addition, ByteHouse utilizes other widely adopted techniques in modern data warehouses, including Massively Parallel Processing (MPP), columnar storage, and vectorized execution.

**3.1.2 Optimization Strategies Hindered by Inaccurate Cardinality Estimation.** Numerous optimization strategies have been developed across the three layers to deliver fast performance for its customers. Among these strategies, the classical ones encompass sideways information passing (SIP) [23], magic set rewriting [40], and late materialization [1, 42]. Nonetheless, the efficacy of these strategies

is constrained by the inaccuracies of traditional CardEst methods. We explore two examples in the following discussions.

**Materialization Strategies:** During query processing, materialization in column-based database systems like ByteHouse involves converting data from a columnar format to a row-based tuple. Regarding materialization strategies, ByteHouse favors the approach of early materialization, wherein tuples are generated early in the query plan, owing to its simplicity and common use [42, 47].

ByteHouse initially adopted a one-stage reader approach for early materialization. This method involves scanning and processing queried columns in one pass, applying all necessary predicates simultaneously. The method is effective for non-selective predicates as it concurrently reduces per-tuple processing by handling entire column blocks. However, it becomes less efficient with highly selective predicates, where only a small subset of tuples require further processing, resulting in the construction of many unused tuples and, thus, unnecessary overhead. Consequently, accurate selectivity estimation becomes crucial in optimizing the materialization strategy. Traditional CardEst methods often struggle to provide satisfactory estimations, particularly with small samples, and are less adept at detecting cross-column correlations than learned methods.

**Aggregation Processing:** As a frequent operation in data warehouses, aggregation processing typically necessitates using an in-memory hash table to track the distinct values of the aggregation key. Effectively managing this hash table often involves addressing the challenge of incrementally increasing distinct key values. This *resizing*, which requires allocating larger memory blocks and rehashing entries, is resource-intensive due to the consumption of significant CPU and memory. In specific business applications of ByteHouse, we observe that frequent early-stage *resizings* introduce notable overhead, adversely affecting the performance of aggregation processing.

To address this issue, the current strategy employed by ByteHouse is to cache the size of hash tables of previous queries. However, this method is effective only for identical repeat queries and would become rapidly obsolete due to massive data updates. An alternative approach is to reduce the frequency of *resizing* by accurately estimating the initial size requirement of the hash table. Considering the prevalent ad-hoc queries from ByteHouse’s customers, a highly accurate NDV estimator could be pivotal in minimizing the frequent *resizings* requirement.

#### 3.2 CardEst Model Choice

Selecting the most suitable CardEst models from the diverse options available is a crucial challenge for ByteCard, particularly in effectively integrating them into ByteHouse’s existing architecture. The ideal models for pragmatic integration must fulfill the following criteria: 1) they should offer higher accuracy in cardinality estimates than traditional methods in most scenarios; 2) given the limited resources dedicated to cardinality estimation within the broader context of query optimization, the training process should be resource-efficient; and 3) the inference mechanism needs to be efficient enough to avoid excessively lengthening query execution times. After rigorous analysis and evaluation, ByteCard has strategically chosen three learned CardEst models, each optimized for specific query optimization scenarios of ByteHouse.

**3.2.1 Choice for COUNT CardEst Models.** Query-driven models such as MSCN [24], which necessitate extensive logging and evaluation of query sub-expressions for training, are resource-intensive and would lead to an expansion of ByteHouse’s logs. As these models are specific to certain workloads, they might diminish effectiveness with data changes, which is a commonly observed phenomenon due to ByteHouse’s frequent data updates. Therefore, query-driven methods are considered impractical for ByteHouse’s requirements.

Alternatively, data-driven methods focus on learning data distributions through advanced unsupervised machine learning models. However, these models are often complex, challenging to train and maintain and struggle to adapt to rapid data updates in ByteHouse. BayesCard [56] offers a solution with its tree-structured Bayesian networks (BNs), effectively addressing single-table COUNT estimations. These networks stand out for their advantages of high accuracy, efficient training, small model size, quick inference, and adaptability to data changes [18].

However, to handle join-size estimation, most of the data-driven methods [22, 52, 56, 58, 62], including BayesCard, hold the design philosophy to understand the distribution of the joined tables, imposing a non-trivial overhead for model training. Besides, denormalizing will add extra columns to facilitate later inference. The number of extra columns will expand rapidly as the number of join conditions increases. This is not affordable inside ByteHouse as our users generally maintain thousands of tables with terabytes of data. Therefore, we decided to adopt a recent approach FactorJoin [55] for join queries. It naturally supports using the Bayesian Networks as simple-table cardinality estimation and requires almost no additional training overhead. Specifically, in the offline training phase, FactorJoin creates specialized buckets on the join key values (i.e., *join-bucket*), and builds Bayesian Networks to understand the correlations among filter columns and join keys within a single table. In the inference phase, FactorJoin first dynamically constructs a factor graph [33], which is derived from the join relationships specified in the query. Then, it integrates the related single-table Bayesian Networks and join-buckets and applies inference on this graph to estimate the cardinality bounds accurately. FactorJoin is practical to be implemented in ByteCard. It stems from its efficient training process and its demonstrable superiority in estimation accuracy and inference speed compared to other methods [55].

**3.2.2 Choice for COUNT-DISTINCT CardEst Models.** The COUNT-DISTINCT (NDV) CardEst methods can be classified into sketch-based and sampling-based categories. However, both of them face challenges when dealing with small samples. The commonly used sketch-based estimator HyperLogLog (HLL) [15, 19] has no theoretical guarantees for sampled data and requires a full dataset scan for accurate estimation, which makes it an impractical approach for ByteHouse’s columnar storage. Moreover, frequent data updates reduce the effectiveness of old sketches. Meanwhile, the sample-based estimators [5, 6] often rely on specific heuristics or data assumptions, which might not generally apply to diverse datasets. Their robustness is compromised as the foundational assumptions are prone to breakdown.

The learning-based NDV estimator proposed in [9] adopts a supervised learning framework, also requiring the collection of

true NDV from a significant number of online queries for each workload. Alternatively, RBX [54] innovatively treats NDV as a standard data property akin to mean and standard deviation and aims to derive a “closed”-formula of NDV calculation. This approach opts for a neural network to learn this formula because it can approximate any continuous function. This estimator exhibits robust performance across a spectrum of workloads and maintains efficacy across different sampling rates, fulfilling the accuracy criterion. The workload-independent nature guarantees one training process can serve a wide range of workloads and aligns with the resource criterion. Moreover, the neural network designed by RBX has a few network layers, enabling ByteCard to conduct efficient inference within ByteHouse’s query processing. Therefore, ByteCard chooses RBX as its learned-based NDV estimator.

**3.2.3 Validation & Summary for Model Choices.** To ascertain the efficacy of our model selection for ByteCard, we translated ByteHouse’s cardinality estimation requirements into SQL queries when processing the workloads from the IMDB, STATS, and AEOLUS datasets. Then, we trained different models on the three datasets offline. The performance of these models was evaluated using the above queries, with the Q-Error results detailed in Table 2. This evaluation underscores the effectiveness of selected models, especially notable at the 99% quantile, where learned-based methods demonstrate significant benefits.

Subsequently, we investigate the scalability of training time and model size across diverse datasets for various candidate models. To validate our model choice<sup>3</sup>, we conduct the comparative evaluation of training time and model size between different datasets. We select MSCN as the benchmark query-driven model alongside three data-driven models. The last model, adopted by ByteCard, utilizes BNs for simple-table estimations and FactorJoin for join-size estimations. The training configurations for all models adhere to their papers’ default specifications. Specifically, for FactorJoin’s bucket strategy, we opt for equi-height buckets with a total count of 200. From the results in Table 3, we can see that the training time of MSCN consistently exceeds that of other models across various datasets. Note that this time does not include the computation time of true cardinalities as training objectives. This observation underscores the impracticality of query-driven models for core applications like cardinality estimation. Among data-driven models, DeepDB [22] and BayesCard [56] exhibit longer training times and larger model sizes, attributed to their denormalization strategy for join-size estimation. Conversely, ByteCard leverages simple-table models and captures join-key distributions using *join-buckets* and factor graphs, effectively reducing training overhead and model size while preserving high-accuracy estimations.

**Summary:** ByteCard adopts a lightweight Bayesian network for each table in ByteHouse’ database to estimate single-table COUNT cardinalities. It then integrates the single-table models using FactorJoin for precise join-size estimation. Furthermore, ByteCard utilizes the workload-independent RBX method for NDV estimation, where

<sup>3</sup>Given that RBX adheres to a universal model paradigm, its training algorithm will not be assessed in this phase. Further analysis on RBX’s approach to addressing anomalies (i.e., RBX produces NDV estimations with relatively large Q-Errors) will be detailed in Section 6.2.2.

**Table 2: Estimation Errors of Learned CardEst Methods in ByteCard**

CardEst	IMDB			STATS			AEOLUS		
	50%	90%	99%	50%	90%	99%	50%	90%	99%
COUNT Est.	1.14	4.82	425	1.47	8.03	4026	1.3	3.57	7491
NDV Est.	3.67	191	392	2.93	362	517	3.8	133	934

**Table 3: The Training Time and Model Size between Different CardEst Models**

Measure	MSCN			DeepDB			BayesCard			ByteCard (BN+FactorJoin)		
	IMDB	STATS	AEOLUS	IMDB	STATS	AEOLUS	IMDB	STATS	AEOLUS	IMDB	STATS	AEOLUS
Training Time (Min)	41	34	45	78	113	145	33	27	31	7	13	11
Model Size (MB)	3.9	2.8	7.3	43	162	201	2.4	6.1	6.5	4.3	2.3	3.2

a single model from one offline training process suffices for most estimation scenarios.

## 4 SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE OF BYTECARD

In this section, we first outline the foundational design principles of ByteCard, followed by an in-depth exploration of each module within ByteHouse, detailing their architecture and operational mechanisms.

### 4.1 Design Principles


When developing ByteCard to optimize ByteHouse’s query processing, we emphasize its practicability, which requires reducing computational overhead and ensuring efficient use of learned CardEst models. Moreover, we preserve ByteCard’s flexibility to facilitate the integration of new CardEst models and broaden the framework to include more query optimization aspects, including cost estimation.

The architecture of ByteCard is shown in Fig. 2. To fulfill the objectives described above, ByteCard introduces two core modules, i.e., a high-level program abstraction known as Inference Engine and a standalone service called ModelForge Service, alongside auxiliary modules, to keep ByteCard’s efficiency and efficacy while safeguarding ByteHouse’s stability.

The Inference Engine is the central hub for deploying inference algorithms of CardEst models. It aims to simplify the integration process for inference algorithms in the multi-threaded environments of query processing. The ModelForge Service is meticulously designed to focus on the iterative development for training and the models’ management, ensuring their accuracy and reliability. In addition to the core components, auxiliary modules are developed to provide other necessary supports, including the Model Loader and Model Monitor. The Model Loader is responsible for efficiently loading and updating models across the large-scale cluster. At the same time, the Model Monitor pays attention to the model quality and accuracy, triggering updates and fine-tuning if necessary. These components collectively guarantee the efficient functioning of the Inference Engine and ModelForge Service, which further provide strong support for the effectiveness of ByteCard framework and the stability of ByteHouse.

### 4.2 Inference Engine

As shown in Fig 3, the Inference Engine provides high-level interfaces for communication with ByteCard’s internal modules and the integration with ByteHouse’s query processing. With this engine, ByteHouse can accelerate its query processing by harnessing

**Figure 2: The Architecture of ByteCard**

the precise estimations provided by the advanced learning-based CardEst models.

**4.2.1 Interact with other modules.** As each model in our framework possesses distinct structures and serialization methods, this requires designing the loadModel interface such that the deserialization procedure for various models can be effectively encapsulated. This interface is usually invoked by Model Loader, a background process responsible for loading CardEst models from the cloud-based storage. From the perspective of ByteHouse’s Daemon Manager, the Model Loader operates similarly to other background tasks, such as the LSM-tree’s compaction task [7, 36] in ByteHouse’s storage layer. Then, the Daemon Manager assigns resources to these loading tasks similarly, except for the strategy of task triggering. In contrast to the complex strategies utilized for LSM-tree’s compaction, our approach employs a timestamp-based approach for loading the up-to-date model. Consequently, ByteCard guarantees only models with the most recent timestamp are considered for loading and updating. In the current configuration, models are scheduled for loading at a default interval of one hour unless Model Monitor detects that the performance of models is decreased due to the shift of data distribution.

Upon loading a model into memory, the Model Validator employs its validate interface to evaluate the model’s validity. This step is crucial for preventing potential crashes during actual inference (i.e., executing the estimate interface) in the query processing of ByteHouse. The validation process involves two primary checks: the *size checker* and the *health detector*. The *size checker* regulates the size of individual models and the total size of all the loaded models to prevent excessive memory usage in ByteHouse. To avoid the case in which one table’s model occupies too much memory, ByteCard will refuse to load a model if its size is too large. Moreover, when the cumulative size exceeds a predetermined threshold, ByteCard employs an LRU strategy to prioritize and retain the most frequently

```

1  template <typename T>
2  class CardEstInferenceEngine {
3  // Load a CardEst model
4      bool loadModel(String modelPath);
5
6  // Validate model legitimacy
7      bool validate();
8
9  // Initialize inference context
10     void initContext();
11
12 // Featurize a SQL query into a vector
13     FeatureVector featurizeSQLQuery(String sqlQuery);
14
15 // Featurize an abstract syntax tree into a vector
16     FeatureVector featurizeAST(AbstractSyntaxTree ast);
17
18 // Perform CardEst inference using a feature vector
19     double estimate(FeatureVector featVec);
20 };

```

**Figure 3: The APIs of Inference Engine**

used models. The *health detector* is responsible for maintaining the models’ healthy state. For example, in the case of Bayesian Networks, the detector employs a cyclic detection method to verify the structural legitimacy of the model, ensuring its structure conforms to a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG).

After the model is validated successfully, the subsequent step involves employing `initContext` to establish the programming context for inference algorithms, thereby preparing the model for estimation in the query processing. This interface enables the initialization of immutable data structures extracted from the inference algorithms, ensuring these structures remain read-only within each query thread. This approach allows the algorithms to be executed lock-free, thereby achieving high-concurrency inference.

**4.2.2 APIs for Integration with ByteHouse’s Query Processing.** The Inference Engine offers two kinds of APIs for integration with ByteHouse: one for final estimation (via the `estimate` interface) and the other for featurization (via the `featurizeSQLQuery` and `featurizeAST` interfaces). The final estimation is contingent upon a feature vector from the featurization phase. The specific inference algorithms of each CardEst model can be implemented by their own probability calculations or matrix operations in this interface.

The featurization interface is orthogonal to the inference algorithms. Its primary role is to capture the features of ByteHouse’s query-related data structures. To facilitate this, two APIs are provided for ByteHouse: One for featurization of SQL queries and the other for featurization of the abstract syntax tree (AST) produced by the ByteHouse’s analyzer. SQL-based featurization is designed for easy integration with emerging inference algorithms developed by the research community, as these algorithms usually develop featurization methods directly based on SQL queries. This interface is handy for rapid proof-of-concept evaluation. Alternative featurization, which leverages AST structures, is more effective in extracting richer features, including syntactic structures.

Nonetheless, modern database systems often utilize non-standard in-memory AST structures, leading to a lack of portability. We suggest that each system should develop a dedicated implementation of inference algorithms tailored to its AST structure. This customization would greatly help maximize the utility of learning-based CardEst models, facilitating more precise cardinality estimations for the system.

### 4.3 ModelForge Service

The ModelForge Service is introduced to encapsulate the training algorithms of learning-based CardEst models into a standalone service, which facilitates the automatic training process for different models. The initial models for existing database tables in ByteHouse are trained on the online sampled data, with the sampling process strategically scheduled during low-activity periods within the ByteHouse cluster.

Whenever the data updates appear, ByteHouse’s Data Ingestor signals the service with relevant data consumption information, which is essential for the subsequent update of the models. For Apache Hive, these messages include table schema, data format, and location. Apache Kafka contains topic names, data formats, and offset details. The training phase begins only after gathering sufficient data from these upstream sources and storing them in its dedicated cloud storage. This process involves data sampling and model training, after which the updated model is stored in a designated location, accessible for later loading by Model Loader. The data used for training is automatically purged after a predefined period, ensuring efficient data management.

The decision to develop a standalone service for running training algorithms on upstream data is driven by three factors: 1) Continuous sampling and training operations directly on the data stored within ByteHouse’s storage layer would be resource-intensive and might risk impairing the performance of online customer queries. 2) This dedicated service enables ByteCard to easily incorporate the latest training algorithms of CardEst models from the research community. 3) Despite the diversity of customer queries, the underlying data distribution tends to be relatively stable, allowing models trained on updated data to reflect the overall distributions accurately.

Within ModelForge Service, two primary tasks exist: routine training for COUNT CardEst models and occasional fine-tuning for COUNT-DISTINCT CardEst models. The regular training of COUNT CardEst models per table involves structural learning using the Chow-Liu tree algorithm [8], which aims at developing effective tree-structured models. This is followed by parameter learning based on the Expectation Maximization (EM) [13] applied to the established structure. In addition, the fine-tuning of COUNT-DISTINCT CardEst models for individual columns is designed to adjust the pre-trained RBX model to some specific columns in which the original parameters are less effective. During this process, the model learns the unique features of the particular columns while preserving its ability to conduct effective NDV estimation in general scenarios.

To enhance the efficacy of CardEst methods, ModelForge Service facilitates the specialized training for individual table shards, especially when the data distribution varies notably across different shards. This process requires the training service to obtain the shard keys and functions, segment the training data accordingly, and then train unique models specifically for each shard.

### 4.4 Auxiliary Modules

**4.4.1 Model Preprocessor.** This module performs data preprocessing in ByteHouse’s query analyzer and optimizer, further aiding the training and inference processes of different CardEst models. The

key steps consist of the *column selection* for training, *preliminary type-mapping*, and *join-pattern collection*.

The *column selection* excludes columns with complex types such as the Array and Map, which are beyond the processing capabilities of current CardEst models. The *preliminary type-mapping* is tailored to convert the database type of each selected column into formats compatible with machine learning algorithms. For example, machine learning often uses types like Binary, Categorical, and Continuous. The resultant information from the above two steps is recorded in a system table named `model_preprocessor_info`. The ModelForge Service then accesses this table to retrieve some essential information (such as which columns to read) and uses the type mapping to conduct the actual training.

The final step, *join-pattern collection*, involves gathering join schemas (such as identifiable joinable columns) using ByteHouse’s analyzer. This process is critical in industrial data warehouses like ByteHouse, where customers are not required to define Primary Key-Foreign Key (PK-FK) relationships during table creation. This practice increases the flexibility of business analytics. For multi-table CardEst models, the join pattern serves as a crucial input for the training process, as these models are required to capture the joint distribution of the join keys.


**4.4.2 Model Monitor.** As a robust industrial-level system with numerous internal customers, ByteHouse prioritizes query performance and system stability. To uphold ByteHouse’s stability, ByteCard includes a Model Monitor to assess the quality of CardEst models produced by ModelForge Service, ensuring that subpar models do not impede query processing.

Following the model-evaluation approach from [18], Model Monitor automatically generates test queries for COUNT and COUNT-DISTINCT estimation with multiple predicates. These queries are then executed by ByteHouse to obtain true cardinalities, enabling the Model Monitor to make estimations and compute Q-Errors for CardEst models. Models are retained only if their Q-Error is below a certain threshold. If the models cannot meet this standard, ByteCard reverts to traditional methods for estimating the cardinality of the affected tables, ensuring consistent performance and reliability.

Note that Model Monitor is configured to assess only the single-table COUNT CardEst models, and the multi-table models are excluded. This is due to the substantial computational resources that online ByteHouse clusters need to calculate true join sizes in Q-Error evaluation. Given that the multi-table model (FactorJoin) used by ByteCard relies on single-table models for join-size estimation, monitoring the performance of single-table models indirectly contributes to the oversight of multi-table model estimations. This approach ensures efficient resource utilization while maintaining the accuracy and reliability of single and multi-table cardinality estimations in ByteCard.

## 5 MODEL INTEGRATION

This section elaborates on integrating CardEst models into the ByteCard framework. The models’ training algorithms are developed in Python within the ModelForge Service to avoid affecting ByteHouse’s online query processing. Due to Python’s limitations in multi-threaded environments, particularly the Global Interpreter



**Figure 4: The Single-Table BN Model with its CPDs** Lock (GIL) issue [3], ByteCard employs C++ for deploying inference algorithms. This choice aligns with ByteHouse’s development language and ensures algorithms’ efficient usage in multi-threaded environments.

### 5.1 The Single-Table COUNT Model

We employ the tree-based Bayesian Networks (BN) as our single-table model for COUNT cardinality estimation. A tree-based Bayesian network is a probabilistic graphical model representing a set of variables and their conditional dependencies via a tree structure. ByteCard utilizes this model to capture the joint probability distributions across table columns. In this model, each node represents a random variable (corresponding to a table column in the context of CardEst), and each edge denotes the conditional dependencies between these variables, which are encapsulated by structures known as the conditional probability distributions (CPDs). In ByteCard, the CPDs are represented as 1D vectors or 2D matrices.

Figure 4 depicts a distilled BN model trained from a business table in an online ByteHouse cluster for analyzing the advertising placement strategy. The columns of the table are structured as a tree hierarchy, with Target Platform as the root node and Content Type as a child node, which is dependent on the Target Platform. This tree structure is reflective of practical scenarios within the domain. The adjacent CPDs depicts the dependence between those columns. The CPD of Target Platform is a 1D vector, while the CPD of Content Type and Target Platform are 2D matrices to capture the probabilistic relationships between the columns.

The inference algorithm for single-table cardinality estimation is based on the variable elimination (VE) [25], a technique for simplifying inference procedures on complex networks. Deploying VE technique for BNs requires avoiding potential data races in multi-threaded environments. To address this issue, ByteCard proposes to shift two key procedures to the `initContext` interface, which are:

- (1) **Root Identification:** The VE algorithm begins at the root and progresses towards the leaves, involving a message passing down the tree to update probability distributions at each level. In ByteCard, the root of the tree-based model serves as the starting point of the VE process.

By identifying the root of each model as an immutable structure in the `initContext` interface, then instead of applying a global lock for the entire model, we can prevent data races between each query thread and enable high-concurrency inference invocations in the multi-thread environments of query processing.

- (2) **CPD Indexing:** The execution of single-table model inference, conducted via the estimate interface, requires frequent accesses to the probability values in the CPDs. Typically, the CPDs are located in the tree structure’s nodes, but the tree’s repeated traversal to access CPDs during inference is inefficient. To address this issue, the tree structures with CPDs are transformed into an array indexed according to the nodes’ topological order. This array also records the information of nodes’ children for easy reference. As illustrated in Fig. 4, the root node Target Platform is assigned an index of 1, with subsequent indices reflecting the topological order of its children. In contrast, the leaf node Duration is assigned an index of 6. This indexing mechanism, integrated within the `initContext` interface, enables direct access to any CPD by its index, thereby eliminating the need for repeated traversal through the tree structure.

## 5.2 The Multi-Table COUNT Model

ByteCard selects the model `FactorJoin` for multi-table COUNT estimation. It combines single-table models and “join-buckets” to estimate the join query sizes accurately. `FactorJoin` employs an approach that integrates single-table models to analyze join key distributions, which subsequently partitions the joint domain of these keys into discrete buckets. The framework then utilizes a factor graph model to encapsulate these keys within a probabilistic graphical paradigm, which further facilitates the computation of an upper limit on the join sizes.

To integrate `FactorJoin`’s inference algorithm, invoking the `initContext` interface of each relevant single-table model during the initialization phase is essential. Beyond the *join-pattern collection* conducted by the Model Preprocessor as mentioned in Section 4.4, ByteCard develops two key strategies for `FactorJoin`:

- (1) **Join-Bucket Construction:** An additional task for the Model Preprocessor is the creation of “join-buckets” for `FactorJoin`. These buckets are vital for enabling join-size inference on the factor graph. By leveraging the join schema collected earlier and the equi-height histograms in ByteHouse’s optimizer, Model Preprocessor can construct “join-buckets” based on the joint domain values of all join-keys.
- (2) **Distribution-Dimension Reduction:** A standard fact table is quite common in business scenarios, where one table has several join-keys. Inference on the factor graph needs to maintain the joint distribution of these join-keys. Thus, excessive join-keys in a single table would lead to high distribution dimensionality and increased inference complexity. To address this issue, `FactorJoin` proposes a technique that explores the causality patterns between these join-keys with a tree probabilistic structure, such that the dimensionality of the joint distribution can be effectively reduced. To apply this technique, ByteCard leverages the same training procedure as the Chow-Liu algorithm in ModelForge Service. This approach for distribution dimensionality greatly enhances ByteCard’s integration efficacy and lowers the inference complexity of factor table-related join-size estimation.

## 5.3 The COUNT-DISTINCT CardEst Model

ByteCard has chosen RBX as its NDV estimator, which employs a seven-network layer training on the general feature called “frequency-profile” of NDV estimation. The “frequency profile” is a compact representation of the frequency distribution of distinct values calculated based on a sample of column data. Although training RBX from the ground up is time-consuming, it usually does not require retraining when facing new workloads. Upon completion of the training, the model weights can be stored in the cloud storage.

To integrate RBX into our framework, ByteCard loads the neural network architecture of RBX into memory during the startup of ByteHouse. Subsequently, the Model Monitor is responsible for loading the RBX model parameters through the `initContext` interface, which ensures that ByteCard retains RBX’s seven-layer neural network architecture. Unlike the frequent loading of Bayesian Network (BN) parameters, the RBX model weights are loaded with a comparatively lower frequency. This practice is justified by the broad effectiveness of RBX parameters across various scenarios due to the model’s workload-independent properties.

The RBX’s featurization process notably involves computing the important feature “frequency-profile”. Calculating the “frequency profile” is a computationally intensive task significantly impacting the overall inference process of RBX. In specific optimization scenarios of query processing where real-time NDV estimation is crucial, creating a “frequency profile” is critical to efficiently providing accurate NDV estimates to ByteHouse. Section 6.2 delves into a specific estimation scenario to apply RBX’s estimation, shedding light on the refinement of “frequency-profile” computation. After feature extraction, the central inference computation within the estimate interface entails matrix multiplication operations upon the neural network.

## 6 ENHANCED QUERY OPTIMIZATION

This section shows how ByteHouse leverages the accurate cardinality estimations from ByteCard to enhance its query optimization. While the discussion is limited to only two scenarios, ByteCard has the potential to offer broader benefits.

### 6.1 The Cases for Materialization Strategy

We enhanced ByteHouse’s previous strategy by introducing a multi-stage reader approach. In contrast to the single-stage reader that retrieves columns and applies predicate filtering in one pass, this method incrementally constructs tuples through sequential filtering and appending columns. To accommodate diverse business scenarios, ByteHouse now simultaneously utilizes single- and multi-stage strategies. This integration with ByteCard enables the materialization strategies to significantly reduce I/O costs during query processing. At last, we will discuss how join-order selection affects the efficiency of materialization strategies.

**6.1.1 Column-Order Selection in Multi-Stage Reader.** In the multi-stage reader, the order in which the required columns are accessed is crucial. Specifically, it is beneficial to prioritize highly selective columns to minimize I/O overhead in later stages. The strength of learned CardEst models is their capability to capture cross-column correlations, which is challenging for traditional histogram-based



methods. Although the independent storage of each column in ByteHouse might suggest that cross-column correlations are negligible, this assumption is incorrect in certain cases.

*Example 6.1. Assume, for contradiction, that the selection order of columns, despite their cross-column correlations, has no substantial effect on I/O overhead. Consider an instance where filters are set as  $col1 > 0$  AND  $col2 > 0$  AND  $col3 > 0$ , with  $col1$  independent of  $col2$  and  $col3$ , which are strongly correlated ( $col2 = col3 + 2$ ). This assumption leads to  $prob(col2 > 0) \leq prob(col2 > -2) = prob(col3 > 0)$ . Assuming  $prob(col1 > 0)=0.7$ ,  $prob(col2 > 0)=0.6$  and  $prob(col3 > 0) = 0.8$ , a straightforward selectivity estimation would prioritize  $col2 \rightarrow col1 \rightarrow col3$ . However,  $prob(col2 > 0 \text{ AND } col3 > 0) = prob(col2 > 0) < prob(col1 > 0)$ , suggesting that reading  $col2$  and  $col3$  before  $col1$  would minimize I/Os. This contradicts our initial assumption, proving that the order of column access, especially considering cross-column correlations, critically impacts I/O overhead. Therefore, accounting for these correlations and optimizing the access order of columns is essential to maximize the effectiveness of learned CardEst models.*

To exploit the power of learned CardEst, estimating the selectivity of column combinations with diverse predicates is necessary. This incurs additional overhead due to the need to enumerate all read column orders. However, imposing constraints on the enumeration process could help mitigate this overhead. For example, we can early-stop the process if the selectivity of the current generated combination exceeds a predefined threshold. This constraint allows us to ease the enumeration process while leveraging the benefits of learned CardEst models.

**6.1.2 Dynamical Decision of Reader Selection.** The complexity of complex analytical workloads highlights that no single materialization strategy is universally optimal. While the multi-stage reader could effectively reduce unnecessary read I/Os and performs well in most cases, it has been observed that for specific customer queries, the multi-stage reader might incur significantly more I/Os than its single-stage counterpart. These scenarios often occur when the predicates are non-selective, requiring processing a large portion of the dataset across different stages.

To optimally select the appropriate materialization strategy for a given query, ByteHouse utilizes ByteCard’s cardinality estimation to compute the query’s overall selectivity. The single-table CardEst model (i.e., tree-based Bayesian network) that we employ proves more efficient for queries with multiple AND-ed predicates due to its inherent modeling of joint probability distributions across columns. In practice, ByteCard uses the *inclusion-exclusion* principle to transform OR-ed queries to AND-ed formats before calculating selectivities. ByteHouse opts for the single-stage reader when a query’s overall selectivity is high (e.g.,  $< 0.15$ ); otherwise, it defaults to the multi-stage reader.

**6.1.3 Join-Order Selection.** The efficiency of materialization strategies in handling multi-table join queries critically depends on the join orders, which affects the decision on whether to materialize tuples before or after applying the join operation in the query plan [1]. Early join operations containing large tables necessitate in-memory tuple materialization, which consumes substantial time and resources.

As discussed in Section 3, ByteCard employs FactorJoin for join size estimation, thereby avoiding the *join-uniformity* assumption. Presently, ByteCard utilizes FactorJoin exclusively for estimating join sizes between base tables, a practice that has already shown considerable promise in enhancing ByteHouse’s join processing efficiency through materialization strategies. Enhanced accuracy in join size estimation enables ByteHouse to optimize join order, reducing the volume of intermediate results needed for materialization. This optimization, in turn, lessens CPU and I/O costs linked to join operations, leading to more efficient join query execution.

## 6.2 The Cases for Aggregation Processing

The NDV estimation is also essential for optimizing the processing of a wide range of queries in ByteHouse. This subsection discusses how ByteCard utilizes RBX estimator to optimize the aggregation processing in ByteHouse and how to address the estimator’s anomalous cases.

**6.2.1 How RBX can help?** As Section 3 discusses, *resizing* hash tables during aggregation processing could significantly impact query performance, especially regarding memory management. Therefore, it is essential to accurately estimate the hash table’s initial size. Underestimating the initial size can lead to frequent resizing due to rapid saturation, which degrades performance. Overestimating the initial size can lead to unnecessary disk spillover or suboptimal memory utilization.

The estimation of hash table size can benefit from ByteCard’s learned NDV estimator (i.e., RBX), which adapts to the diverse and unpredictable data distributions encountered in different scenarios. This approach differs fundamentally from traditional statistics collection methods used in optimizers, which calculate NDV estimations for different columns beforehand. A notable challenge in hash-table size prediction for aggregation processing is that columns targeted for aggregation often are subject to user-defined predicates, making the precomputation of NDVs impractical.

To enable RBX to infer the hash table size accurately, ByteCard needs to construct a key feature (i.e., *sample-profile*) in the featureization interface as mentioned in Section 5. To build this feature for inference, Model Loader loads a small sample (under 10 million rows) for each table and converts them into a DataFrame<sup>4</sup> format using a high-performance C++ library. This enables efficient filtering and calculation of the *sample-profile*. Based on the *sample-profile*, ByteCard facilitates RBX’s actual inference through the estimate interface.

**6.2.2 Calibration.** While the RBX estimator typically offers ByteHouse high-precision estimations, there are cases in specific business scenarios where it may underestimate the NDV, mainly when the actual number of distinct values in a column is exceptionally high. To address this issue, ByteCard has established a calibration protocol to fine-tune the estimation of the RBX model. If the Model Monitor detects inadequate NDV estimations of some specific columns (e.g., large Q-Errors), it will initiate a fine-tuning procedure for the problematic column in the ModelForge Service. This procedure augments the original RBX’s training dataset with

<sup>4</sup>The DataFrame is a mutable two-dimensional table supporting various data types and labeled axes for streamlined data handling and in-memory analysis.

sampled data from the problematic columns, alongside additional synthetic data characterized by high NDVs, and retrains the RBX model from the established checkpoint that is applicable to general use cases. For scenarios with exceptionally high NDVs, the fine-tuning process requires a reduced learning rate and imposes more significant penalties for underestimations. Once the fine-tuning is completed, the refined neural network parameters are stored in the cloud and retrieved by the Model Loader. It is important to note that these updated parameters are specifically tailored to adjust and calibrate only the columns that have been identified as problematic.

## 7 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

This section evaluates the performance improvements by integrating ByteCard into ByteHouse, using workloads from academic and industrial datasets to evaluate ByteCard’s effectiveness. We begin our evaluation by analyzing how ByteCard enhances the overall performance metric, specifically, the query latency across various workloads. This end-to-end evaluation establishes the practical benefits of the proposed system. Subsequently, we will analyze the improvement from the perspective of the ByteHouse system, focusing on aspects like reading I/Os. Finally, we will examine how ByteCard refines the accuracy of cardinality estimation to bolster the above systematic metric and provide further insights into ByteCard’s models.

### 7.1 Experimental Setup

All experiments were conducted on a large-scale ByteHouse cluster with the specifications detailed in Table 4.

**Datasets.** For datasets, we employed two from the academic community (IMDB [28], STATS [18]) and one from our internal business scenario (AEOLUS-1T). The original sizes of the two academic datasets were relatively small, so we scaled them to 1TB using the method proposed in [21]. This scaling method preserves the original data distribution, facilitating the calculation of the true cardinality and evaluating the algorithm metric, Q-Error.

**Workloads.** We opted for the JOB-LIGHT workload [24] instead of the original JOB workload [28] as JOB-LIGHT does not contain any predicates on strings, which is not a priority for ByteHouse’s current customers. We then selected the STATS-CEB [18] workload for the STATS dataset as it is the latest benchmark that is sufficiently complex to evaluate CardEst methods.

To assess the performance of aggregation processing, we manually extended the original workloads with additional queries that reflect practical analytical usage, creating new workloads called JOB-Hybrid and STATS-Hybrid, respectively. For instance, the aggregation queries for the STATS dataset include an average score of user posts and several comments per post by year.

For the AEOLUS-1T dataset, we employed a representative workload extracted from the online cluster called AEOLUS-Online. This workload comprises five business tables and encompasses various join and aggregation queries. The statistical information of the three workloads is presented in Table 5.

### 7.2 Query Latency

We compared end-to-end query performance between two traditional CardEst methods and ByteCard on the three workloads. The

**Table 4: Machine and Cluster setup.**

CPU	Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 6230 (CPU @ 2.10GHz and 75 cores)
Memory	300 G
Network	10Gbps Ethernet
OS	Debian 9 (Linux Kernel Version 5.4.56)
Cache	55M shared L3 cache
Server	1
Compute-Worker	8
Ingestor-Worker	8

**Table 5: Workload Statistics.**

	JOB-Hybrid	STATS-Hybrid	AEOLUS-Online
# of queries	100	200	200
# of join templates	23	70	-
# of joined tables	2-5	2-8	2-5
# of group-by keys	1-2	1-2	2-4
range of true cardinality	$9 \cdot 10^3 - 9 \cdot 10^{12}$	$5.2 \cdot 10^4 - 4.4 \cdot 10^{12}$	$7 \cdot 10^3 - 4.7 \cdot 10^{11}$
# of queries hit the max joined-table	31	6	7
# of queries hit the max group-by key	11	13	50

first method, inherent to ByteHouse, leverages sketch-based algorithms (Histogram and HyperLogLog) with pre-computed sketches for each dataset. The second is sample-based, akin to AnalyticDB’s approach [60]. We standardized sample rates and the degree of parallelisms across methods for a fair comparison and disabled query caching in all experiments to ensure unbiased results.

The results are plotted in Figure 6, with latency normalized against the highest value in each plot. The figure illustrates the 50th, 75th, 90th, and 99th percentile query latency across three workloads. For each workload, ByteCard demonstrates the optimal latency almost at all quantiles. This efficacy is attributed to its precise estimation capabilities and its integral role in performance-critical execution paths within ByteHouse, notably in aspects like materialization strategy and join-order selection.

In the lower latency quantiles, the performance of the sample-based method is observed to be sub-optimal when compared to the sketch-based method, with ByteCard exhibiting comparable efficacy. The suboptimal performance of the sample-based approach is attributable to its requisite for predicate computation during real-time sampling. This process incurs significant overhead in the cardinality estimation stage, a limitation not encountered by the other two methods.

At higher latency quantiles, ByteCard notably outperforms traditional methods, with the most substantial improvement evident in the P99 latency of the STATS-Hybrid workload. This improvement is attributed to ByteCard’s selection of lightweight models, which provide high-accuracy cardinality estimation and benefit from an efficient inference procedure enabled by the Inference Engine abstraction. The marked enhancement of the STATS workload is due to its complex data distribution, which challenges traditional methods to deliver accurate cardinality estimates.

We then focus on the perspective of ByteHouse to understand how ByteCard improves query latency performance for different workloads. In this set of experiments, we analyze ByteCard’s role in reducing read I/Os and diminishing the need for frequent hash table resizing during aggregation processing. To this end, we divided the STATS and AEOLUS datasets into varying scales and conducted training processes for each scale. This approach enables




Figure 5: Query Performance




Figure 6: Query Performance

an evaluation of ByteCard’s impact on system metrics of ByteHouse, highlighting its effectiveness across varying data scales.

**Read I/Os.** Figure 6(a) illustrates the read I/Os during query processing for the STATS-Hybrid workload across various scales of the STATS dataset, with the values normalized to the largest I/O size observed in this experiment. In smaller data scales, the sketch-based method (specifically, histograms in this context) aids ByteHouse’s materialization strategy in reducing read I/Os more effectively than the sample-based method, owing to its capacity for relatively precise estimations. However, as the data scale enlarges, the sketch-based method’s performance deteriorates due to its reliance on simplified assumptions. In contrast, the sample-based method delivers more accurate estimations in larger data scales, benefiting from its flexibility and adaptability to changing data patterns. Despite these advantages, both traditional methods are surpassed by ByteCard. ByteCard’s superiority is attributed to its capacity to capture cross-column and cross-table correlations, utilizing Bayesian networks and FactorJoin. Consequently, ByteCard guides the materialization strategy for ByteHouse to minimize read I/Os more effectively.

**Resizing Frequency.** Figure 6(b) displays the frequency of hash table resizing during the aggregation processing of the AEOLUS dataset at different scales. The sketch-based method, specifically HyperLogLog, fails to support NDV estimation effectively in such a dynamic scenario; The sample-based method has significant overhead due to its requirement to evaluate query predicates in real time. Given these constraints, both methods are generally deemed unsuitable for aggregation processing scenarios. Consequently, our analysis is confined to evaluating whether enabling ByteCard in ByteHouse would reduce resizing frequency. The results revealed by Figure 6(b) emphasize the efficiency of ByteCard, particularly RBX, in significantly reducing the necessity for hash table resizing during the aggregation process of ByteHouse, showcasing its superior performance and adaptability.

Notably, RBX’s workload-independent nature eliminates the requirement of separate model training for each dataset scale. As

the data scale escalates, resizing frequency rapidly increases in the absence of ByteCard. Conversely, by utilizing RBX’s estimations provided by ByteCard, ByteHouse shows remarkable effectiveness in significantly reducing the frequency of hash table resizing, even amidst escalating data scales. This highlights the efficacy of RBX’s estimations in dynamically adjusting to varying data volumes, thereby enhancing ByteCard’s effectiveness in memory management during aggregation processing.

### 7.3 Algorithmic Observations

In this set of experiments, we delve into an algorithmic perspective to evaluate the accuracy of cardinality estimations provided by ByteCard for ByteHouse. Subsequently, we examine the resource consumption of the models employed by ByteCard, focusing on model size and training time.

**Q-Error.** Figure 7 presents the Q-Error results using violin plots. For all the distributions of Q-Errors, we can see that most Q-errors are concentrated on smaller values indicated by the width of the violin. The thick horizontal line in the middle of box inside each violin represents the median of Q-Error, while the box’s extent shows the interquartile range (the middle 50% of the values). Traditional methods and ByteCard exhibit distinct characteristics on both critical elements of the plots.

The median Q-Error of ByteCard across all the workloads achieves the lowest value among the three evaluated methods. Its interquartile range is also relatively lower than the two traditional methods. For JOB-Hybrid, the sketch-based method’s median Q-Error is comparable to that of the sample-based method but exhibits poorer performance at higher quantiles. For STATS-Hybrid, the sketch-based method’s performance deteriorates further, attributable to STATS’s more complex data distribution and the larger query space of STATS-Hybrid. In the case of AEOLUS-Online, sample-based methods demonstrate limited robustness, primarily due to the complexity of business queries, which hinder accurate estimation of small samples.

Interestingly, in many cases, the sample-based method demonstrates a better Q-Error than the sketch-based method. Yet, it does not translate into superior end-to-end query performance. This paradox arises because the improved cardinality estimation of the sample-based method, due to its flexibility, comes at the expense of increased estimation overhead. This phenomenon underscores why ByteCard prioritizes models that offer high-accuracy estimation and efficient inference. Owing to strategic model selection and the




Figure 7: Algorithm Performance: Q-Error

Inference Engine abstraction for efficiently integrating the inference algorithms, ByteCard consistently achieves optimal Q-Error across all three workloads.

**Model Details.** Table 6, extracted from the ModelForge Service, records the size and training details of ByteCard’s models such as Bayesian Network (BN). The table also encompasses FactorJoin, detailing the size of its *join-buckets* and the associated construction time, indicative of its training time. Both models maintain a compact size, below 5 Mb. Integration of these models into ByteHouse results in a moderate increase in memory footprints, yet this expansion does not impose a substantial resource burden on the system.

Table 6: Details of ByteCard’s Models Per Table

Dataset	Method	Model Size	Training Time
IMDB	BN	3.6 Mb	2.5 min
	FactorJoin	2.9 Mb	1.9 min
	RBX	256 Kb	-
STATS	BN	4.2 Mb	3.1 min
	FactorJoin	2.3 Mb	0.8 min
	RBX	256 Kb	-
AEOLUS	BN	4.3 Mb	2.2 min
	FactorJoin	3.6 Mb	1.7 min
	RBX	534Kb	57 min

The training time of RBX for the IMDB and STATS datasets is not recorded due to its workload-independent nature, requiring only a single offline training session. As a result, the model size for RBX remains uniform across these datasets. While RBX is generally effective, it faces challenges with columns in AEOLUS’s tables with unusually high NDVs. To mitigate this, a calibration approach involving model fine-tuning is developed.

The learning rate is reduced in the ModelForge Service’s fine-tuning process, leading to slower convergence. The fine-tuning for a single problematic column may take approximately an hour. Notably, this does not compromise ByteHouse’s stability. Firstly, the fine-tuning occurs in the ModelForge Service, thereby not impacting ByteHouse’s computational resources. Secondly, in cases where Model Monitor identifies poor NDV estimations from RBX models for specific columns, it instructs ByteHouse to switch to a traditional NDV estimator. ByteCard only integrates a RBX model for estimating these problematic columns once MM has validated the new parameters.

## 8 LESSONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

**Limitations of Learned CardEst Methods]:** Although learned CardEst methods offer significant potential to enhance ByteHouse via various optimization strategies, their implementation might sometimes result in less-than-optimal performance due to several factors. Firstly, the complexity of data distributions and the diversity of query workloads across different business scenarios pose

substantial challenges to achieving accurate cardinality estimates. No single model, including BayesCard or FactorJoin, could excel in all situations. For instance, BayesCard is prone to underestimate join sizes with substantial true cardinalities in comparison to its counterparts [18, 56]. Although the integration of BayesCard with FactorJoin through ByteCard has mitigated this issue to some extent, we plan to further delve into emerging approaches such as meta-learning [20, 21, 57] to tackle the estimation challenges.

Moreover, their focus solely on base table estimations constrains the current landscape of learning-based CardEst models. This limitation calls for cutting-edge researches that synergize machine learning techniques with the Cascades framework [16], a foundation for modern query optimizers. The Cascades framework typically employs the memogroup [27], a fundamental abstraction for organizing logically equivalent query plans or expressions. We suggest that researchers construct CardEst models centered around the memogroup, leveraging its essential role in efficiently exploring the space of potential query plans.

In addition, achieving accurate CardEst does not solely ensure optimal system performance. Other critical factors, including cost models, indexing strategies, and hardware constraints, significantly influence the overall system efficiency. The complexity of big-data systems and the variability of cloud environments [38, 43] make the accurate modeling of query plan costs rather challenging, even with reliable cardinality estimates. Our future work will explore additional opportunities where machine learning could enhance ByteHouse’s query processing efficiency, mainly through integrating learning-based cost models [43, 45].

**Model Preference for ML-enhanced Components:** Unlike the approaches that apply ML for logical tuning outside the system kernel, such as knob tuning [41, 51, 61] and materialized view recommendations [17, 31, 51], ByteCard distinguishes itself as an ML-enhanced component embedded in the core of industrial-grade data warehouses, aiming at the physical (in-kernel) optimization. This strategic positioning allows ByteCard to directly enhance the data processing capabilities of the warehouse by leveraging ML for in-depth system improvements rather than focusing solely on external logical tuning strategies.

For learning-based physical optimization, particularly in areas such as cardinality and cost estimation, it is vital to establish distinct criteria for model selection, which differs from those applied in learning-based logical tuning approaches. Unlike logical tuning, where machine learning serves mainly as an intelligent advisory mechanism, physical optimization demands direct integration into the runtime execution process, necessitating distinct considerations for model selection. For model selection in physical optimization

tasks, we advocate a shift towards prioritizing rapid inference capabilities. This criteria calls for a preference for compact yet precise models over more cumbersome alternatives, including deep neural networks or large language models (LLMs) [4, 53]. The considerable training demands and resource intensiveness required by larger models make them impractical within physical optimization, where efficiency and rapid execution are crucial.

**Future Integration of More ML-Enhanced Components:** Incorporating ML-enhanced components into database systems requires careful design since integrating different models would demand different design choices. Within a tightly coupled architecture, it’s crucial to include both model training and inference processes within the system kernel. However, this approach limits the framework’s capacity to evaluate emerging learning-based cardinality estimation methods. Executing the training and inference phases for diverse AI4DB models in the native language dedicated to system development entails significant engineering effort. By leveraging ByteCard, specifically designed to incorporate learning-based cardinality estimation, we present an engineering exemplar that encapsulates the adoption of AI4DB methods.

Our future work aims to deploy more ML-enhanced components, such as learning-based cost models, into our system. Contrary to cardinality estimation models, cost models typically employ query-driven approaches to improve performance. These models, such as XGBoost [37] and Elastic Net [43], require runtime traces and query plan statistics for effective training. Like other data warehouse systems, ByteHouse is equipped to gather and store these necessary logs in designated system tables. To facilitate the integration of learning-based cost models, the ModelForge Service will connect to the warehouse to retrieve query logs, enabling the training process to be executed through its on-demand services.

Integrating inference algorithms of learning-based cost models into our system necessitates circumventing the simple Python implementations to mitigate their adverse impact on query performance. Thus, ByteCard’s Inference Engine emerges as a pivotal component. The engine’s interface, purposefully designed to be agnostic towards the varied inference logic of AI4DB models, standardizes the model behavior for inference within the database kernel. While the loading of learning-based models could adhere to the protocols established for the CardEst models, the initialization and validation phases demand carefully customized implementations for each model to avoid disrupting regular query processing. Additionally, a robust implementation for model featurization and the inference algorithm is essential. These implementations must be optimized for kernel-level invocation, mainly through inference-related interfaces, to ensure efficient and reliable execution during database tasks.

## 9 CONCLUSIONS

ByteCard represents a significant advancement in integrating state-of-the-art, learning-based CardEst models into ByteDance’s industrial data warehouse system, ByteHouse. The framework’s design, including the Inference Engine and ModelForge Service, facilitates efficient model management and deployment, thereby enhancing query processing without burdening the computational resources of ByteHouse. This work paves the way for ByteHouse’s future

advancements in challenging areas of query optimization, including cost models.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We sincerely thank the anonymous reviewers for their feedback which helped improve our work. Also, we extend our thanks to our former colleague, Duc Canh Le, for his contribution to the development of the early ByteCard prototype. This work is supported by NSFC 62202171, Shanghai Pujiang Program (21PJ1403200) and ByteDance-ECNU joint program (PJ20240202900021).

## REFERENCES

- [1] Daniel J Abadi, Daniel S Myers, David J DeWitt, and Samuel R Madden. 2006. Materialization strategies in a column-oriented DBMS. In *2007 IEEE 23rd International Conference on Data Engineering*. IEEE, 466–475.
- [2] Nikos Armenatzoglou, Sanuj Basu, Naga Bhanoori, Mengchu Cai, Naresh Chainani, Kiran Chintia, Venkatraman Govindaraju, Todd J Green, Monish Gupta, Sebastian Hillig, et al. 2022. Amazon Redshift re-invented. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data*. 2205–2217.
- [3] David Beazley. 2010. Understanding the python gil. In *PyCON Python Conference*. Atlanta, Georgia. 1–62.
- [4] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M.F. Balcan, and H. Lin (Eds.), Vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., 1877–1901. [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2020/file/1457c0d6b6bcb4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/1457c0d6b6bcb4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Paper.pdf)
- [5] Anne Chao and Shen-Ming Lee. 1992. Estimating the number of classes via sample coverage. *Journal of the American statistical Association* 87, 417 (1992), 210–217.
- [6] Moses Charikar, Surajit Chaudhuri, Rajeev Motwani, and Vivek Narasayya. 2000. Towards estimation error guarantees for distinct values. In *Proceedings of the nineteenth ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART symposium on Principles of database systems*. 268–279.
- [7] Lixiang Chen, Ruihao Chen, Chengcheng Yang, Yuxing Han, Rong Zhang, Xuan Zhou, Peiquan Jin, and Weining Qian. 2023. Workload-Aware Log-Structured Merge Key-Value Store for NVM-SSD Hybrid Storage. In *2023 IEEE 39th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 2198–2210.
- [8] CKCN Chow and Cong Liu. 1968. Approximating discrete probability distributions with dependence trees. *IEEE transactions on Information Theory* 14, 3 (1968), 462–467.
- [9] Reuven Cohen and Yuval Nezi. 2019. Cardinality Estimation in a Virtualized Network Device Using Online Machine Learning. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking* 27 (2019), 2098–2110. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:76667669>
- [10] Benoit Dageville, Thierry Cruanes, Marcin Zukowski, Vadim Antonov, Artin Avanes, Jon Bock, Jonathan Claybaugh, Daniel Engovatov, Martin Hentschel, Jiansheng Huang, et al. 2016. The snowflake elastic data warehouse. In *Proceedings of the 2016 International Conference on Management of Data*. 215–226.
- [11] Yifan Dai, Yien Xu, Aishwarya Ganesan, Ramnathan Alagappan, Brian Kroth, Andrea Arpaci-Dusseau, and Remzi Arpaci-Dusseau. 2020. From {WiscKey} to Bourbon: A Learned Index for {Log-Structured} Merge Trees. In *14th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 20)*. 155–171.
- [12] Jialin Ding, Ryan Marcus, Andreas Kipf, Vikram Nathan, Aniruddha Nrusimha, Kapil Vaidya, Alexander van Renen, and Tim Kraska. 2022. SageDB: An Instance-Optimized Data Analytics System. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 15, 13 (2022), 4062–4078.
- [13] Chuong B Do and Serafim Batzoglou. 2008. What is the expectation maximization algorithm? *Nature biotechnology* 26, 8 (2008), 897–899.
- [14] Anshuman Dutt, Chi Wang, Azade Nazi, Srikanth Kandula, Vivek Narasayya, and Surajit Chaudhuri. 2019. Selectivity estimation for range predicates using lightweight models. *PVLDB* 12, 9 (2019), 1044–1057.
- [15] Philippe Flajolet, Éric Fusy, Olivier Gandouet, and Frédéric Meunier. 2007. Hyperloglog: the analysis of a near-optimal cardinality estimation algorithm. In *Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science*. Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science, 137–156.
- [16] Goetz Graefe. 1995. The cascades framework for query optimization. *IEEE Data Eng. Bull.* 18, 3 (1995), 19–29.
- [17] Yue Han, Guoliang Li, Haitao Yuan, and Ji Sun. 2021. An autonomous materialized view management system with deep reinforcement learning. In *2021 IEEE 37th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 2159–2164.
- [18] Yuxing Han, Ziniu Wu, Peizhi Wu, Rong Zhu, Jingyi Yang, Liang Wei Tan, Kai Zeng, Gao Cong, Yanzhao Qin, Andreas Pfadler, Zhengping Qian, Jingren Zhou, Jiangneng Li, and Bin Cui. 2022. Cardinality Estimation in DBMS: A Comprehensive Benchmark Evaluation. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 15, 4 (apr 2022), 752–765. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3503585.3503586>
- [19] Stefan Heule, Marc Nunkesser, and Alexander Hall. 2013. Hyperloglog in practice: Algorithmic engineering of a state of the art cardinality estimation algorithm. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Extending Database Technology*. 683–692.
- [20] Benjamin Hilprecht and Carsten Binnig. 2021. One model to rule them all: towards zero-shot learning for databases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.00642* (2021).
- [21] Benjamin Hilprecht and Carsten Binnig. 2022. Zero-Shot Cost Models for out-of-the-Box Learned Cost Prediction. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 15, 11 (jul 2022), 2361–2374. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3551793.3551799>
- [22] Benjamin Hilprecht, Andreas Schmidt, Moritz Kulessa, Alejandro Molina, Kristian Kersting, and Carsten Binnig. 2019. DeepDB: learn from data, not from queries!. In *PVLDB*.
- [23] Zachary G Ives and Nicholas E Taylor. 2008. Sideways information passing for push-style query processing. In *2008 IEEE 24th International Conference on Data Engineering*. IEEE, 774–783.
- [24] Andreas Kipf, Thomas Kipf, Bernhard Radke, Viktor Leis, Peter Boncz, and Alfons Kemper. 2019. Learned cardinalities: Estimating correlated joins with deep learning. In *CIDR*.
- [25] Daphne Koller and Nir Friedman. 2009. *Probabilistic graphical models: principles and techniques*. MIT press.
- [26] Andrew Lamb, Matt Fuller, Ramakrishna Varadarajan, Nga Tran, Ben Vandier, Lyric Doshi, and Chuck Bear. 2012. The vertica analytic database: C-store 7 years later. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1208.4173* (2012).
- [27] Kulkjin Lee, Anshuman Dutt, Vivek Narasayya, and Surajit Chaudhuri. 2023. Analyzing the Impact of Cardinality Estimation on Execution Plans in Microsoft SQL Server. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 16, 11 (2023), 2871–2883.
- [28] Viktor Leis, Andrey Gubichev, Atanas Mirchev, Peter Boncz, Alfons Kemper, and Thomas Neumann. 2015. How good are query optimizers, really? *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 9, 3 (2015), 204–215.
- [29] Viktor Leis, Bernhard Radke, Andrey Gubichev, Atanas Mirchev, Peter Boncz, Alfons Kemper, and Thomas Neumann. 2018. Query optimization through the looking glass, and what we found running the join order benchmark. *The VLDB Journal* 27 (2018), 643–668.
- [30] Guoliang Li, Xuanhe Zhou, Ji Sun, Xiang Yu, Yue Han, Lianyuan Jin, Wenbo Li, Tianqing Wang, and Shifu Li. 2021. opengauss: An autonomous database system. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 14, 12 (2021), 3028–3042.
- [31] Xi Liang, Aaron J Elmore, and Sanjay Krishnan. 2019. Opportunistic view materialization with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.01363* (2019).
- [32] Jie Liu, Wenqian Dong, Qingqing Zhou, and Dong Li. 2021. Fauc: fast and accurate deep ensembles with uncertainty for cardinality estimation. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 14, 11 (2021), 1950–1963.
- [33] H-A Loeliger. 2004. An introduction to factor graphs. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine* 21, 1 (2004), 28–41.
- [34] Frank Luan, Amog Kamsetty, Eric Liang, and Zongheng Yang. 2020. Github repository: neurocard project. <https://github.com/neurocard/neurocard> (2020).
- [35] Parimarjan Negi, Ziniu Wu, Andreas Kipf, Nesime Tatbul, Ryan Marcus, Sam Madden, Tim Kraska, and Mohammad Alizadeh. 2023. Robust Query Driven Cardinality Estimation under Changing Workloads. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 16, 6 (2023), 1520–1533.
- [36] Subhadeep Sarkar, Dimitris Staratzis, Ziehen Zhu, and Manos Athanassoulis. 2021. Constructing and Analyzing the LSM Compaction Design Space. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 14, 11 (jul 2021), 2216–2229. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3476249.3476274>
- [37] Gaurav Saxena, Mohammad Rahman, Naresh Chainani, Chunbin Lin, George Caragea, Fahim Chowdhury, Ryan Marcus, Tim Kraska, Ippokratis Pandis, and Balakrishnan Narayanaswamy. 2023. Auto-WLM: Machine learning enhanced workload management in Amazon Redshift. In *Companion of the 2023 International Conference on Management of Data*. 225–237.
- [38] Jörg Schaad, Jens Dittrich, and Jorge-Arnulfo Quiané-Ruiz. 2010. Runtime measurements in the cloud: observing, analyzing, and reducing variance. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 3, 1-2 (2010), 460–471.
- [39] P Griffiths Selinger, Morton M Astrahan, Donald D Chamberlin, Raymond A Lorie, and Thomas G Price. 1979. Access path selection in a relational database management system. In *Proceedings of the 1979 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*. 23–34.
- [40] Praveen Seshadri, Joseph M Hellerstein, Hamid Pirahesh, TY Cliff Leung, Raghu Ramakrishnan, Divesh Srivastava, Peter J Stuckey, and S Sudarshan. 1996. Cost-based optimization for magic: Algebra and implementation. In *Proceedings of the 1996 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*. 435–446.
- [41] Yu Shen, Xinyuyang Ren, Yupeng Lu, Huaqun Jiang, Huanyong Xu, Di Peng, Yang Li, Wentao Zhang, and Bin Cui. 2023. Rover: An online Spark SQL tuning service via generalized transfer learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04046* (2023).
- [42] Lakshmi Kant Shrinivas, Sreenath Bodagala, Ramakrishna Varadarajan, Ariel Cary, Vivek Bharathan, and Chuck Bear. 2013. Materialization strategies in the vertica analytic database: Lessons learned. In *2013 IEEE 29th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 1196–1207.
- [43] Tarique Siddiqui, Alekh Jindal, Shi Qiao, Hiren Patel, and Wangchao Le. 2020. Cost models for big data query processing: Learning, retrofitting, and our findings. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*. 99–113.
- [44] Mike Stonebraker, Daniel J Abadi, Adam Batkin, Xuedong Chen, Mitch Cherniack, Miguel Ferreira, Edmond Lau, Amerson Lin, Sam Madden, Elizabeth O’Neil, et al. 2018. C-store: a column-oriented DBMS. In *Making Databases Work: the Pragmatic*

- Wisdom of Michael Stonebraker.* 491–518.
- [45] Ji Sun and Guoliang Li. 2019. An End-to-End Learning-Based Cost Estimator. 13, 3 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.14778/3368289.3368296>
- [46] Ji Sun, Jintao Zhang, Zhaoyan Sun, Guoliang Li, and Nan Tang. 2021. Learned cardinality estimation: A design space exploration and a comparative evaluation. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 15, 1 (2021), 85–97.
- [47] Yutian Sun, Tim Meehan, Rebecca Schussel, Wenlei Xie, Masha Basmanova, Orri Erling, Andrii Rosa, Shixuan Fan, Rongrong Zhong, Arun Thirupathi, et al. 2023. Presto: A Decade of SQL Analytics at Meta. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 1, 2 (2023), 1–25.
- [48] Yutian Sun, Tim Meehan, Rebecca Schussel, Wenlei Xie, Masha Basmanova, Orri Erling, Andrii Rosa, Shixuan Fan, Rongrong Zhong, Arun Thirupathi, Nikhil Collooru, Ke Wang, Sameer Agarwal, Arjun Gupta, Dionysios Logothetis, Kostas Xirogiannopoulos, Amit Dutta, Varun Gajjala, Rohit Jain, Ajay Palakuzhy, Prithvi Pandian, Sergey Pershin, Abhisek Saikia, Pranjal Shankdhar, Neerad Somanchi, Swapnil Tailor, Jialiang Tan, Sreeni Viswanadha, Zac Wen, Biswapesh Chattopadhyay, Bin Fan, Deepak Majeti, and Aditi Pandit. 2023. Presto: A Decade of SQL Analytics at Meta. 1, 2, Article 189 (jun 2023), 25 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3589769>
- [49] Chuzhe Tang, Youyun Wang, Zhiyuan Dong, Gansen Hu, Zhaoguo Wang, Minjie Wang, and Haibo Chen. 2020. XIndex: a scalable learned index for multicore data storage. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGPLAN symposium on principles and practice of parallel programming*. 308–320.
- [50] Saravanan Thirumuruganathan, Suraj Shetiya, Nick Koudas, and Gautam Das. 2022. Prediction Intervals for Learned Cardinality Estimation: An Experimental Evaluation. In *2022 IEEE 38th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 3051–3064.
- [51] Dana Van Aken, Andrew Pavlo, Geoffrey J Gordon, and Bohan Zhang. 2017. Automatic database management system tuning through large-scale machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM international conference on management of data*. 1009–1024.
- [52] Jiayi Wang, Chengliang Chai, Jiabin Liu, and Guoliang Li. 2021. FACE: A normalizing flow based cardinality estimator. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 15, 1 (2021), 72–84.
- [53] Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, et al. 2022. Emergent abilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07682* (2022).
- [54] Renzhi Wu, Bolin Ding, Xu Chu, Zhewei Wei, Xiening Dai, Tao Guan, and Jingren Zhou. 2021. Learning to Be a Statistician: Learned Estimator for Number of Distinct Values. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 15, 2 (oct 2021), 272–284. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3489496.3489508>
- [55] Ziniu Wu, Parimarjan Negi, Mohammad Alizadeh, Tim Kraska, and Samuel Madden. 2023. FactorJoin: A New Cardinality Estimation Framework for Join Queries. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 1, 1 (2023), 1–27.
- [56] Ziniu Wu and Amir Shaikhha. 2020. BayesCard: A Unified Bayesian Framework for Cardinality Estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.14743* (2020).
- [57] Ziniu Wu, Peilun Yang, Pei Yu, Rong Zhu, Yuxing Han, Yaliang Li, Defu Lian, Kai Zeng, and Jingren Zhou. 2022. A Unified Transferable Model for ML-Enhanced DBMS. *Conference on Innovative Data Systems Research* (2022).
- [58] Zongheng Yang, Amog Kamsetty, Sifei Luan, Eric Liang, Yan Duan, Xi Chen, and Ion Stoica. 2021. NeuroCard: One Cardinality Estimator for All Tables. *PVLDB* 14, 1 (2021), 61–73.
- [59] Zongheng Yang, Eric Liang, Amog Kamsetty, Chenggang Wu, Yan Duan, Xi Chen, Pieter Abbeel, Joseph M Hellerstein, Sanjay Krishnan, and Ion Stoica. 2019. Deep unsupervised cardinality estimation. *PVLDB* (2019).
- [60] Chaoqun Zhan, Maomeng Su, Chuangxian Wei, Xiaoqiang Peng, Liang Lin, Sheng Wang, Zhe Chen, Feifei Li, Yue Pan, Fang Zheng, et al. 2019. AnalyticDB: real-time OLAP database system at Alibaba cloud. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 12, 12 (2019), 2059–2070.
- [61] Ji Zhang, Yu Liu, Ke Zhou, Guoliang Li, Zhili Xiao, Bin Cheng, Jiahu Xing, Yangtao Wang, Tianheng Cheng, Li Liu, et al. 2019. An end-to-end automatic cloud database tuning system using deep reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Management of Data*. 415–432.
- [62] Rong Zhu, Ziniu Wu, Yuxing Han, Kai Zeng, Andreas Pfadler, Zhengping Qian, Jingren Zhou, and Bin Cui. 2021. FLAT: Fast, Lightweight and Accurate Method for Cardinality Estimation. *VLDB* 14, 9 (2021), 1489–1502.