

Enabling Data Dependency-based Query Optimization

Daniel Lindner
Hasso Plattner Institute, University of
Potsdam, Germany
daniel.lindner@hpi.de

Daniel Ritter
SAP
Walldorf, Germany
daniel.ritter@sap.com

Felix Naumann
Hasso Plattner Institute, University of
Potsdam, Germany
felix.naumann@hpi.de

ABSTRACT

Data dependency-based query optimization techniques can considerably improve database system performance: we apply three such optimization techniques to five database management systems (DBMSs) and observe throughput improvements between 5 % and 33 %. We address two key challenges to achieve these results: (i) efficiently identifying and extracting relevant dependencies from the data, and (ii) making use of the dependencies through SQL rewrites or as transformation rules in the optimizer.

First, the schema does not provide all relevant dependencies. We present a workload-driven dependency discovery approach to find additional dependencies within milliseconds. Second, the throughput improvement of a state-of-the-art DBMS is 13 % using only SQL rewrites, but 20 % when we integrate dependency-based optimization into the optimizer and execution engine, e. g., by employing dependency propagation and subquery handling. Using all relevant dependencies, the runtime of four standard benchmarks improves by up to 10 % compared to using only primary and foreign keys, and up to 22 % compared to not using dependencies. The dependency discovery overhead amortizes after a single workload execution.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Information systems** → **Query optimization**; *Data mining*; *Query planning*; Horizontal partitioning.

KEYWORDS

Data profiling, Query optimization, Data dependencies, Subqueries.

1 INTRODUCTION

Data dependencies are metadata formalizing specific properties and interrelations of data. Their discovery and use have been researched for decades [19] in different application areas, such as data cleaning [20, 59] and data integration [38, 43]. For instance, a column is a valid unique column combination (UCC) if there are no duplicate values. If all values of one column are also present in another column, there is an inclusion dependency (IND). Relational databases support specific data dependencies, such as unique/primary key constraints (UCCs) and foreign key constraints (INDs).

Knowledge about data dependencies is the basis of manifold query optimization techniques [33], as efficient query plans can speed up query runtimes by orders of magnitude [30, 46]. Besides UCCs and INDs, such optimization techniques use functional dependencies (FDs) or order dependencies (ODs).

As part of our own experiments, Figure 1 shows that the average throughput across four analytical benchmarks and for five DBMSs improves when applying three exemplary data dependency-based SQL query rewrites and when using the optimizer of one DBMS. Many queries achieve better performance with the rewrites, and




Figure 1: Average throughput improvements of dependency-based optimization using SQL rewrites (and the Hyrise optimizer) over base configurations (multi-threaded).

better performance still when optimized by the DBMS, as they further benefit from changing join types that SQL cannot express.

Though research proposed many and various dependency-based optimizations, real-world DBMSs apply only a few [34] based on primary and foreign keys (PKs/FKs) for multiple reasons [33]:

- R-1 The performance impact of dependency-based optimizations has yet to be thoroughly quantified [34].
- R-2 Data dependencies are fragile along a query plan. For instance, a column might no longer be unique after a join.
- R-3 Many valid data dependencies exist in real-world datasets, but they are often unknown or not declared as constraints [7, 40]. SQL cannot even express some relevant dependencies, such as FDs or ODs, as table constraints [29, p. 89].
- R-4 Dynamic, changing datasets can render dependencies invalid; for instance, a single insertion can invalidate a UCC or an IND.

This paper addresses the first three reasons, focusing on a data warehouse scenario where data is updated by *extract, transform, load* (ETL) processes. We select three exemplary cost-independent dependency-based query rewrites for groupings and joins [34], which are expensive operations [16], and apply them to different workloads and DBMSs (R-1). To facilitate the entire performance improvement, we integrate these rewrites into the optimizer of an open-source DBMS. As a precondition, we propagate dependencies in the query plan (R-2) and modify the optimizer and execution engine to handle specific subquery patterns introduced by rewrites transforming joins into selections.

Workload-driven dependency discovery can find relevant dependencies beyond schema-defined constraints and the expressiveness of SQL [33]. We use the architecture of previous work to discover these dependencies with fast validation algorithms tailored to databases (R-3) as part of an ETL process. Though we focus on three

optimization techniques, we present an extensible framework for applying further dependency-based optimizations. We perceive discovered data dependencies as metadata rather than constraints the DBMS enforces. Thus, we abolish the necessity to model constraints explicitly and do not add overhead for enforcing constraints, e. g., by maintaining additional indexes.

After Section 2 presents related work in dependency-based query optimization and metadata discovery, Section 3 introduces fundamental concepts of data dependencies, dependency-based query optimization, and database systems. Section 4 presents our system overview. In particular, we make the following core contributions:

- C-1 *Dependency propagation.* We describe how to represent and propagate data dependencies in the query plan to enable precise and straightforward application of dependency-based optimization techniques (Section 5).
- C-2 *Subquery handling.* One selected rewrite heavily uses scalar subqueries in selection predicates. Thus, we integrate the handling of scalar subqueries into the DBMS, focusing on cardinality estimation and dynamic pruning using subquery results during execution (Section 6).
- C-3 *Metadata-aware dependency validation.* We present novel algorithms that exploit the data layout, encoding, and statistics to achieve negligible dependency discovery overhead when validating four dependency types (Section 7).
- C-4 *Evaluation.* We evaluate the potential of dependency-based optimization even beyond using PKs and FKs for five state-of-the-art systems, including a commercial one. Furthermore, we analyze the benefits of the system integration and discuss the overhead of additional dependency discovery (Section 8). We achieve average latency improvements between 10 % and 22 % for four benchmarks using only three rewrites.

We conclude and discuss how future work can extend our approach to dynamic datasets in Section 9. Our open-source implementation is available online.¹

2 RELATED WORK

We identify two main research fields connected to metadata-based query optimization. First, data dependency-based query optimization has been proposed for various systems and recently applied to a research prototype. Second, data profiling systems for the automatic discovery of further metadata have been developed to use discovered metadata for query optimization.

2.1 Data Dependency-based Query Optimization

Query optimization using data dependencies has been proposed since the 1970s. In their survey, Kossmann et al. [34] collected more than 60 such optimization techniques, grouping them by the type of exploited dependency, the affected operator of the relational algebra, and the optimization category. Section 3.2 presents three logical query rewrites [1, 12, 15, 51, 65] in detail.

Based on their survey, Kossmann et al. [33] presented an approach to automatically generate and validate interesting dependency candidates using workload information. They evaluated to

which extent selected optimizations using these discovered dependencies benefit the performance of three benchmark workloads. An overview of their system is given in Section 4. However, the authors neither completely integrated dependency-based optimizations into the DBMS nor provided efficient validation algorithms.

We build upon previous work by thoroughly integrating selected optimization techniques in the query processing pipeline, extending query optimization and execution logic. Thus, we show that a deeper system integration improves performance characteristics (Section 8.3). Furthermore, we present novel, highly optimized metadata-aware dependency validation strategies and evaluate the impact of selected optimization techniques for different DBMSs.

2.2 Further Metadata for Query Optimization

Data profiling refers to the task of metadata discovery [2]. Traditional data dependency mining algorithms aim to find all valid dependencies in a given dataset. Efficient algorithms have been proposed for different dependency types in single-node and distributed environments [11, 18, 53]. However, (i) finding all dependencies in a dataset is expensive, and (ii) further metadata besides data dependencies can be used for query optimization.

Thus, various systems exist to discover and use *semantic constraints* for cost-based query optimization [32]. An example of such a semantic constraint is that every manager in a company is paid a bonus of at least \$1 000. Yu and Sun [70] and Hsu and Knoblock [26] compared the result sets of queries to derive valid constraints. Thus, they could only transform queries if relevant query reformulations were also part of the workload. To overcome this shortcoming, Shekhar et al. [61] and Pena et al. [56] derived valid constraints from the data first and used them for optimization in the second step. These systems also discover semantic constraints that cannot be used for query optimizations, leading to avoidable overhead. Furthermore, they add another optimization layer on top of the DBMS. Siegel et al. [62] generated semantic constraint candidates during optimization and validated them later, coupling constraint discovery tightly with query optimization.

Recently, Liu et al. [40] performed static source code analysis to identify various constraints the applications guarantee, such as inclusion dependencies, regular expressions for strings, or attribute nullability. They used these constraints for SQL query preprocessing, stating that “most of the inferred constraints [were] not declared in the database,” optimizers did not support specific rewrites, and they were “unaware of any existing tools that can discover [constraints]” [40, p. 1209–1210].

In contrast, we present a system to integrate dependency-based optimization techniques and the discovery of beneficial dependencies into database systems. Instead of semantic constraints, we exploit data dependencies. Furthermore, our approach to collecting relevant metadata is decoupled from the core query execution and uses specialized validation algorithms.

3 DATA DEPENDENCIES FOR OPTIMIZATION

This section describes the basic concepts we build upon in our work. After we define different data dependency types in Section 3.1, Section 3.2 illustrates three dependency-based logical query rewrites

¹See <https://github.com/HPI-Information-Systems/dependency-based-qa>.

using an example query. Finally, Section 3.3 introduces relevant features of relational DBMSs.

3.1 Data Dependencies

Data dependencies are dedicated metadata that describe *how* data is interrelated. Specific relationships are formalized to prove and compute whether a dataset fulfills a dependency’s requirements, i. e., whether the dependency is *valid* or not. In the following, we define four types of data dependencies.

Unique Column Combination (UCC). Let R be a relation. The subset of attributes $X \subseteq R$ is a UCC iff there are no tuples whose projection on X is equal [41]. UCCs can occur by chance or stem from real-world identifiers or surrogate keys. Thus, they are also referred to as *candidate keys* [14]. A relational database can represent UCCs via unique or primary key constraints.

Functional Dependency (FD). An FD $X \rightarrow Y$ is valid iff all tuples with the same values for $X \subseteq R$ also have the same values for $Y \subseteq R$ [14, 68]. In particular, the FD $X \rightarrow R \setminus X$ always holds if X is a UCC. However, FDs can be more complex and usually stem from real-world relationships [60], such as $\text{zip} \rightarrow \text{city}$.

Order Dependency (OD). If ordering the tuples of R by X also orders the tuples by Y , then $X \mapsto Y$ is a valid OD [64]. In this case, X and Y are lists of attributes in R , i. e., the attribute order is relevant. ODs often occur in data that includes a time component [64, 65].

Inclusion Dependency (IND). The IND $X \subseteq Y$ is valid iff all distinct values of $R[X]$ are also present in $S[Y]$ [13]. As a special case, R and S might refer to the same relation. INDs, or foreign key candidates, often represent membership or ownership and can be represented using a foreign key constraint.

3.2 Data Dependency-based Query Rewrites

Corresponding to previous work [33], we picked a subset of three dependency-based logical query rewrites surveyed by Kossmann et al. [34] that rely on the four dependency types defined in Section 3.1. Specific query rewrites promise to improve performance always [34]. Furthermore, the selected rewrites target aggregate and join operators, which are costly for analytical workloads [16]. To illustrate the three rewrites, we use an example query inspired by TPC-DS data and constraints, which selects each customer’s ID, name, and the sum spent on purchases for a specific time period:

```
SELECT c_sk, c_name, sum(s_sales_price)
FROM date_dim
      INNER JOIN sales ON d_sk = s_sold_date
      INNER JOIN customer ON s_customer = c_sk
WHERE d_date = '2000-01-01'
GROUP BY c_sk, c_name;
```

Figure 2 shows query plans resulting from the three query rewrites, where Figure 2a is the original query plan. Data dependencies exploited by each individual optimization technique are highlighted.

O-1 Dependent group-by reduction [12, 15]. Grouping by multiple attributes can be avoided if an FD’s determinant *and* dependent attributes are part of the group-by list. We remove all dependent attributes from the grouping set and select any dependent attribute value of dependent attributes, as they are uniform within the group.

In the example query, the customer’s name c_name is unique for their ID c_sk . Thus, we only group by c_sk .

O-2 Join to semi-join rewrite [51]. The second query rewrite transforms an inner equi-join $R \bowtie S$ to a semi-join $R \ltimes S$. Many DBMSs implement semi-joins as they execute them efficiently [3, 5, 24, 44, 51]. This rewrite is possible if S ’s join key is unique and subsequent operators or the final projection require no further attributes of S . In fact, the semi-join acts as a filter for R by the values of S ’s join key(s). Figure 2c shows that we perform a semi-join to replace $\text{sales} \bowtie \text{date_dim}$. Here, date_dim ’s join key is the primary key, and no attribute of date_dim is selected later.

O-3 Join to predicate rewrite [1, 65]. If joins are merely used to filter relations, we might even replace them with a selection. In our example query, the date_dim table represents each day. Thus, the d_date column is unique. Selecting a single day results in a single value for the join key. Instead of joining the sales table with the date_dim table, the query plan of Figure 2d turns the join into a selection to filter sales for the single join key, which is determined by a scalar subquery.

Similarly, the rewrite can be applied to range predicates. Adapting our example query, we change the temporal filter from $d_date = '2000-01-01'$ to $d_year = 2000$. The OD $d_sk \mapsto d_date$ ensures that the minimal and maximal join keys within the selected d_date values are fed into the join, and the combination of the IND $s_sold_date \subseteq d_sk$ and the UCC d_sk guarantees that all tuples of the sales table have exactly one join partner. Thus, we can rewrite the join to a selection with a predicate value between the minimum and maximum of the join key in Figure 2e.

3.3 Relevant Database Concepts

Dependency-based query optimization is applicable to any DBMS. However, columnar, partitioned, and encoded data with statistics is the basis of our novel dependency validation algorithms and dynamic partition pruning. We integrate the dependency discovery system as a plug-in as an optional task decoupled from the DBMS core. Thus, we explain these pertinent DBMS concepts in the following

Storage layout. Many commercial, open-source, and research DBMSs support columnar storage [17, 21, 28, 35, 40, 45, 57, 58], which improves performance for analytical workloads [1, 10]. Standardized storage formats, such as Apache Parquet and ORC, also build upon this layout [71]. Columns are usually split into horizontal partitions (also called *chunks* or *row groups*) to ease parallelization and the distribution of large data. Each partition contains one *segment* for each column in the table, storing a fraction of the attribute’s fields.

Immutable segments can be encoded to improve space and execution efficiency using various lightweight or heavyweight compression schemes. Dictionary encoding is often the default for real-world data [22, 71], where the sorted dictionary stores all unique values locally for each segment or globally for the entire column [10]. The attribute vector references the dictionary offset for each segment position’s value.

Statistics. Databases use segment statistics to refine access to stored data. Segments’ minimal and maximal values (*zone maps* [72]) or value ranges (*range sets* [52]) allow for *pruning* partitions, i. e., skipping them during execution if they do not match selection




Figure 2: Original query plan and versions successively rewritten using O-1, O-2, and O-3. Edges are annotated with the data dependencies that enable the following rewrites. Rewritten parts and dependencies used are highlighted. Note that the selection predicate on *date_dim* was changed to showcase the OD-based version of O-3.

predicates. Pruning is effective if data is partitioned by attributes that are frequently used in predicates, where tuples within the same value range are stored in the same partition. Such statistics are also available for Parquet files [71].

Plug-in interface. Plug-in interfaces allow functionality to be added without changing the core database code [4, 17]. Plug-ins are shared libraries that can be dynamically loaded and unloaded.

4 WORKLOAD-DRIVEN DATA DEPENDENCY DISCOVERY

This section describes the general approach of workload-driven dependency discovery and details of our implementation for an open-source DBMS. The architecture of the workload-driven dependency discovery system is based on Kossmann et al. [33].

4.1 Overview

Figure 3 gives an architectural overview of our automatic dependency discovery system. During regular workload execution, the DBMS translates a SQL query into a query plan and optimizes it ①. Optimizer rules can use metadata, such as data dependencies ②, in the optimization step. If the same query has been issued before, the query plan is obtained from the plan cache ③.




Figure 3: Architectural overview of the automatic dependency discovery, based on Kossmann et al. [33]. We contribute to components with bold outlines.

The automatic dependency discovery can be triggered asynchronously. First, the discovery system obtains the workload’s collected query plans from the plan cache ④. The candidate generator parses these plans ⑤ and obtains a set of dependency candidates ⑥. These dependency candidates are examined using an extensible set

of candidate rules ⑦, which anticipate the dependency-based optimizer rules' behavior and return those dependencies from which optimization could benefit if they were valid.

Finally, the candidates are validated ⑧ on the stored data instance, skipping already validated candidates. We describe the tailored dependency validation algorithms and the order of candidate validation in Section 7. Valid dependencies are persisted ⑨ as table metadata. After execution, the plug-in clears the SQL plan cache ⑩. Thus, a future query of an already issued template must be optimized again, this time with optimization techniques using the persisted dependencies ②.

4.2 System Integration

We want to implement selected optimization techniques and dependency discovery for a modifiable system with relevant features from Section 3.3, allowing reproducibility. Two state-of-the-art alternatives are the open-source systems *DuckDB* [57] and *Hyrise* [17]. Our aim is to improve the throughput of analytical systems processing high-load workloads and serving multiple concurrent users. Thus, we implemented the dependency discovery system as a plug-in for Hyrise, as DuckDB is primarily designed for a single-client use case [57]. Hyrise is a columnar in-memory DBMS with horizontal partitioning into fixed-sized chunks of 65 535 tuples, featuring different encoding schemes (the default is dictionary encoding), zone maps or range sets per column segment, a plug-in interface, and a rule-based optimizer with heuristic and cost-based transformations.

We contribute multiple components based on the architecture of Kossmann et al. [33]. First, we facilitate using discovered data dependencies in the core DBMS. Section 5 explains how we propagate data dependencies in query plans to derive valid dependencies for each operator in the optimization phase. Second, Section 6 provides the adaptations required to support subqueries introduced by dependency-based rewrites. These adaptations include improved cardinality estimation and extensions to query scheduling and execution to enable dynamic partition pruning. Third, we present our highly optimized dependency validation algorithms in Section 7.

The dependency discovery's design as a plug-in decouples it from the DBMS core, making it completely optional if all dependencies are known in advance. Triggering the discovery process is controllable and asynchronous, avoiding overhead in the running system. Thus, dependency discovery can be performed as a one-shot overhead for static datasets, regularly as part of an ETL process, or continuously for evolving workloads, where different query templates are queried over time. We perceive (discovered) data dependencies as additional metadata useful for optimization rather than as (SQL) data constraints. Because dependencies, as opposed to constraints, are not enforced by the DBMS, we avoid the overhead of, e. g., additional index structures and data checks regarding memory consumption and insertion latency.

5 DATA DEPENDENCY PROPAGATION IN THE QUERY PLAN

We describe how we can ensure which relevant dependencies are valid for each operator in the query plan during optimization. This knowledge is crucial for dependency-based optimization to return




Figure 4: Example of dependency propagation in the query plan. Operators can add or remove data dependencies.

correct and complete query results. Evaluating the validity of dependencies for a specific logical operator is cumbersome, as operators can modify the required properties of a relation. For instance, a UCC $R.a$ might not be valid after an inner join $R \bowtie S$, as each tuple in R can have multiple join partners, or an IND $R.a \subseteq S.x$ can be invalid after a selection on S . Thus, we adequately propagate dependencies in the query plan (C-1). Liu et al. [40] gave anecdotal evidence that this propagation is not trivial by stating that implementing UCC propagation in Postgres lasted more than two years².

We achieve precise dependency information by consecutive dependency propagation and adaptation by each logical operator. Starting from the declared or validated dependencies persisted for a relation (see Section 4.1), each operator adds or removes dependencies and forwards them. Query plans are subject to change for each optimization step. Thus, operators do not persist dependencies but recursively compute them on the fly based on their input operators' dependencies. Figure 4 provides an example of this dependency propagation. The following paragraphs explain how we propagate the displayed dependencies.

Unique column combinations. The uniqueness of columns is affected only by operators that duplicate tuples. In the example query plan, relation R initially has a UCC on column a . Relation S has no valid UCCs, but its column x is unique after being the group-by attribute of the aggregation $\gamma_x(S)$. The inner join $R \bowtie_{a=x} S$ does not produce multiple output tuples for both join keys, as they are unique. Thus, both UCCs are preserved. The projection $\pi_{a,x}$ does not affect the UCCs. This example illustrates how operators adapt input dependencies to provide all dependencies that hold for them.

The example is not exhaustive, and we implemented further logic to propagate dependencies. We forward UCCs if all required columns are part of the operator's output and no function modifies the values. A UCC a on R is invalidated (i) by inner equi-joins $R \bowtie_{a=S.x} S$ where S 's join key is not unique, (ii) by outer and theta-joins, and (iii) by UNION ALL operators. However, grouping creates new UCCs.

Functional dependencies. FDs can always be derived from existing UCCs and ODs. Even after joins $R \bowtie_{R.a=S.x} S$ where x is not unique and after theta-joins, the FD $a \rightarrow R \setminus a$ still holds and can be forwarded. These forwarded FDs remain unchanged as long as the involved attributes are part of the operator output.

Order dependencies. ODs are invalidated by UNION ALL operators or if their attributes are not part of the operator output. However, the join keys of an equi-join $R \bowtie_{R.a=S.x} S$ form two ODs $a \mapsto x$ and

²See <https://commitfest.postgresql.org/35/2433/> (accessed April 9, 2024).

$x \mapsto a$, as seen in Figure 4. For such joins, existing ODs with the join key(s) on the left-hand side form transitive ODs with the other relation’s join key(s). As we derive FDs from ODs, this behavior reflects transitive FDs for the join keys.

Inclusion dependencies. For an IND $R.a \subseteq S.b$, it is not obvious whether it should be propagated starting from R or S . Furthermore, INDs are also the most volatile dependency type: a single selection on S can invalidate the IND. Thus, we persist them as a dependency on both relations and propagate them starting at S . To prove whether a propagated IND holds, we must only check whether all foreign key columns are still present in the plan. We forward INDs if all columns are part of an operator’s output, except for selections. Selections only propagate an input IND with b as the referenced column for $\sigma_{b \text{ IS NOT NULL}}(S)$. In most cases, selections return an empty set of INDs and do not recurse further.

By incorporating dependency propagation in the query plan, we enable dependency-based query optimization out of the box and move further to making data dependencies first-class citizens of the database system.

6 SUBQUERY HANDLING

This section proposes dedicated subquery handling to leverage dynamic pruning using subquery results. Dependency-based optimizations rewrite joins into selections using the results of scalar subqueries (see join to predicate rewrite O-3 in Section 3.2), which require adjusted treatment in the query plan and enable further optimization during execution. Usually, database optimizers perform the opposite operation and rewrite even scalar subqueries to (semi-)joins (*subquery unnesting*) to avoid evaluating the subquery for each row [9, 23, 25, 31]. However, executing predicates containing the result of a scalar subquery is efficient, as we can execute the subquery once and use its result like a regular constant. Thus, we handle these predicates accordingly in the query plan (C-2), even though the predicate values are unknown until query execution. We identify two main challenges to employing these ideas: (i) cardinality estimation and (ii) partition pruning. Our proposed solutions are generally applicable and not limited to facilitating dependency-based optimization.

6.1 Cardinality Estimation

One approach to mitigate the aforementioned challenges is to execute the subqueries during optimization and to insert the predicate values in a preprocessor-like manner. The optimizer places selections with concrete predicate values in the query plan based on the estimated selectivity and cost. These selections will likely be estimated differently than the unnested semi-join, leading to optimized plans with a completely different structure than the unoptimized versions. Furthermore, this approach violates the desirable separation of query optimization and execution.

If predicates using scalar subquery results generated by O-3 are placed equivalently to semi-joins, the placement resembles the unnested alternative the query optimizer considers without this optimization. Otherwise, changed placements could effectively alter the join order, causing different query plans as a side effect.

We have yet to determine the exact subquery results during optimization. Thus, the cardinality estimation of the unnested subquery,

i.e., a semi-join, is probably the closest approximation the cardinality estimator can provide. In particular, it equals the estimation without applying O-3, leading to an equivalent placement in the plan. Knowing the exact patterns of the rewritten query plans, we can check if predicates with uncorrelated subqueries match these patterns and estimate their cardinality like the original, unnested semi-joins before applying the rewrite.

6.2 Partition Pruning Using Subquery Results

Commonly, horizontally partitioned databases prune partitions based on statistics, such as zone maps or range sets [48, 52, 72]. Partitions where no tuples can match selection predicates are excluded from execution, reducing the amount of data being processed by the selection and previous operators in the plan. Clearly, we cannot perform such pruning during optimization if the predicate values are yet to be determined by the query execution. However, we keep track of the predicates that could enable pruning and shift from static partition pruning to *dynamic* pruning using subquery results.

We link predicates with scalar subquery results to the logical operators that first access the base relations alongside the optimization logic that performs static partition pruning. We search for eligible selections with predicates that contain scalar subquery results by visiting subsequent operators and traversing all paths until we reach the plan’s root, i. e., the final operator. We can only prune using predicates that are in all paths: a predicate that is only part of a disjunctive OR condition cannot be safely used without risking incorrect query results. We attach selection predicates fulfilling this condition to the operators accessing the base relations and loading the data. During the translation to physical operators and when instantiating a plan from a cached template, we map and relink translated or copied predicates.

When scheduling physical operators for execution, we add the subquery operators as predecessors of the operators accessing the base relations. Thus, the subqueries are executed first, and we can perform dynamic partition pruning with the evaluated subquery results when executing the operators loading the data. We take care to guarantee that the resulting operator graphs are acyclic. Otherwise, queries become stuck in mutual waiting situations. Cycles could happen due to subplan deduplication, where equivalent plan parts are mapped to a single operator sequence.

Our proposed technique for dynamic partition pruning using subquery results is also applicable to predicates using scalar subquery results in general and to data-induced predicates (diPs) [52], which can be further optimized with this form of dynamic pruning. In fact, O-3 can be perceived as a special case of a diP that completely replaces a join.

7 METADATA-AWARE DATA DEPENDENCY VALIDATION

Reducing the overhead of additional dependency discovery requires efficient dependency validation strategies. This section presents tailored dependency validation algorithms we designate as *metadata-aware validation* (C-3). First, we motivate the need for fast dependency validation for query optimization and explain how it differs from traditional data profiling. Subsequently, we provide details on

how we tailored algorithms to validate four types of data dependencies specifically inside a database. Finally, we explain how we order dependency candidates to minimize validation overhead.

We can validate specific dependency types using SQL [2, 8]. For instance, the following query validates the UCC candidate R_a :

```
SELECT count(DISTINCT a) = count(a) FROM R;
```

However, specialized validation algorithms outperform such validation using general-purpose database operators [2, 18]. Contrary to state-of-the-art data profiling algorithms, we do not need to discover and validate *all* dependencies of a particular type, which is an NP-hard problem [2]. Furthermore, we can exploit metadata and encoding characteristics provided by the database system.

Rather than optimizing lattice traversal by aggressive search space pruning and using data structures to combine already computed results, we focus on resource-efficient validation of individual dependency candidates. We implemented our approach for an in-memory database system, mainly relying on dictionary encoding. However, the provided algorithms apply to any system that uses statistics for columns or horizontal partitions of columns, including standardized storage formats, such as Apache Parquet. As the applied query rewrites mostly target joins, our tailored validation algorithms provide specializations for numeric key candidates.

In the

following, R denotes a relation, a an attribute of R , and S_a the set of a 's segments, i. e., partitions of a . We denote the minimum and maximum attribute value present in a segment $s \in S_a$ with $\min(s)$ and $\max(s)$. The cardinality (number of distinct values) of s is $\text{card}(s)$, whereas the number of tuples in s is $\text{size}(s)$. The notions of cardinality and size also apply to attributes and relations. $|S_a|$ is the number of column a 's segments.

7.1 Unique Column Combinations

State-of-the-art UCC discovery algorithms intersect so-called position list indexes (PLIs) [27] to combine the values of multiple columns and traverse the lattice efficiently [11, 54]. However, we can simplify the validation to construct a hash set containing a column's values for a single unary UCC candidate. As soon as we add a value to this set without increasing the set size, the column is not unique, and we can invalidate the candidate. If we added all fields of a column without aborting, the column is a UCC.

We can further optimize the validation logic by incorporating metadata known by the database. We use a segment's minimal and maximal value, size, and cardinality to reduce validation overhead. By accessing the first and the last elements of segments s 's local dictionary, we can obtain $\min(s)$ and $\max(s)$. The dictionary size equals the number of the segment's distinct values $\text{card}(s)$, whereas the length of the attribute vector is the number of tuples $\text{size}(s)$. If the segment is not dictionary-encoded, zone maps, range sets, or other statistics provide this information. For instance, also Apache Parquet files contain segment size and cardinality.³

For metadata-aware UCC validation, we iterate over the dictionaries or data statistics. Figure 5 shows a running example of our UCC validation approach. If a single segment is not unique, neither is the column. Thus, we compare the distinct value count of each segment with its size, i. e., the number of stored tuples. We can

³See <https://parquet.apache.org/docs/file-format/metadata/> (accessed April 9, 2024).




Figure 5: Metadata-aware UCC validation using the on-the-fly segment index. Segment 17 invalidates the UCC: it is not unique and its domain overlaps with Segment 2.

immediately terminate the validation and reject the candidate if $\text{card}(s) \neq \text{size}(s)$. This is the case for Segment 17: it has six unique values, where the segment size is seven.

Furthermore, a column is unique if all segments are unique and the segments' value domains do not overlap. Thus, we build a segment index containing chunk IDs on the fly. We continuously insert each segment's chunk ID with both $\min(s)$ and $\max(s)$ as keys. We use a tree-based `std::map` for this index to iterate the nodes in a sorted manner, which is not a performance issue in our experiments (see Section 8.4). For each chunk ID at key $\min(s)$, the chunk ID at the following key must reference the same segment, i. e., the same ID. Segments 1 and 2 in Figure 5 have no overlapping domains, but the minimal value of Segment 17 is between Segment 2's minimal and maximal values. Thus, the chunk ID at key 9 differs from that at the subsequent key 14.

However, the column can still be unique if all segments are unique, but their domains overlap. Then, we must fall back to constructing the hash set of all values. Segments of range-partitioned (especially sorted) primary keys do not overlap by design, speeding up their validation (cf. Section 8.4). For such a range-partitioned column a of relation R , checking each segment's uniqueness and building the index has a complexity in $\mathcal{O}(|S_a| \cdot \log |S_a|)^4$ rather than $\mathcal{O}(\text{size}(R))$ for hash set construction,⁵ where $|S_a| \ll \text{size}(R)$.

7.2 Functional Dependencies

Our approach to validate FD candidates uses a simplified strategy exploiting that $a \rightarrow R \setminus a$ is a valid FD if a is a UCC, e. g., if a is a primary key. Instead of searching for FDs in all combinations of the candidate columns (i. e., the *lattice*), we only check if one of the columns is unique. This simplification comes with the downside of falsely rejecting valid n -ary FD candidates with more than one determinant column. Indeed, we miss query optimization opportunities with these candidates, but we avoid the expensive lattice traversal. However, the anticipated query rewrite benefits most when we can reduce to a single grouping attribute.

7.3 Order Dependencies

We cannot avoid sorting when validating an OD candidate $a \mapsto b$. The basic approach is to sort by a using the DBMS's sort operator

⁴We assume an amortized complexity of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ for accessing the next element in the index. In particular, incrementing the `std::map`'s iterator is constant if a is sorted, as we always insert keys at the tree's leaf with the highest value.

⁵For simplicity, we assume average hash set insertion in $\mathcal{O}(1)$, i. e., no hash collisions or hash table resizing. We pre-allocate the hash table to guarantee enough buckets.

and to verify whether b is also sorted. If this is not the case, we reject the candidate. To optimize the validation and reject invalid ODs faster, we first sort and check on a sample of 100 tuples. We show that this sample size is sufficient to reject all invalid ODs in our benchmark data (Section 8.4).

For tables with multiple chunks/partitions, we construct one segment index for each a and b . If we iterate both indexes simultaneously and the chunk IDs have the same order, we can sort each chunk individually and only fall back to sorting the entire column if there are overlaps. For segments of b , overlaps of one value, i. e., $\min(s_j) = \max(s_j)$, are allowed. In this way, we can reduce the complexity from $\mathcal{O}(\text{size}(R) \cdot \log \text{size}(R))$ to $\mathcal{O}(|S_a| \cdot \log |S_a| + |S_a| \cdot c \cdot \log c) \approx \mathcal{O}(|S_a| \cdot \log |S_a| + \text{size}(R) \cdot \log c)$, where c is the chunk size (e. g., fixed size of 65 535 for Hyrise) and $|S_a| \ll \text{size}(R)$. Sorting can be omitted if the partitions are already sorted by a , reducing the complexity to $\mathcal{O}(|S_a| \cdot \log |S_a| + \text{size}(R))$ for ordered relations.

7.4 Inclusion Dependencies

In general, we can validate a single IND candidate $R.a \subseteq S.x$ by building a hash set of x 's values and checking if each value of a is contained in this set. Multiple encoding characteristics and statistics can be exploited to accelerate validation. First, we often observe that $\text{size}(R) \gg \text{size}(S)$ when R is a fact table and S is a dimension table. Thus, the set of x 's values is relatively small, and many tuples in R reference the same key in S . If a is dictionary-encoded, we do not have to probe each tuple for containment, but only the dictionary entries for each segment.

Second, we can use minimum and maximum values and continuity for further optimization. For instance, the IND $R.a \subseteq S.x$ cannot hold if $\min(a) < \min(x)$ or $\max(a) > \max(x)$, which can easily be derived from the segment statistics or the dictionaries. Furthermore, the IND must hold if $\min(a) \geq \min(x)$, $\max(a) \leq \max(x)$, and $\forall v \in [\min(x), \max(x)] : v \in x$, i. e., x contains continuous values. This rather straightforward reformulation allows us to drastically improve the validation performance for integer data types, e. g., numeric keys: if $\max(x) - \min(x) = \text{card}(x) + 1$, x must contain all values in $[\min(x), \max(x)]$. For unique columns, $\text{card}(x) = \text{size}(x)$. Thus, if we know that x is a UCC, we can check for continuity and ensure that x 's minimal and maximal values match a .

The uniqueness property can either be given by an already validated UCC or derived by applying the same techniques as for UCC validation (set construction with index optimization for range-partitioned keys, see Section 7.1). In the latter case, we also detect a valid UCC on x , which we store as well and do not need to validate again if requested. We only fall back to probing a 's values to the hash set if x is not continuous.

The general validation strategy of building a set for $S.x$'s values and probing $R.a$'s values has a complexity in $\mathcal{O}(\text{size}(S) + \text{size}(R))$. If x is continuous but unsorted, we can omit the probing step and reduce the complexity to $\mathcal{O}(|S_{S,x}| \cdot \log |S_{S,x}| + \text{size}(S) + |S_{R,a}|)$. For a range-partitioned and continuous integer key x , the complexity further decreases to $\mathcal{O}(|S_{S,x}| \cdot \log |S_{S,x}| + |S_{R,a}|)$ using the segment index or $\mathcal{O}(|S_{S,x}| + |S_{R,a}|)$ if we already validated that x is unique.

Identifying a 's minimum and maximum value in $\mathcal{O}(|S_{R,a}|)$ is always required. However, $|S_{R,a}| \ll \text{size}(R)$ and $|S_{S,x}| \ll \text{size}(S)$. For foreign keys in fact and dimension tables, $\text{size}(S) \ll \text{size}(R)$.

7.5 Ordering Dependency Candidates

From the previous description of validation techniques, we observe characteristics that yield rules for a beneficial order to validate dependency candidates. First, validating an IND candidate $R.a \subseteq S.x$ always confirms a possible UCC $R.x$. If this UCC is also a candidate, we can skip its validation later. Second, we can skip the validation of an FD candidate if any of the candidate columns is a UCC.

Furthermore, the rules generating dependency candidates can provide additional information. The candidate rule for O-3 is an example of *candidate dependence*. Section 3.2 explains that we need an OD, an IND, and a UCC to apply this rewrite based on a range predicate. If it is invalid, an OD candidate $S.x \mapsto S.y$ can be rejected early using sampling. An IND candidate $R.a \subseteq S.x$ cannot be rejected before constructing $S.x$'s value set if $S.x$ does not contain all values present in $R.a$.

Thus, the need to validate the IND candidate depends on the validation result of the OD candidate. We track this dependence and only validate the IND if the OD has not been rejected before. Combining all these observations, we obtain a clear candidate order by dependency type: we validate ODs first, INDs second, UCCs third, and FDs last.

8 EVALUATION

In this section, we evaluate the impact of dependency-based optimizations and the efficiency of metadata-aware data dependency validation. After briefly describing four standard benchmarks and characteristics of our experimental environment, we study the impact of dependency-based optimizations on five different DBMSs through SQL rewrites and compare the performance to optimization integrated into a DBMS. Then, we evaluate the performance impact per optimization technique and benchmark in the context of the additional dependency discovery overhead for Hyrise. Finally, we analyze the benefits of metadata-aware dependency validation algorithms and discuss the experimental results.

8.1 Experimental Setup

We evaluate our approach using four standard benchmarks. Besides the industry-standard TPC-H [67] and TPC-DS [66] benchmarks (limited to 48 TPC-DS queries supported by Hyrise), we use the star schema benchmark (SSB) [49, 50] and the join order benchmark (JOB) [37]. TPC-H, TPC-DS, and SSB allow controlling the data present in the database using a scale factor (SF). If not stated differently, this SF is 10. JOB is based on the fixed real-world IMDB dataset, so it does not provide scaling. We conducted the experiments on one non-uniform memory access (NUMA) node of an Ubuntu 22.04 LTS server with one Intel Xeon Platinum 8180 CPU (28 cores/56 threads) per node. Our Hyrise plug-in was implemented in C++ and compiled using LLVM-14. To ease interpretation, we use *symmetric logarithmic axes* [69] in Figures 7, 9 and 10, which are linear close to 0 and logarithmic for larger values.




Figure 6: Average throughput improvements of dependency-based optimization using SQL rewrites (and the Hyrise optimizer) over base configurations (MT). Reprinted from page 1.

8.2 Optimization for Different DBMSs

We evaluate the potential of dependency-based query optimization for five analytical DBMSs: *Greenplum* [42] (version 7.0.0, column layout), which is based on Postgres but uses the Orca optimizer [63], *MonetDB* [28] (11.47.11), *Umbra* [47], *Hyrise* [17], and the commercial in-memory database *SAP HANA* [21, 22, 44]. The measurements for SAP HANA were conducted on a server with two Intel Xeon Silver 4116 CPUs (12 cores/24 threads per node, 48 threads in total).

We do not aim to compare system performance but the improvements achieved by dependency-based query optimization. Thus, we report only the relative throughput improvement and no absolute runtimes. To compare the throughput impact on the different systems, we consider a multi-threaded, high-load scenario with 32 concurrent clients. Each client executes a combined workload of all TPC-H, TPC-DS, SSB, and JOB queries in random order. We run the queries for two hours and consider the mean of all complete workload executions for the throughput calculation.

The baseline consists of unmodified benchmark queries, where no system is provided with primary and foreign keys from the schemas. Thus, we prevent the systems from applying any dependency-based optimizations that might already be implemented. Furthermore, the systems cannot use index joins exploiting automatically generated indexes on unique or primary key columns.

We measured the throughput change to an adapted workload, where we reformulated the SQL queries with optimizations O-1 (dependent group-by reduction) and O-3 (join to predicate rewrite). Plain SQL cannot model semi-joins introduced by optimization O-2 (join to semi-join rewrite). We split subqueries generated by O-3 into separate statements to prevent the DBMSs from unnesting them to the original join. In addition, we measure the throughput impact for Hyrise with the original queries, where the optimizer knows all relevant dependencies and rewrites the queries internally.

Relative throughput improvements are shown in Figure 6 and vary from 5% to 33% due to different system architectures and characteristics. Dependency-based optimization shows its potential for all systems. With only three query rewrites, all but one systems achieve over 10% more throughput, including a highly optimized commercial DBMS. For Hyrise, the improvement when using the optimizer is 6.7%pt. higher than for SQL rewrites, illustrating that system integration allows for larger improvements.

8.3 Performance Impact and Dependency Discovery Overhead

We compare the overhead of dependency discovery to the performance benefit of the three rewrites O-1 to O-3 presented in Section 3.2 for Hyrise. We perform single-threaded (ST) and multi-threaded (MT) benchmark executions with one client. The single-threaded setup allows us to assess the efficiency of optimized query plans without hiding latency by parallelism. Multi-threaded experiments are limited to the NUMA node’s 28 physical cores to ensure stable measurements. We report the average query latency of 100 repetitions within a time limit of 60 s per query. For the baseline execution (*W/o Deps.*), we do not provide any schema-defined (foreign) key constraints. We expect the rewrites to have a varying performance impact based on the benchmark characteristics.

Table 1 depicts the latency impact of the three optimizations and their combination for four benchmarks compared to the dependency discovery overhead (candidate generation and validation). In general, the overhead of dependency discovery is (much) lower than the saved latency already for a single benchmark execution if there are valid candidates. We achieve an average latency improvement of at least 10% (7% MT) through all benchmarks when combining all optimization techniques, where the overhead is at least one order of magnitude smaller than the saved execution time. Furthermore, we report the execution time with combined optimization techniques when knowing all schema-defined dependencies and the additional improvement enabled by further dependencies.

The impact of O-2 (join to semi-join rewrite) and O-3 (join to predicate rewrite) is high for TPC-DS and JOB. These benchmarks have snowflake schemas, which result in many joins of fact tables and dimension tables that can be rewritten. Each join rewritten to a predicate by O3 can also be turned into a semi-join by O-2. Thus, the impact of the two rewrites does not add up when all optimizations are applied. O-1 (dependent group-by reduction) is most beneficial for TPC-H, where aggregates are also dominant [16].

Exploiting dependencies beyond the schema (+ *UCCs*, *ODs* in Table 1) yields further improvements for TPC-DS and JOB. O-3 is the only optimization requiring more than schema-defined dependencies, and benchmarks where this optimization is beneficial profit most from discovering additional dependencies. The discovery time for SSB and JOB decreases when schema dependencies are known. The discovery time does not change for TPC-H and TPC-DS, as it is dominated by validating OD candidates for O-3.

Figure 7 visualizes the ST performance impact on individual queries. Each query is represented as a dot and placed with the baseline latency on the x-axis and the latency when applying the optimizations on the y-axis. The optimizations improve query latency if the query is below the diagonal line.

For TPC-H, shown in Figure 7a, we observe that eight out of 22 queries improve by at least 5%, where Q10 benefits most from reducing seven group-by columns to one and decreases its latency by 49%. 32 out of 48 TPC-DS queries improve by up to 90% (Figure 7b). We observe high relative latency improvements when joins between fact tables and the *date* dimension are rewritten to range predicates and the physical order of tuples correlates to the date. In this case, we can dynamically prune large parts of the fact table. O-2 also achieves high absolute improvements and reduces the

Table 1: Performance impact and overhead of dependency discovery for four benchmarks and three rewrite techniques O-1 to O-3 (see Section 3.2), as well as all techniques combined, with schema-defined and additional dependencies. Overall single- (ST) and multi-threaded (MT) execution time in seconds [s] and relative latency change [%] (one client). For dependency discovery, # is the number of dependency candidates, \checkmark is the number of valid candidates, and ms is the total discovery time.

	TPC-H (22 Queries)					TPC-DS (48 Queries)					SSB (13 Queries)					JOB (113 Queries)				
	Execution		Discovery			Execution		Discovery			Execution		Discovery			Execution		Discovery		
	ST [s (%)	MT [s (%)	#	\checkmark	ms	ST [s (%)	MT [s (%)	#	\checkmark	ms	ST [s (%)	MT [s (%)	#	\checkmark	ms	ST [s (%)	MT [s (%)	#	\checkmark	ms
W/o Deps.	37.1	17.8				37.9	16.4				10.5	3.9				34.4	19.9			
O-1	-1.6 (-4)	-0.7 (-4)	9	4	<1	-0.6 (-1)	-0.1 (-1)	32	2	<1	± 0.0 (± 0)	± 0.0 (± 0)	7	0	<1	± 0.0 (± 0)	± 0.0 (± 0)	0	0	<1
O-2	-1.9 (-5)	-0.4 (-2)	6	6	<1	-5.7 (-15)	-1.8 (-11)	15	11	<1	-1.1 (-10)	-0.5 (-13)	4	4	<1	-4.1 (-12)	-3.0 (-15)	10	10	309
O-3	-0.2 (-1)	± 0.0 (± 0)	22	9	<1	-6.3 (-17)	-1.8 (-11)	46	16	13	-0.4 (-4)	-0.2 (-5)	15	6	10	-5.9 (-17)	-3.1 (-15)	38	15	36
Combined	-3.5 (-10)	-1.2 (-7)	31	13	<1	-8.3 (-22)	-2.6 (-16)	85	25	13	-1.1 (-10)	-0.6 (-16)	22	7	10	-7.0 (-20)	-4.2 (-21)	40	17	330
PKs & FKs	33.9	16.5				31.5	14.5				9.5	3.4				30.5	16.9			
+ UCCs, ODs	-0.3 (-1)	± 0.0 (± 0)	24	3	<1	-1.9 (-6)	-0.7 (-5)	74	4	13	-0.1 (-1)	-0.1 (-4)	18	2	<1	-3.1 (-10)	-1.2 (-7)	30	7	27




Figure 7: Latencies with and without dependency-based optimizations per benchmark query (ST). Average relative latency improvement in parentheses. Queries that change at least by $\pm 5\%$ are colored (green/red). Note the bi-symmetric logarithmic axes (linear < 0.1 s).

latency of Q95 by ≈ 4.8 s. However, Q1 degrades by 6%: the optimizer places semi-joins like predicates, which is disadvantageous in this case. We do not observe performance degradations from O-3 because our adapted subquery handling provides stable query plans compared to the original joins, i. e., no join reordering. Seven out of 13 SSB queries improve by up to 24%, whereas Q1.3 degrades by 6% (Figure 7c). For JOB, 82 out of 113 queries improve up to 83%, as shown in Figure 7d. The UCC-based version of O-3 achieves high




Figure 8: Latency improvement in seconds and discovery overhead in milliseconds for increasing scale factors (ST).

relative improvements. Pushing down rewritten semi-joins is not always beneficial for this benchmark, as ten queries degrade.

We also executed the workloads and dependency discovery using a scale factor (SF) of 1 and SFs from 20 to 100 for TPC-H, TPC-DS, and SSB. The ST latency improvement compared to the dependency discovery overhead is shown in Figure 8. For all scale factors, the dependency discovery overhead is orders of magnitude smaller than the latency improvement and does not exceed 97 ms for SSB, 3 ms for TPC-H, and 17 ms for TPC-DS (all SF 100). While this implies linear scaling for SSB and TPC-H, the discovery scales sub-linearly for TPC-DS. This behavior is because all tables with candidates grow linearly with the scale factor for TPC-H and SSB, whereas some dimension tables of TPC-DS grow slower than linearly.

The latency improvement, i. e., the saved execution time, has the highest growth rate for TPC-DS and the lowest growth rate for SSB. For TPC-H, we observe a reduced latency improvement from SF 80 on, caused by previously reported disadvantageous placement decisions, most severely in Q21. Here, rewritten semi-joins with large build sides are pushed below selections.

Our experiments demonstrate that dependency-based optimization techniques improve a database’s performance. Datasets with normalized schemas benefit more than datasets with fewer dimension tables because of the higher potential for join rewrites. While exploiting schema-provided dependencies already has an impact, discovering and using additional dependencies can turn




Figure 9: Dependency candidate validation runtimes using naïve strategies and metadata-aware, optimized strategies. Note the symmetric logarithmic y-axis (linear <1 ms).

joins into selections, further improving performance. Integration of subqueries used for these selections yields stable query plans compared to the baseline. Discovering additional dependencies is amortized after a single benchmark execution.

8.4 Metadata-aware Dependency Validation

Our first experiments investigate the efficiency of the metadata-aware data dependency validation algorithms presented in Section 7. We validate all candidates generated for the benchmarks and report the validation times. For stable results, we repeat validation executions 1000 times and report average runtimes.

Performance impact of tailored validation. We evaluate the efficiency of optimized dependency candidate validation compared to baseline approaches without the optimizations described in Section 7. Instead, we use the fallback validation strategies as a baseline: first, we always construct a pre-allocated hash set to validate UCC candidates. Second, we build a hash set for the referenced column and probe all fields of the foreign key column for INDs. Third, we do not use columns’ minimal and maximal values to reject IND candidates or persist the possible uniqueness of the referenced column as a UCC. Fourth, we do not sample and use the segment index for ODs; instead, we always sort the entire column. Ultimately, we do not track candidate dependence and validate all INDs regardless of the validity of OD candidates.

In this experiment, we expect performance improvements when validation optimizations can be applied. To account for longer execution times of the naïve candidate validation, we execute it only 100 times per benchmark run. Figure 9 shows the overall validation times per benchmark using naïve and optimized validation techniques. We observe a speedup of 2.3 for JOB and improvements of at least two orders of magnitude for the other benchmarks.

Confirming and rejecting candidates clearly benefits from our optimizations, most noticeably for TPC-H. Here, our system generates IND candidates for the *lineitem* table and OD and UCC candidates on the *orders* table, which are costly to validate by sorting an entire column or adding it to a hash set due to the relation sizes. However, metadata-aware optimizations can confirm candidates, reject candidates by sampling or metadata, or skip candidates if they depend on another invalidated candidate. We observe similar behavior for TPC-DS and SSB. The validation improves less for JOB, as we often




Figure 10: Average candidate validation times for four benchmarks (number of candidates in parentheses). Note the symmetric logarithmic y-axis (linear <0.1 ms). Whiskers cover the entire value range.

fall back to set-based validation techniques. Next, we analyze the validation performance in detail.

Detailed validation performance per benchmark. Figure 10 reports the average validation time per candidate type and benchmark. The validation times for the TPC-H benchmark are shown in Figure 10a. For this benchmark, the system generates 31 dependency candidates. Most candidates are validated very fast, whereas no candidate requires more than 100 μ s. Five of six OD candidates are rejected after the sampling phase, and only *region.r_regionkey* \mapsto *region.r_name* is valid. We skip the validation for five IND candidates as they depend on invalid ODs (see Section 7.5), even though all six map to a foreign key relationship as defined by the schema and, thus, are valid. One of the skipped candidates is *lineitem.l_orderkey* \subseteq *orders.o_orderkey*. This candidate would dominate the entire validation, with a validation time of \approx 750 ms. The *o_orderkey* column is not continuous, as only 25% of the possible key range is populated [67, p. 86]. Thus, we have to fall back to hash set construction and probing and cannot use optimizations using metadata. However, we validate the IND *nation.n_regionkey* \subseteq *region.r_regionkey* only using metadata within microseconds.

Of the twelve UCC candidates, our validation algorithm rejects four invalid candidates in microseconds using metadata. It skips another candidate on a primary key, which has already been confirmed as a byproduct of IND candidate validation. The remaining seven UCC candidates are primary keys and the name columns of

nation and region, which can be confirmed using metadata, as they are range-partitioned (in fact, the two tables consist of a single partition). The UCC on the *order* table’s primary key consumes by far the most time with $\approx 80 \mu\text{s}$, as it has 229 segments that we index. Three FD candidates are skipped due to containing a UCC, and the remaining four candidates are rejected by metadata.

Figure 10b shows the validation times of 85 candidates generated for the TPC-DS benchmark. Eight out of twelve OD candidates are rejected by sampling. Each of the four remaining OD candidates has the *date_dim*’s sequential key as the ordering column, which orders *d_date*, the sequential month and quarter representation, and *d_year*. The two candidates involving string columns are confirmed in $\approx 5 \text{ ms}$.

All IND candidates represent valid foreign key relationships, but we skip the validation of five candidates that depend on invalid ODs. We confirm the remaining eight candidates in under 1 ms each by exploiting the sorted primary keys. The validation time scales with the number of column segments, where the validation of *inventory.inv_date_sk* \subseteq *date_dim.d_date_sk* takes $\approx 300 \mu\text{s}$ due to traversing *inv_date_sk*’s 2032 segments.

Sorted primary keys also enable the confirmation of eleven of the 39 UCC candidates within a few microseconds. The IND validation already confirmed one UCC candidate, and the remaining 27 candidates are rejected by metadata immediately. One FD candidate is confirmed by metadata in a few microseconds, and all 20 remaining candidates are immediately rejected by metadata.

The validation times for SSB, displayed in Figure 10c, show a larger variance. Two OD candidates are rejected by sampling, and two ODs on the *date* table are confirmed in $\approx 25 \mu\text{s}$. The two invalid OD candidates lead to skipping two IND candidates, but the remaining candidate *lineorder.lo_orderdate* \subseteq *date.d_datekey* falls back to the hash set-based inclusion check because *d_datekey* is not continuous [49, p. 4]. Thus, confirming this IND takes almost 10 ms. Of the 15 UCC candidates, we confirm three candidates and reject eleven candidates by metadata within a few microseconds. The UCC *date.d_datekey* was already confirmed as part of the IND validation. No FD candidates were generated as the SSB queries do not group by multiple columns of the same table.

The validation of JOB’s candidates takes the most time, as seen in Figure 10d. All nine OD candidates are rejected by sampling in less than 1 ms, allowing to skip all eleven IND candidates. Three of the 20 UCC candidates are rejected by metadata, and twelve candidates are confirmed by metadata in microseconds. The remaining five candidates are valid UCCs but are not range-partitioned. Thus, we must use hash set construction for these candidates, taking up to 125 ms for *char_name.id* and 166 ms for *name.id*. The JOB queries have no group-by statements; thus, there are no FD candidates.

Our experiments confirm that metadata-aware validation is efficient for rejecting and confirming dependency candidates. We observe the longest validation times for valid candidates that fall back to default validation, i. e., complete sorting for ODs or hash set construction for UCCs and INDs. Metadata-aware validation scales well with relation size and number of partitions. Ordering the candidates by type allows skipping candidates known to be valid, and exploiting candidate dependence for candidates generated for O-3 reduces the validation overhead.

8.5 Discussion

Our experiments highlight that dependency-based query optimization techniques benefit DBMS performance. Degradations of individual queries arise from the interplay with other optimizer rules, which can be further tuned to improve latencies. Our results conclude that the schema design influences the potential of dependency-based optimizations and the efficiency of dependency discovery. Normalized snowflake schemas with fact and dimension tables lead to more joins that can be reformulated, especially in combination with valid dependencies additional to PKs and FKs (O-3).

If a dimension table’s join key orders dimension columns, joins with the fact table can be reformulated to a scan of the fact table for both point and range predicates on the dimension. Thus, the disadvantage of performing many costly joins when using a snowflake schema compared to a flat table [6, 39] can be reduced. Suppose the dimension table’s key is also sequential and range-partitions the table. In that case, metadata-aware dependency validation can work on metadata, validating UCCs and INDs immediately without traversing entire columns.

Most data dependencies required for the selected query rewrites are genuine dependencies on dimension tables, which are unlikely to be rendered invalid. However, the main limitation of our solution is that dependency validation must currently be re-iterated as part of an ETL process whenever data changes.

9 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We presented three selected query rewrites based on data dependencies that substantially reduce workload latencies and automatically discovered relevant data dependencies for these rewrites in milliseconds. We developed metadata-aware dependency validation algorithms to confirm or reject dependency candidates purely based on database statistics and described how a DBMS can be adapted to integrate dependency-based optimizations thoroughly, allowing for larger improvements than using SQL rewrites. The suggested methods to handle scalar subqueries in cardinality estimation and pruning are not limited to dependency-based query optimization. Our experiments confirm the benefit of dependency-based query optimization for four benchmarks: the throughput of five DBMSs improves by 5 % to 33 %.

While we do not have to validate dependencies given by schema constraints, our approach allows perceiving data dependencies as pure metadata. By eliminating the need to specify constraints only for the purpose of query optimization and providing automatic workload-driven dependency discovery, our approach combines the concepts of autonomous databases [55] and data profiling.

We considered dependency discovery as part of ETL processes. Thus, an evident next step is handling dynamic datasets (cf. R-4). Our optimized dependency validation algorithms’ runtimes suggest that enhanced incremental dependency validation can integrate into online query optimization rather than being executed as a background task without noticeable effects on optimization time. Such an online approach also eliminates the need to collect workload information. By using multi-version concurrency control (MVCC) [36] information for validated dependencies, we can apply dependency-based rewrites despite changed data or combine optimized and regular subplans for different portions of the data.

REFERENCES

- [1] Daniel J. Abadi, Samuel Madden, and Nabil Hachem. 2008. Column-stores vs. row-stores: how different are they really?. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD)*. 967–980.
- [2] Ziawasch Abedjan, Lukasz Golab, and Felix Naumann. 2015. Profiling relational data: a survey. *The VLDB Journal* 24, 4 (2015), 557–581.
- [3] Rafi Ahmed, Allison W. Lee, Andrew Witkowski, Dinesh Das, Hong Su, Mohamed Zait, and Thierry Cruanes. 2006. Cost-Based Query Transformation in Oracle. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Very Large Databases (VLDB)*. 1026–1036.
- [4] RJ Atwal, Peter Boncz, Ryan Boyd, Antony Courtney, Till Döhmen, Florian Gerlinghoff, Jeff Huang, Joseph Hwang, Raphael Hyde, Elena Felder, Jacob Lacouture, Yves LeMaout, Boaz Leskes, Yao Liu, Alex Monahan, Dan Perkins, Tino Tereshko, Jordan Tigani, Nick Ursa, Stephanie Wang, and Yannick Welsch. 2024. MotherDuck: DuckDB in the cloud and in the client. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Innovative Data Systems Research (CIDR)*. 7 pages.
- [5] Maximilian Bandle, Jana Giceva, and Thomas Neumann. 2021. To Partition, or Not to Partition, That is the Join Question in a Real System. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD)*. 168–180.
- [6] Yuanzhe Bei, Thao Pham, Akshay Aggarwal, Nga Tran, Jaimin Dave, Chuck Bear, and Michael Leuchtenburg. 2019. Vertica Flattened Tables and Live Aggregate Projections: A Column-based Alternative to Materialized Views for Analytics. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Big Data (BigData)*. 1749–1758.
- [7] Siegfried Bell. 1997. Dependency Mining in Relational Databases. In *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Qualitative and Quantitative Practical Reasoning (ECSQARU-FAPR)*. 16–29.
- [8] Siegfried Bell and Peter Brockhausen. 1995. *Discovery of Data Dependencies in Relational Databases*. Technical Report. University Dortmund. 6 pages.
- [9] Srikanth Bellamkonda, Rafi Ahmed, Andrew Witkowski, Angela Amor, Mohamed Zait, and Chun Chieh Lin. 2009. Enhanced Subquery Optimizations in Oracle. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)* 2, 2 (2009), 1366–1377.
- [10] Carsten Binnig, Stefan Hildenbrand, and Franz Färber. 2009. Dictionary-based order-preserving string compression for main memory column stores. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD)*. 283–296.
- [11] Johann Birnick, Thomas Bläsius, Tobias Friedrich, Felix Naumann, Thorsten Papenbrock, and Martin Schirneck. 2020. Hitting Set Enumeration with Partial Information for Unique Column Combination Discovery. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)* 13, 11 (2020), 2270–2283.
- [12] Peter A. Boncz, Thomas Neumann, and Orri Erling. 2013. TPC-H Analyzed: Hidden Messages and Lessons Learned from an Influential Benchmark. In *Proceedings of the TPC Technology Conference (TPCTC)*. 61–76.
- [13] Marco A. Casanova, Luiz Tucheran, and Antonio L. Furtado. 1988. Enforcing Inclusion Dependencies and Referential Integrity. In *VLDB*. 38–49.
- [14] Edgar F. Codd. 1971. *Further Normalization of the Data Base Relational Model*. Research Report RJ909. IBM. 33 pages.
- [15] C. J. Date and Hugh Darwen. 1992. *Relational Database Writings 1989-1991*. Addison-Wesley, Chapter The Role of functional Dependence in Query Decomposition, 133–150.
- [16] Markus Dreseler, Martin Boissier, Tilmann Rabl, and Matthias Uflacker. 2020. Quantifying TPC-H Choke Points and Their Optimizations. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)* 13, 8 (2020), 1206–1220.
- [17] Markus Dreseler, Jan Kossmann, Martin Boissier, Stefan Klauk, Matthias Uflacker, and Hasso Plattner. 2019. Hyrise Re-engineered: An Extensible Database System for Research in Relational In-Memory Data Management. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Extending Database Technology (EDBT)*. 313–324.
- [18] Falco Dürsch, Axel Stebner, Fabian Windheuser, Maxi Fischer, Tim Friedrich, Nils Strelow, Tobias Bleifuß, Hazar Harmouch, Lan Jiang, Thorsten Papenbrock, and Felix Naumann. 2019. Inclusion Dependency Discovery: An Experimental Evaluation of Thirteen Algorithms. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM)*. 219–228.
- [19] Ronald Fagin and Moshe Y. Vardi. 1984. The Theory of Data Dependencies - An Overview. In *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP)*. 1–22.
- [20] Wenfei Fan, Floris Geerts, and Xibei Jia. 2008. Semandq: a data quality system based on conditional functional dependencies. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)* 1, 2 (2008), 1460–1463.
- [21] Franz Färber, Sang Kyun Cha, Jürgen Primisch, Christof Bornhövd, Stefan Sigg, and Wolfgang Lehner. 2011. SAP HANA database: data management for modern business applications. *SIGMOD Record* 40, 4 (2011), 45–51.
- [22] Franz Färber, Norman May, Wolfgang Lehner, Philipp Große, Ingo Müller, Hannes Rauhe, and Jonathan Dees. 2012. The SAP HANA Database - An Architecture Overview. *IEEE Data Engineering Bulletin* 35, 1 (2012), 28–33.
- [23] Richard A. Ganski and Harry K. T. Wong. 1987. Optimization of Nested SQL Queries Revisited. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD)*. 23–33.
- [24] Goetz Graefe, Ross Bunker, and Shaun Cooper. 1998. Hash Joins and Hash Teams in Microsoft SQL Server. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Very Large Databases (VLDB)*. 86–97.
- [25] Laura M. Haas, Johann Christoph Freytag, Guy M. Lohman, and Hamid Pirahesh. 1989. Extensible Query Processing in Starburst. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD)*. 377–388.
- [26] Chun-Nan Hsu and Craig A. Knoblock. 1996. Using Inductive Learning To Generate Rules for Semantic Query Optimization. In *Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. AAAI/MIT Press, 425–445.
- [27] Ykä Huhtala, Juha Kärkkäinen, Pasi Porkka, and Hannu Toivonen. 1999. TANE: An Efficient Algorithm for Discovering Functional and Approximate Dependencies. *Comput. J.* 42, 2 (1999), 100–111.
- [28] Stratos Idreos, Fabian Groffen, Niels Nes, Stefan Manegold, K. Sjoerd Mullender, and Martin L. Kersten. 2012. MonetDB: Two Decades of Research in Column-oriented Database Architectures. *IEEE Data Engineering Bulletin* 35, 1 (2012), 40–45.
- [29] International Organization for Standardization. 2023. *Information technology - Database languages SQL - Part 2: Foundation (SQL/Foundation)*. Standard Specification ISO/IEC 9075-2:2023(E).
- [30] Yannis E. Ioannidis. 1996. Query Optimization. *Comput. Surveys* 28, 1 (1996), 121–123.
- [31] Won Kim. 1982. On Optimizing an SQL-like Nested Query. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS)* 7, 3 (1982), 443–469.
- [32] Jonathan J. King. 1980. Modelling Concepts for Reasoning About Access to Knowledge. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Data Abstraction, Databases and Conceptual Modelling*. 138–140.
- [33] Jan Kossmann, Daniel Lindner, Felix Naumann, and Thorsten Papenbrock. 2022. Workload-driven, Lazy Discovery of Data Dependencies for Query Optimization. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Innovative Data Systems Research (CIDR)*. 7 pages.
- [34] Jan Kossmann, Thorsten Papenbrock, and Felix Naumann. 2022. Data dependencies for query optimization: a survey. *The VLDB Journal* 31, 1 (2022), 1–22.
- [35] Per-Åke Larson, Adrian Birka, Eric N. Hanson, Weiyun Huang, Michal Nowakiewicz, and Vassilis Papadimos. 2015. Real-Time Analytical Processing with SQL Server. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)* 8, 12 (2015), 1740–1751.
- [36] Per-Åke Larson, Spyros Blanas, Cristian Diaconu, Craig Freedman, Jignesh M. Patel, and Mike Zwilling. 2011. High-Performance Concurrency Control Mechanisms for Main-Memory Databases. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)* 5, 4 (2011), 298–309.
- [37] Viktor Leis, Andrey Gubichev, Atanas Mirchev, Peter A. Boncz, Alfons Kemper, and Thomas Neumann. 2015. How Good Are Query Optimizers, Really? *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)* 9, 3 (2015), 204–215.
- [38] Maurizio Lenzerini. 2002. Data Integration: A Theoretical Perspective. In *Proceedings of the Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (PODS)*. 233–246.
- [39] Mark Levene and George Loizou. 2003. Why is the snowflake schema a good data warehouse design? *Information Systems (IS)* 28, 3 (2003), 225–240.
- [40] Xiaoxuan Liu, Shuxian Wang, Mengzhu Sun, Sicheng Pan, Ge Li, Siddharth Jha, Cong Yan, Junwen Yang, Shan Lu, and Alvin Cheung. 2023. Leveraging Application Data Constraints to Optimize Database-Backed Web Applications. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)* 16, 6 (2023), 1208–1221.
- [41] Claudio L. Lucchesi and Sylvia L. Osborn. 1978. Candidate Keys for Relations. *J. Comput. System Sci.* 17, 2 (1978), 270–279.
- [42] Zhenghua Lyu, Huan Hubert Zhang, Gang Xiong, Gang Guo, Haozhou Wang, Jinbao Chen, Asim Praveen, Yu Yang, Xiaoming Gao, Alexandra Wang, Wen Lin, Ashwin Agrawal, Junfeng Yang, Hao Wu, Xiaoliang Li, Feng Guo, Jiang Wu, Jesse Zhang, and Venkatesh Raghavan. 2021. Greenplum: A Hybrid Database for Transactional and Analytical Workloads. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD)*. 2530–2542.
- [43] Jayant Madhavan, Philip A. Bernstein, and Erhard Rahm. 2001. Generic Schema Matching with Cupid. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Very Large Databases (VLDB)*. 49–58.
- [44] Norman May, Alexander Böhm, and Wolfgang Lehner. 2017. SAP HANA - The Evolution of an In-Memory DBMS from Pure OLAP Processing Towards Mixed Workloads. In *Proceedings of the Conference Datenbanksysteme in Business, Technologie und Web Technik (BTW)*. 545–563.
- [45] Niloy Mukherjee, Shasank Chavan, Maria Colgan, Dinesh Das, Mike Gleeson, Sanket Hase, Allison Holloway, Hui Jin, Jesse Kamp, Kartik Kulkarni, Tirthankar Lahiri, Juan Loaiza, Neil MacNaughton, Vineet Marwah, Atrayee Mullick, Andy Witkowski, Jiaqi Yan, and Mohamed Zait. 2015. Distributed Architecture of Oracle Database In-memory. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)* 8, 12 (2015), 1630–1641.
- [46] Thomas Neumann. 2014. Engineering High-Performance Database Engines. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)* 7, 13 (2014), 1734–1741.
- [47] Thomas Neumann and Michael J. Freitag. 2020. Umbra: A Disk-Based System with In-Memory Performance. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Innovative Data Systems Research (CIDR)*. 7 pages.
- [48] Anisoara Nica, Reza Sherkat, Mihnea Andrei, Xun Chen, Martin Heidel, Christian Bensberg, and Heiko Gerwens. 2017. Statisticum: Data Statistics Management in SAP HANA. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)* 10, 12 (2017),

- 1658–1669.
- [49] Patrick E. O’Neil, Elizabeth J. O’Neil, and Xuedong Chen. 2009. *Star Schema Benchmark*. Standard Specification Revision 3. <https://www.cs.umb.edu/~poneil/StarSchemaB.PDF> (accessed April 9, 2024).
- [50] Patrick E. O’Neil, Elizabeth J. O’Neil, Xuedong Chen, and Stephen Revilak. 2009. The Star Schema Benchmark and Augmented Fact Table Indexing. In *Proceedings of the TPC Technology Conference (TPCTC)*. 237–252.
- [51] Oracle. [n. d.]. *MySQL 8.0 Reference Manual – Optimizing IN and EXISTS Subquery Predicates with Semijoin Transformations*. <https://dev.mysql.com/doc/refman/8.0/en/semijoins.html> (accessed April 9, 2024).
- [52] Laurel J. Orr, Srikanth Kandula, and Surajit Chaudhuri. 2019. Pushing Data-Induced Predicates Through Joins in Big-Data Clusters. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)* 13, 3 (2019), 252–265.
- [53] Thorsten Papenbrock, Jens Ehrlich, Jannik Marten, Tommy Neubert, Jan-Peer Rudolph, Martin Schönberg, Jakob Zwiener, and Felix Naumann. 2015. Functional Dependency Discovery: An Experimental Evaluation of Seven Algorithms. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)* 8, 10 (2015), 1082–1093.
- [54] Thorsten Papenbrock and Felix Naumann. 2017. A Hybrid Approach for Efficient Unique Column Combination Discovery. In *Proceedings of the Conference Datenbanksysteme in Business, Technologie und Web Technik (BTW)*. 195–204.
- [55] Andrew Pavlo, Gustavo Angulo, Joy Arulraj, Haibin Lin, Jiexi Lin, Lin Ma, Prashanth Menon, Todd C. Mowry, Matthew Perron, Ian Quah, Siddharth Santurkar, Anthony Tomic, Skye Toor, Dana Van Aken, Ziqi Wang, Yingjun Wu, Ran Xian, and Tiejing Zhang. 2017. Self-Driving Database Management Systems. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Innovative Data Systems Research (CIDR)*. 6 pages.
- [56] Eduardo H. M. Pena, Erik Falk, Jorge Augusto Meira, and Eduardo Cunha de Almeida. 2018. Mind Your Dependencies for Semantic Query Optimization. *J. Inf. Data Manag.* 9, 1 (2018), 3–19.
- [57] Mark Raasveldt and Hannes Mühleisen. 2019. DuckDB: an Embeddable Analytical Database. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD)*. 1981–1984.
- [58] Vijayshankar Raman, Gopi K. Attaluri, Ronald Barber, Naresh Chainani, David Kalmuk, Vincent KulandaiSamy, Jens Leenstra, Sam Lightstone, Shaorong Liu, Guy M. Lohman, Tim Malkemus, René Müller, Ippokratis Pandis, Berni Schiefer, David Sharpe, Richard Sidle, Adam J. Storm, and Liping Zhang. 2013. DB2 with BLU Acceleration: So Much More than Just a Column Store. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)* 6, 11 (2013), 1080–1091.
- [59] El Kindi Rezig, Mourad Ouzzani, Walid G. Aref, Ahmed K. Elmagarmid, Ahmed R. Mahmood, and Michael Stonebraker. 2021. Horizon: Scalable Dependency-driven Data Cleaning. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)* 14, 11 (2021), 2546–2554.
- [60] Philipp Schirmer, Thorsten Papenbrock, Sebastian Kruse, Felix Naumann, Dennis Hempfing, Torben Mayer, and Daniel Neuschäfer-Rube. 2019. DynFD: Functional Dependency Discovery in Dynamic Datasets. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Extending Database Technology (EDBT)*. 253–264.
- [61] Shashi Shekhar, Babak Hamidzadeh, Ashim Kohli, and Mark Coyle. 1993. Learning Transformation Rules for Semantic Query Optimization: A Data-Driven Approach. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering (TKDE)* 5, 6 (1993), 950–964.
- [62] Michael D. Siegel, Edward Sciore, and Sharon C. Salveter. 1992. A Method for Automatic Rule Derivation to Support Semantic Query Optimization. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS)* 17, 4 (1992), 563–600.
- [63] Mohamed A. Soliman, Lyublena Antova, Venkatesh Raghavan, Amr El-Helw, Zhongxian Gu, Entong Shen, George C. Caragea, Carlos Garcia-Alvarado, Foyzur Rahman, Michalis Petropoulos, Florian Waas, Sivaramakrishnan Narayanan, Konstantinos Krikellias, and Rhonda Baldwin. 2014. Orca: a modular query optimizer architecture for big data. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD)*. 337–348.
- [64] Jaroslaw Szlichta, Parke Godfrey, and Jarek Gryz. 2012. Fundamentals of Order Dependencies. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)* 5, 11 (2012), 1220–1231.
- [65] Jaroslaw Szlichta, Parke Godfrey, Jarek Gryz, Wenbin Ma, Przemyslaw Pawluk, and Calisto Zuzarte. 2011. Queries on dates: fast yet not blind. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Extending Database Technology (EDBT)*. 497–502.
- [66] Transaction Processing Performance Council. 2021. *TPC Benchmark DS*. Standard Specification Version 3.2.0. http://tpc.org/tpc_documents_current_versions/pdf/tpc-ds_v3.2.0.pdf (accessed April 9, 2024).
- [67] Transaction Processing Performance Council. 2022. *TPC Benchmark H*. Standard Specification Revision 3.0.1. http://tpc.org/tpc_documents_current_versions/pdf/tpc-h_v3.0.1.pdf (accessed April 9, 2024).
- [68] Jeffrey D. Ullman. 1988. *Principles of Database and Knowledge-Base Systems, Volume I*. Principles of computer science series, Vol. 14. Computer Science Press.
- [69] J. Beau W. Webber. 2013. A bi-symmetric log transformation for wide-range data. *Measurement Science and Technology* 24, 2 (2013), 3 pages.
- [70] Clement T. Yu and Wei Sun. 1989. Automatic Knowledge Acquisition and Maintenance for Semantic Query Optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering (TKDE)* 1, 3 (1989), 362–375.
- [71] Xinyu Zeng, Yulong Hui, Jiahong Shen, Andrew Pavlo, Wes McKinney, and Huanchen Zhang. 2023. An Empirical Evaluation of Columnar Storage Formats. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)* 17, 2 (2023), 148–161.
- [72] Mohamed Ziauddin, Andrew Witkowski, You Jung Kim, Janaki Lahorani, Dmitry Potapov, and Murali Krishna. 2017. Dimensions Based Data Clustering and Zone Maps. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)* 10, 12 (2017), 1622–1633.