

Harnessing GPU Power for Enhanced OLTP: A Study in Concurrency Control Schemes

Zihan Sun
Tsinghua University
Beijing, China
sunzh22@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Chao Li
Tsinghua University
Beijing, China
li-chao@tsinghua.edu.cn

Yong Zhang
Tsinghua University
Beijing, China
zhangyong05@tsinghua.edu.cn

Chunxiao Xing
Tsinghua University
Beijing, China
xingcx@tsinghua.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

GPUs, whose performance has gone through a huge leap over the past decade, have proved their ability to accelerate Online Analytical Processing (OLAP) operations. On the other hand, there is still a huge gap in the field of GPU-accelerated Online Transaction Processing (OLTP) operations since it was generally believed that GPUs were not suitable for OLTP in the past. However, the massive parallelism and high memory bandwidth give GPUs the potential to process thousands of transactions concurrently. Among the components of OLTP systems, Concurrency Control (CC) schemes have a great impact on the performance of transaction processing and they may behave differently on GPUs because of the different hardware architectures between GPUs and CPUs.

In this paper, we design and build the first test-bed gCCTB for CC schemes on GPUs and implement eight CC schemes for gCCTB. These schemes include six common schemes previously designed for CPUs and two schemes designed for GPUs. Then we make a comprehensive evaluation of these CC schemes with YCSB and TPC-C benchmarks and a number of launch parameters on GPUs. The experience accumulated on our test-bed can assist researchers and engineers to design and implement new GPU-accelerated OLTP systems. Furthermore, the results of our evaluation cast light on research directions of high performance CC schemes on GPUs.

1 INTRODUCTION

GPUs, as the name suggests, are originally designed for processing and generating graphics on display devices. Their compute power is discovered and utilized gradually for general-purpose computing. As a general-purpose computing platform, GPUs have different hardware architectures and programming models with CPUs. For instance, they have thousands of cores, each of which alone performs much worse than a CPU core. However, they achieve massive parallelism by launching and scheduling thousands of threads concurrently in a SIMT[20] manner and thus beat CPUs in compute-intensive tasks. They also have much higher memory bandwidth than CPUs and a different memory hierarchy from CPUs. For example, a GPU has a programmer-configurable scratchpad memory called shared memory, whose bandwidth is the same with L1 cache.

The general computing ability of GPUs has been proved in accelerating DBMS operations including sorting[23, 32, 33, 36], join[21, 22, 30, 31, 35], compaction[41] and index[1, 2, 46], etc.

Moreover, a number of GPU-accelerated DBMSs[7, 15, 18, 29] have been proposed for both research and commercial purposes. Most research in the past decade focus on GPU accelerated Online Analytical Processing[9] (OLAP) and there are only few works related to GPU-accelerated Online Transaction Processing[13] (OLTP) proposed so far. This is because OLAP, as a computationally intensive task, performs the same computing operations on a large number of data items without complex control flows and has a higher computational access to memory ratio, which is more compatible with the data processing characteristics of GPUs. On the other hand, OLTP tasks require less computation, and the control flow is more complex, and each transaction may have a different execution path and execution state (waiting for a read and write operation to complete), which does not seem to match the batch processing characteristics of GPUs. However, the GPU's higher number of concurrent threads and weaker single-core performance than the CPU are consistent with the characteristics of transaction processing: a single operation of transaction processing is simple and it requires a huge amount of concurrency. Therefore, there is a huge potential for GPUs in accelerating OLTP. If the hardware resources of GPUs are fully utilized, a powerful new solution can be provided for OLTP.

Among the build blocks of OLTP DBMS, Concurrency Control (CC) schemes are the first targets to be researched on GPU platform for they are the key bottlenecks of transaction processing performance. As mentioned above, GPUs cannot be simply treated as CPUs with thousands of cores. CC schemes may behave differently on GPUs and need specific design and optimization for GPUs. Therefore, before designing and implementing high performance CC schemes for GPUs, it is necessary to inspect the execution processes of CC schemes on GPUs in depth to identify the bottlenecks and optimization points of these schemes. The common CC schemes designed for CPUs previously are the best subjects of the inspection because they are well studied and proven by practice over the past few decades. However, to the best of our knowledge, there is no test-bed designed for testing CC schemes on GPUs, and the common CC schemes designed for CPUs have not been implemented on GPUs yet.

In this paper, we design and build a test-bed gCCTB for OLTP benchmarking on GPUs, which give us the ability to test different CC schemes on GPU with a variety of benchmarks under different test settings easily and efficiently. Then we implement eight CC schemes on gCCTB, in which six CC schemes are designed for CPUs

Table 1: Characteristics of CC Schemes

Core Mechanics	Scheme	Is Optimistic	Platform
two-phase locking	tpl_nw	false	CPU
	tpl_wd	false	CPU
timestamp ordering	to	false	CPU
	mvcc	false	CPU
	silos	true	CPU
	tictoc	true	CPU
conflict graph ordering	gputx	false	GPU
	gacco	false	GPU

and two schemes are designed for GPUs. After that, we conduct a thorough evaluation of the schemes with YCSB[10] and TPC-C[38] benchmark under different conditions and make several discoveries from the experiment. We find that some launch parameters such as the block size of threads have a great impact on the performance. Furthermore, the occurrences of contentions is heavily amplified on GPUs. Performance of CC schemes faces a heavy degradation as the increase of proportion of write operations and possibility of contention. In this situation, the schemes designed for GPUs are still able to maintain high performance. Some CC schemes designed for CPUs such as OCC and MVCC also show high performance and low abort rate in some low contention and read heavy cases, which may help to design new CC schemes for GPUs.

The key contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- The first concurrency control test-bed on GPU.
- An exploration of migrating CPU oriented CC schemes to GPU.
- The first comprehensive evaluation of the performance of CC schemes on GPU.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we introduce the concurrency control schemes used in our evaluations. Then we discuss the design and implementation of our test-bed in Section 3. We present our evaluation results in Section 4. After that, we discuss related work in Section 5. Finally, we give a conclusion and future research directions in Section 6.

2 CONCURRENCY CONTROL SCHEMES

Concurrency control schemes are used to maintain the isolation property of transaction processing: transactions access data items concurrently as if they are executed alone. The core idea of concurrency control schemes is to control the timing of read/write operations conducted by transactions. To achieve this goal, techniques such as locks[5], timestamps[3] and conflict graphs[34] are introduced to make transactions wait or restart until their access operations fulfill the isolation requirements. Another thing to be considered with a concurrency control scheme is when to check if a transaction satisfies the isolation requirements. Pessimistic concurrency control schemes perform the above check every time a data item is accessed while optimistic schemes postpone the check until commit. In this section, we introduce eight CC schemes implemented in gCCTB. The characteristics of these schemes are listed in Table 1.

2.1 Two-Phase Locking

Two-phase locking (2PL)[5, 12] is the first provably correct method of ensuring the correct execution of concurrent transactions in a database system. Under this scheme, transactions have to acquire locks for a particular element in the database before they are allowed to execute a read or write operation on that element. 2PL is considered a pessimistic approach because it assumes that transactions will conflict and thus they need to acquire locks to avoid this problem.

There are two kind of locks in 2PL: shared (read) lock and exclusive (write) lock, which correspond to read and write operations respectively. Shared locks for the same element held by different threads are compatible with each other. However, an exclusive lock is incompatible with any other shared or exclusive lock for the same element held by another thread. A thread acquiring a lock for an element has to wait for a moment when there is no conflicting lock held by another thread on that element.

The lock management process of 2PL can be divided into two phases. The first phase, known as the growing phase, the transaction is allowed to acquire as many locks as it needs without releasing locks. The second phase, known as the shrinking phase, it is prohibited from obtaining additional locks at this point. When the transaction terminates (either by committing or aborting), all the remaining locks are automatically released.

Since threads holding some locks are waiting for other threads to release locks, deadlocks among these threads may occur. There are several strategies to address this problem. The first strategy is deadlock prevention, which prevents deadlocks before they happen. This can be achieved by using preemption and transaction rollbacks. There are three common deadlock prevention schemes: **no-wait** scheme aborts a transaction when it tries to acquire a lock held by another transaction, **wait-die** scheme aborts a transaction when it tries to acquire a lock held by another transaction whose id is larger, **wound-wait** scheme preempts the holder transaction of a lock when a transaction with a smaller id tries to acquire that lock. The second is deadlock detection. It maintains a directed graph called a wait-for graph. The lock manager examines if there is a cycle in the wait-for graph periodically and aborts some transactions in the cycle to solve the deadlock. Among these strategies, we implement **no-wait** and **wait-die** on gCCTB.

2.2 Timestamp Ordering

Basic Timestamp Ordering: Basic timestamp ordering[3] (T/O) concurrency control schemes generate a serialization order of transactions a priori based on monotonically increasing timestamps. The DBMS uses these timestamps to process conflicting operations in the proper order. In a basic approach of T/O, each element in the table is assigned a read timestamp rts and a write timestamp wts , indicating the timestamp of the latest transaction which reads/writes the element.

When a transaction reads an element it compares its timestamp with the wts of the element. If its timestamp is less than the wts , it has to rollback and restart because the element has been updated by another younger transaction and thus is invisible to older transactions. A transaction writing an element should compare its timestamp with both rts and wts of the element. If its timestamp is

less than the rts or wts, it has to rollback and restart for a similar reason. After checking the timestamps, the transaction also has to update rts/wts of the element according to its operation if its timestamp is newer than the one of the element.

If there is no specific restriction, a transaction may try to update a wts whose writer has not been committed. When both transaction abort, they may not recover the wts to the right value because of the randomness of the rollback order. To address this problem, a transaction writing an element must acquire a lock on that element first and hold it until the transaction is committed or aborted.

There is an optimization of T/O called "Thomas Write Rule"[37]. In this optimization, if a transaction tries to write an element with newer wts than its own timestamp, it does not have to abort but skipping that write operation.

Optimistic Concurrency Control: Optimistic Concurrency Control (OCC)[16] is a variation of T/O since it also uses timestamps to determine the order between operations. The term "optimistic" in OCC means the scheme acts as if conflicts are unlikely to happen. Based on this premise, OCC postpones all of the locking and verification to the end of a transaction.

OCC schemes usually include three consecutive phases: read phase, validation phase and write phase. In the read phase, a transaction completes all of its read and write operations on its private workspace in a non-blocking manner and maintains its read and write set. In the validation phase, the transaction validates its read and write set to decide if it can be committed successfully. If a transaction fails to pass the validation phase, it has to abort and restart. In the write phase, the transaction applies the changes from its workspace into the database.

gCCTB implements two modern approaches of OCC: **silos**[39] and **tictoc**[45]. These two schemes share the same read and write phases. They both lock all the tuples in the transaction's write set in their primary key order at the beginning of their validation phases and then generate a timestamp in a distributed manner, which is based on a partial order derived from conflict relationship with other committed transactions and avoids centralized timestamp allocation. They also have to check if the items in the read set are modified by other worker threads between the read phase and validation phase. The differences between these approaches are the way they generate and update their timestamps. **tictoc** maintains timestamps independently for read and write operations while a timestamp in **silos** is only updated with a write operation. **silos** also combines a global epoch id with a distributed generated timestamp to get the final timestamp.

Multi-version Concurrency Control: In MVCC[4] schemes, each write operation creates a new version tagged with a timestamp for its target. Versions of the same tuple are ordered by their timestamps and form a version chain. Each version has a start and end timestamp indicating its valid time interval. Intervals of version belonging to the same tuple are disjoint and the latest version has an infinite end timestamp. For a read operation, MVCC determines the proper version that is accessible to the operation based on its valid interval and the timestamp of the operation. Therefore a read operation can always get its desired result without being hindered by other write operations. We implement the simplest MVCC scheme which is the multi-version adaption of basic T/O scheme on gCCTB. There are also a number of MVCC based schemes which are more

complex. For instance, the combination of MVCC and OCC such as hekaton[11, 17]. We leave the design and implement of these complex MVCC schemes for future work.

2.3 Conflict Graph Ordering

The read-write and write-write operations of different transactions to the same data item produce conflicting relationships between transactions. By treating transactions as vertices and conflicting relationships as directed edges, a directed acyclic graph called conflict graph can be constructed[34]. By topologically sorting the conflict graph, the order in which all transactions are executed can be derived. The construction and sorting of the conflict graph is done in the preprocessing stage. The two previous CC schemes designed for GPUs are based on conflict graph ordering and we implement both of them on gCCTB.

The first method of GPU concurrency control (we call it **gputx** [14]) assigns a rank to each transaction by sorting the conflict graph. The set of transactions of the same rank (called K-set) can be executed concurrently without any concurrency control. All access operations to a data item are first sorted by their transaction ID, and the operation with the smallest ID is assigned the rank 0. If there is a conflict (read-write, write-read and write-write) between subsequent operations, the rank is increased by one. The rank of a transaction is the maximum rank of all its operations.

The second conflict graph ordering based scheme is from a GPU accelerated OLTP DBMS called **gacco**[6]. In the preprocessing stage, **gacco** constructs a lock table. For each data item, the lock table records the id of the transaction which holds the lock currently. During the transaction processing stage, each read/write operation waits for the lock of the data item to turn to itself. At the end of the operation, the transaction modifies the lock table to grant access to the next waiting transaction. **gacco** does not distinguish between read and write operations, and all access to the same data item by different transactions is considered conflicting.

3 GPU CONCURRENCY CONTROL TEST-BED

The design goal of gCCTB is to give researchers the ability to test different CC schemes on GPU with a variety of benchmarks under different test settings easily and efficiently. The test settings include table formats, index types, CC schemes, thread organizations and constants, etc. To achieve this goal, there are three issues to be addressed:

- (1) How to coordinate the resource allocation and transaction execution between CPU and GPU?
- (2) How to provide researchers with the flexibility of implementing new benchmarks?
- (3) How to assist researchers to integrate new CC schemes?

This section first introduces the hardware features of GPUs and then describes the design and implementation of gCCTB in detail to answer the above questions. Since gCCTB is implemented using CUDA[25] for NVIDIA GPUs, the hardware features and implementation techniques described below are only available for NVIDIA GPUs.

3.1 GPU Architecture

GPUs achieve massive parallelism by launching and scheduling thousands of threads concurrently. Threads of the same kernel running on a GPU are organized into thread blocks, which can be one-dimensional, two-dimensional, or three-dimensional block of threads. Thread blocks of the same kernel are organized into a grid in a similar way to a thread block. A GPU is built around an array of Streaming Multiprocessors[25] (SMs). Thread blocks of a grid are distributed to multiprocessors with available execution capacity. The threads of a thread block execute concurrently on one multiprocessor, and multiple thread blocks can execute concurrently on one multiprocessor.

SIMT Architecture: Threads of one thread block are scheduled in a Single Instruction Multiple Threads (SIMT)[20] way. Specifically, every 32 threads with consecutive thread ids in a block are partitioned into a warp. Threads of the same warp start together at the same program address, but they have their own instruction address counter and register state so they are free to branch and execute independently. A warp executes one common instruction at a time. If threads of a warp diverge at a conditional branch, the warp executes each branch path taken, disabling threads that are not on that path, which is called "warp divergence".

Prior to Volta architecture[28], 32 threads in the same warp shared a single program counter with an active mask specifying the active threads of the warp. However, Volta architecture introduced Independent Thread Scheduling (ITS), which allows full concurrency between threads, regardless of warp. With Independent Thread Scheduling, the GPU maintains execution state per thread, including a program counter and call stack, and can yield execution at a per-thread granularity, either to make better use of execution resources or to allow one thread to wait for data to be produced by another.

The main problem brought about by SIMT is warp divergence[24]. In an OLTP scenario, threads are usually on different execution paths because of their acquisition of different locks, which causes warp divergences especially prone to happen. When threads within a warp diverge and some remain idle, it leads to a suboptimal use of resources, thereby affecting the throughput. Therefore, designers of GPU concurrency control schemes have to take it into consideration to achieve better performance.

Memory Hierarchy: CUDA threads may access data from multiple memory spaces including registers, local memory, L1/L2 cache, shared memory, constant memory and global memory during their execution. Among these memory spaces, each thread has its private registers and local memory and can get access to global memory and constant memory[25]. Besides, each thread in the same block has access to the same shared memory space. Local memory has the same bandwidth with global memory and can be cached in L1/L2 cache. Each SM has its own L1 cache and all of the SMs on the same GPU share the same L2 cache. The shared memory, sharing the same on-chip memory with L1 cache, is equivalent to a programmer-managed cache. Programmers can configure its size and get access of it in device code. The constant memory is read only for device code and has its own constant cache.

The way a GPU transaction processing system organizes and accesses GPU memory may have an impact on throughput. For




Figure 1: Test-Bed Architecture

instance, threads of the same warp access global memory in a coalesced way can make full use of the global memory bandwidth. Caching hotspot data in shared memory is another way of optimizing memory access of transaction processing. However, inappropriate use of shared memory can lead to a decrease in parallelism because of the limited capacity of shared memory on a SM.

Streaming: A stream[25] is a series of memory transfer and computation commands, which may originate from various host threads, and are executed sequentially. In contrast, distinct streams can execute their commands concurrently. Commands issued on a stream can only be executed when all of its dependencies have been fulfilled. These dependencies can arise from previously executed commands on the same stream or from commands on other streams. With properly designed streams, data transfer between CPU and GPU and computation running on different devices can overlap with each other, masking part of the time overhead through parallelism between devices, which can improve the performance.

3.2 Test-Bed Overview

The architecture of gCCTB is shown in Fig. 1. The test-bed can be considered as a tiny database that consists of CPU and GPU parts. Among them the CPU part conducts the scheduling and part of computing jobs while the GPU conducts most of the computing jobs. Both sides share the same table formats and maintain two copies of the database. In the following, we discuss how the two parts work together to solve the three issues mentioned above.

For the first issue, the CPU part coordinates the data generation, initialization and transaction execution. As a coordinator, it constructs tasks (such as data generation and transaction execution) according to test settings and then sends the corresponding data

and code to the GPU part. The GPU part conducts most of the computing tasks and then collects the runtime information for future performance analysis. gCCTB adopts a batch execution model [6] to execute transactions of the same type on GPU in batches. Each worker thread on GPU executes one transaction of the batch.

For the second issue, an intermediate representation is designed for representing table formats and operations of gCCTB. The representation can be translated into definitions of data structures and executable operators on CPU or GPU. Part of these operators are stored procedures while others whose functionalities depend on some dynamic configurations are compiled just-in-time. For instance, the initialization procedures of certain CC schemes depend on table formats to get access to correct items, so the initialization procedures are combined with a series of table-specific intermediate representation (called "accessors") to generate the final initialization code. With the combination of intermediate representation and just-in-time compilation, gCCTB can easily generate well optimized code and keep the flexibility of modifying testing configurations at run time. A transaction is treated as a compiled-just-in-time procedure which is assembled with CC schemes and indexes specified by a configuration before testing. Besides, all of the variables whose value can be determined before testing, such as number of operations and memory addresses of data structures are also compiled into the transaction code as constants. In this way, testers can implement and select different table formats, transactions and data generation methods by writing and running multiple scripts without recompiling the whole test-bed.

For the third issue, gCCTB provides an interface that composes of a series of interface functions for integrating CC schemes and benchmark into our test-bed. These interface functions are abstracts of basic transaction operations. TxStart and TxEnd are called before and after the execution respectively to initialize and cleanup the execution environment. Finalize is called at the end of the execution procedure to collect statistics. CC schemes running on gCCTB must implement this interface. Transaction uses these functions to manipulate data without knowing the detail of CC schemes in advance. Moreover, gCCTB also provides implementations of several key techniques such as locking and atomic operations on GPUs, which are discussed in detail below.

3.3 Key Designs and Implementations

In this section we introduce key designs and implementations of gCCTB. We first introduce the design of two key components: code generation, compilation and measurements. Then we introduce the design of tables and indexes in gCCTB. After that, we discuss the implementations of two key techniques of CC schemes on GPUs: spin lock and atomic operations.

Just-In-Time Code Generation & Compilation: gCCTB uses NVRTC[27] to compile device code during runtime. NVRTC provides gCCTB the ability to add macro definitions in JIT compilation, which provides the convenience for code generation. Code to be compiled ahead-of-time (AOT) and just-in-time can thus be distinguished by a macro which is defined only in JIT compilation. Device code is generated from predefined code templates with external macro definitions. These macros are generated by dependencies of the templates dynamically and injected during JIT compilation. To

increase the development efficiency, these templates have corresponding "placeholder macros" defined in the AOT part to make code editors give correct highlighting and hints.

Measurements: gCCTB measures the execution time of different stages of transaction processing and accumulates it to help the researchers to analyse the performance of CC schemes. The CPU part of gCCTB times the duration of GPU batch execution and data transfer between CPU and GPU through CUDA event mechanism. The GPU part collects the measurements in a parallel way to minimize the performance loss brought by time measurement: each thread measures its own execution time and stores it in its local space. After all of the threads finish processing their workloads, they accumulate their local values to global measurements using atomic add operations.

DBMS Building Blocks: There are also some basic components of a DBMS. On the GPU side, we adopt a simple design and implementation:

- **Table:** A table on the GPU side adopts row store, which is an array of tuples. The size of the table remains constant during GPU-side execution. All tables in a database are arranged consecutively in the GPU memory, sharing the same monotonically incremental id as the primary key. There is an array that records the address offset of each table and the starting value of the primary key.
- **Index:** Indexing on the GPU side is also a research field. Since indexes are not the focus of this paper, only sorted arrays[43] are implemented as indexes on the GPU side. A column to be indexed is sorted and copied to the GPU memory together with the primary keys as the index. A query on the index is a binary search on the sorted array.

Spin Lock: A spin lock[42] is a lock that causes a thread trying to acquire it to wait in a loop while repeatedly checking whether the lock is available. Since GPUs lack a programmer-controllable thread scheduling mechanism, spin lock is the simplest way to implement a latch. The way of implementing a spin lock on GPU depends on the Independent Thread Scheduling (ITS) hardware feature, which enables a GPU to schedule each thread in a warp independently. The implementation which utilizes the ITS feature does not have to release the lock in the same loop body with the checking operations. Another key point to be noticed is that operations loading data from global memory should use the "volatile" keyword to avoid loading outdated data from the cache. This technique is also used in other implementation described below.

Atomic Operation: Among different CC schemes, it is common to read/write a 64-bit integer and perform some operations atomically, in which the integer may be accessed by multiple threads in parallel while other operations are thread-private. We call this atomic operation "i64-bound atomic operation (ibao)". There are two types of ibao: one for those whose operations update the 64-bit integer (w-ibao) and the other for the read only (r-ibao). The key point is that a thread loads the initial integer value at the beginning and tests if the integer has been changed by other threads after the operations to guarantee the atomicity.

3.4 CC Schemes Migration and Implementation

In this section we introduce the migration and implementation of eight CC schemes on gCCTB. Since gCCTB adopts a batch execution model, the GPU memory consumption of a CC scheme can be determined in advance. Therefore, the CPU part of a CC scheme allocates and initializes the memory of its runtime information before the execution. Besides, there is a common optimization adopted by It's common for CC schemes to load/store tuples of information atomically. According to our observation, the tuples can always be packed into 64 bits in the GPU batch execution scenario. So we utilize the C bit fields and the atomic operation mentioned above to achieve the latch free load/store of the tuples.

3.4.1 Two-Phase Locking: gCCTB implements two approaches of **2PL: no-wait and wait-die**. There is no centralized lock manager in gCCTB. Instead, each worker thread maintains its own lock information. The information of a lock consists of a shared bit, lock holder bits and holder count bits. Lock and unlock operations are achieved using the atomic operation mentioned above.

3.4.2 Timestamp Ordering:

Basic T/O: The basic T/O scheme acquires a new timestamp from an allocator in each iteration. The timestamp allocator can be implemented in several ways and its selected implementation is compiled with the T/O scheme just-in-time. In our naive approach, it simply adds a 64-bit global variable atomically to allocate a new timestamp. We give two implementations of the basic T/O scheme. The first adopts a 64-bit packed information structure, which consists of a commit bit, a 31-bit rts and 31-bit wts and utilize the atomic operation. This implementation is applicable to low contention situations in which timestamps do not exceed 31 bits. The second adopts a structure consisting of 64-bit rts and wts separately and uses latches to confirm the atomic access to the structures. Testers have to select the proper T/O implementation for different test settings manually.

MVCC: The MVCC scheme implemented in gCCTB is based on the basic T/O scheme. It shares the same timestamp allocator with basic T/O and also has two implementations for different timestamp size assumptions. There is an array of the latest versions corresponding to all of the entries and another array of history versions. Since the number of versions is the same as the number of write operations, the array of history versions can be pre-allocated and divided into local spaces maintained by worker threads. The pointer pointing to the previous version is simplified to an offset from the start address of the history version array. A worker thread writing to an entry copies the corresponding version node into its local space and adds a new version to the global version array. For rolling back, the thread copies the previous version from its local space back to the global array.

OCC: gCCTB implements two OCC schemes, **silos** and **tictoc**. Both implementations utilize the atomic operation implementation described before to load entries and timestamps atomically. They both assume that write operations are performed in ascending order of primary keys, and that the write sets are not sorted when locking their items. In the implementation of **silos**, the timestamp information including a lock bit and a 63-bit timestamp is packed into a 64-bit integer. Since transactions are processed in a batched manner on GPU, there is no need to maintain the epoch described in the

original **silos** paper. In the implementation of **tictoc**, timestamp information including a lock bit, a 48-bit wts and 15-bit delta is packed into a 64-bit integer. It also adopts the no-wait optimization mentioned in its original paper. This optimization makes a transaction abort instantly when it has to wait for a lock in the write phase.

3.4.3 Conflict Graph Ordering: Two conflict graph ordering based schemes: **gputx** and **gacco** are implemented on gCCTB. In the preprocessing stage, implementations of both schemes first utilize the accessors mentioned above and indexes to gather all of the transaction id - primary key pairs, forming "access tables". The preprocessing code that constructs the access tables is generated for workloads dynamically at runtime. At the same time, they also count how many transactions each data item is accessed by to determine the boundary of each data item in the access table. We adopt the thrust library[26] for sorting and calculating prefix sums. In **gacco**, the preprocessing and execution of the same batch are assigned with the same CUDA stream. Streams are synchronized before they access the same data structures on the GPU.

4 EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

Our experiments focus on the following aspects:

- (1) Performance of different CC schemes on the GPU: The performance metrics include throughput and abort rate.
- (2) Bottlenecks of these CC schemes: To identify the bottlenecks, we measure the execution time of different stages of the transaction processing.
- (3) Influence of different launch parameters: GPUs organize threads into warps, thread blocks and grids. We call these organizing parameters "launch parameters". This is more complex than CPUs since the only parameter on CPUs is the number of threads.
- (4) Influence of different contention levels and proportions of write operations: These factors are well studied previously on CPUs and may have a different impact on performance of CC schemes on GPUs.

In the following, we first introduce the setup of our experiments, especially the selection of benchmark and launch parameters. Then we demonstrate the results of the evaluation and give an analysis and discussion of the results.

4.1 Experimental Setup

Experimental Environment: gCCTB is implement with C++ and CUDA library version 12.0 and the source code can be found on Github¹. The experiments are run on a server equipped with two Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 5120 CPUs (14 cores) with 512 GB main memory and one NVIDIA Tesla A100 GPU with 80 GB memory. The operating system is Ubuntu 18.04.1 LTS.

Benchmark Selection: We adopt YCSB[10] and TPC-C[38] benchmark. The Yahoo! Cloud Serving Benchmark (YCSB) is representative of large-scale online services. A YCSB transaction consists of 16 access operations and each operation accesses a single random tuple following a Zipfian distribution. There are two parameters W, θ controlling the proportion of write operations and contention

¹https://github.com/Al0ha0e/gpu_cc_tb

level respectively, which give researchers the flexibility to test the performance of CC schemes in a variety of situations. We construct three sets of YCSB benchmark with different parameters, which are selected according to experiment results showed in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3: the performance drops dramatically at $\theta = 0.6$, $\theta = 0.8$ and $W = 0.1$:

- Read Only (RO): $W = 0$, $\theta = 0$
- Medium Contention (MC): $W = 0.1$, $\theta = 0.6$
- High Contention (HC): $W = 0.1$, $\theta = 0.8$

Another benchmark adopted by us is TPC-C, which simulates a warehouse-centric order processing application. The transactions in TPC-C are more complex than those in YCSB. Only two (Payment and NewOrder) out of the five transactions in TPC-C are taken into consideration in our evaluation. These two transaction make up 88% of the default TPC-C mix and comprise read and write operations. The NewOrder transaction simulates an ordering process. This process includes several orderlines which subtract the quantities of stocks and increase the order counts. The Payment transaction simulates a payment process which deducts the balance from a customer and adds the respective amount to the specific row in the warehouse and district table, in which the warehouse table is the major contention point. We follow the TPC-C specification where $\sim 10\%$ of the NewOrder transactions and $\sim 15\%$ of the Payment transactions access a "remote" warehouse. We test these two types of transactions separately instead of mixing them into the same set. **Metric Selection:** To measure the performance of these CC schemes, we use the throughput and abort rate as the metrics. The unit of throughput is million transactions per second. The abort rate is the ratio of the number of abort to the number of successfully executed transactions. Moreover, we also measure the execution time of each stage of the transaction processing including preprocessing, CC manager working, waiting, index lookup, timestamp allocating, aborting and useful work. The aborting time is the sum of the execution time of the aborted transactions.

Launch Parameters: There are three launch parameters that have significant impacts on the transaction processing performance in different ways:

- Warp Density (wd): Number of working threads in a warp is 2^{wd} , $wd \in [0, 5]$. The non-working (idle) threads in a warp exit instantly right after the launch. As wd increases, both the level of contention and resource utilization decrease.
- Block Size (wc): Number of warps in a thread block, $wc \in [1, 32]$. As wc increases, the parallelism and the resource utilization level of a single SM also increase. However, the average SM resources allocated to each thread of the same block decrease.
- Batch Size (bs): Number of transactions to be executed in a batch, $bs \in [2^{10}, 2^{22}]$. As bs increases, the parallelism increases while the level of contention also increases.

4.2 YCSB Results

In the following, we first test the impact of YCSB parameter θ and W on the performance. These experiments are conducted with fixed launch parameters $wd = 2$, $wc = 16$, $bs = 2^{20}$. Then for each YCSB benchmark, we perform a grid search on the launch parameters and compare the best performance of different CC schemes for each bs .




Figure 2: YCSB Different θ $W = 0.1$, $wd = 2$, $wc = 16$, $bs = 2^{20}$




Figure 3: YCSB Different W $\theta = 0.6$, $wd = 2$, $wc = 16$, $bs = 2^{20}$

Next, we fix the batch size to 2^{20} and observe the distribution of throughput under different wd and wc conditions through the heat map. Then we select one of the wd and change wc to observe the performance changes of each CC scheme. Finally we fix the wc to observe the execution time breakdown of each scheme.

4.2.1 Impact of θ and W . The results in Fig. 2 show the impact of θ with $W = 0.1$. The throughput of all the schemes decrease as θ increases. The throughput suffers a sharp decrease when θ goes from 0.5 to 0.6 and 0.7 to 0.8. The increase of abort rate is probably the main reason for the performance decrease for CC schemes other than conflict graph based schemes. Especially for two-phase locking schemes, the abort rate is much higher than other schemes and reaches over 1024 when $\theta = 0.8$.

The results in Fig. 3 show the impact of W with $\theta = 0.6$. The performance of CC schemes except for **gacco** decrease when transactions start to contain write operations. When W increases, the performance decrease of optimistic CC schemes is more dramatic than that of other schemes. The changes of throughput and abort rate when $W > 0$ are more slightly than they vary with θ .

Above results show that the performance of CC schemes running on GPUs is sensitive to the variation of contention and "stable" to the variation of proportion of write operations. The huge performance gap between read only and write transactions shows a potential of GPU-specific optimization of CC schemes.

4.2.2 Read-Only. Fig. 4 shows the best performance achieved by different CC schemes on YCSB-RO. Since **gacco** and **gputx** also require preprocessing for read-only transactions, their throughput is relatively low. Because **gputx** constructs batches by itself, its performance is not affected by the batch size. The performance gaps of the other schemes are not large, and the performance of




Figure 4: Batch Size: YCSB-RO

the optimistic schemes is slightly worse due to the complexity of the validation mechanism.

The results in Fig. 5 show the throughput distributions of schemes under different launch parameters. The distributions are similar between CC schemes and stable to the variation of wc when $wd \leq 3$. The conflict graph based schemes show different performance distributions when $wd \geq 4$: the performance keeps increasing when wd increases while for other schemes, the throughput reaches the peak when $wd = 4$ and decreases dramatically when $wd = 5$. All of the schemes other than conflict graph based schemes share similar distributions, which may be because of the preprocessing stages of the conflict graph based schemes.

Fig. 6(a) shows the throughput comparison of CC schemes when $wd = 4$. The performance of non-conflict graph ordering based schemes is similar and is much better than that of conflict graph ordering based schemes. The time consumed by the preprocessing stage may result in the performance loss, which is confirmed by results shown in Fig. 6(b). Another observations are the performance fluctuation of non-conflict graph ordering based schemes when wc changes and the performance reaches the peak when $wc = 1$, which may have something to do with the GPU hardware architecture and is beyond the scope of this paper.

Fig. 6(b). shows the execution time breakdown when $wc = 16$. Since the transactions are readonly, there is no time consumption caused by solving contentions. The transaction managers and indexes take up a large portion of the execution time. **gacco** and **gputx** also spend part of their execution time on preprocessing. Since **gacco** treats read and write operations as the same type, some worker threads still have to wait for other threads to finish their read operations.

4.2.3 Medium Contention. Fig. 7 shows the best performance and the corresponding abort rate of schemes tested on YCSB-MC. The OCC schemes get the highest throughput, followed by **gacco**, and the performance gaps between the other CC schemes are relatively small. The abort rate can be divided into three levels: 2PL based schemes have the highest abort rates, the abort rates of **to** and **mvcc** is at the middle level, and the abort rate of the OCC schemes is at the lowest level.

The results in Fig. 8 show the throughput distribution of CC schemes tested on YCSB medium contention benchmark. The performance distribution of different schemes is more diverse than

that of readonly benchmark. For the wc dimension, **gacco**, **silo** and **tictoc** are insensitive to the change of wc . Two-phase locking based schemes, **to** and **mvcc** perform better when wc gets larger while **gputx** performs better when wc is smaller. For the wd dimension, increasing it causes performance loss for all the schemes.

Fig. 9(a) and (b) show the throughput and abort rate respectively, where $wd = 2$. Optimistic schemes show good performance on the MC test set, with **tictoc** and **silo** ranking first and second, respectively, followed by **gacco**. The performance of the rest of the CC schemes is relatively similar. In terms of abort rate, conflict graph ordering based schemes do not abort and are therefore not reflected in Fig. 9(b). The two-phase locking based schemes still maintain a high abort rate, and the abort rate of the optimistic concurrency control schemes corresponds to its performance and is in the lowest of all schemes.

In terms of execution time breakdown shown in 9(c), both **gacco** and **mvcc** spend a large percentage of waiting time. The two-phase locking based schemes also account for the largest proportion of rollback time, which is consistent with the results in Fig. 9(b). Both **to** and **mvcc** spend less time allocating timestamps. The optimistic concurrency control schemes spend longer manager time in exchange for lower wait time and abort time.

4.2.4 High Contention. Fig. 10 shows the best performance and the corresponding abort rate of schemes tested on YCSB-HC. Among them, **tictoc**, **silo** and **gacco** have relatively high performance. The performance of **tictoc** decreases significantly after $wc > 16$, and it can be seen from Fig. 10(b) that the abort rate also experiences an increase, while the abort rate of **silo** remains stable. The performance of other schemes is not much different, but the abort rate is very different, which can be divided into three levels: 2PL based schemes have the highest abort rate, which exceeds 1024, the abort rate of **to** is at the middle level, and the abort rates of the OCC schemes and **mvcc** are at the lowest level. It is worth noting that the abort rate of **mvcc** is always low, becoming the lowest of all schemes after $wc > 16$.

Fig. 11 shows the performance distribution tested on YCSB-HC. In the case of HC, the performance of schemes suffers a significant degradation. As can be seen from the figure, the performance distribution of schemes except **tictoc** can be seen as a development from the MC case. The opposite distribution has been shown in **tictoc**, where the peak performance occurs in regions with higher wd rather than lower wd in YCSB-MC.

Fig. 12(a) (b) shows how throughput and abort rate change with wc . Under these launch parameters, the performance of the schemes is not much different. Except for the conflict graph based schemes, the performance has an improvement trend with the increasing of wc . Another strange phenomenon is that the performance of **silo** and **gacco** experiences a downward trend when $wc \leq 3$. As can be seen from Fig. 12(b), the abort rates of 2PL based schemes are extremely high. Unlike the case of YCSB-MC, **mvcc** has become the scheme with the lowest abort rate. The abort rate rankings of **to**, **silo** and **tictoc** are the same as YCSB-MC.

Fig. 12(c) shows the execution time breakdown of each scheme in YCSB-HC. It highlights the performance bottlenecks of the algorithms: the 2PL-based schemes, as well as the **to** and optimistic schemes, all spend the vast majority of their execution time on






Figure 5: YCSB-RO $bs = 2^{20}$



(a) Total Throughput (b) Execution Time Breakdown $wc = 16$

Figure 6: Block Size: YCSB-RO $wd = 4, bs = 2^{20}$



(a) Total Throughput (b) Abort Rate

Figure 7: Batch Size: YCSB-MC

aborting. **gacco** and **mvcc** spend a lot of time waiting. It can be seen that the time breakdown of **gputx** is not much different from the other two YCSB benchmarks, for its performance degradation is mainly caused by the decrease in the number of transactions executed concurrently.

4.3 TPC-C Results

In the following, we test the Payment and NewOrder separately. For each transaction, we first test the impact of number of warehouses, then we perform a grid search on the launch parameters and compare the best performance of different CC schemes for each batch size. Due to space constraints, we left full experiment results of TPC-C on our git repository².

4.3.1 Payment. Fig. 13 shows the impact of warehouse number. Except for **mvcc**, the throughput of other schemes increases greatly with the increase of the number of warehouses. The abort rates of **tpl_wd** and **silo** go through a decrease and then an increase, with the lowest values appearing at 64 and 32 warehouses, respectively. The abort rates of other CC schemes decrease with the increase of the number of warehouses.

Fig. 14(a) shows the best performance of schemes tested with TPC-C Payment. It can be seen that **gacco** performs the best, and its performance increases with batch size, significantly outperforming other schemes at $wc \geq 14$. The OCC schemes have a medium performance, followed by 2PL based schemes. It is worth noting that there are also differences in the location of performance peaks of different schemes: 2PL-based schemes reach the peak when $wc = 12$, **to** reaches when $wc = 16$, and **mvcc** reaches when $wc = 14$. Fig. 14(b) shows the abort rates of different schemes. Abort rates of 2PL based schemes are still the highest, but the abort rate of **tpl_nw** is higher than that of **tpl_wd**. Then, the abort rate of **tictoc** is in the middle. The abort rates of **to**, **mvcc**, **silo** are not much different, and in a state of decline after $wc > 12$.

²https://github.com/Al0ha0e/gpu_cc_tb/tree/master/figures/png




Figure 8: YCSB-MC $bs = 2^{20}$




Figure 9: Block Size: YCSB-MC $wd = 2, bs = 2^{20}$




Figure 10: Batch Size: YCSB-HC

even reaches 10^7 , while there is not much difference in the performance of other schemes, The performance of all schemes increases monotonically with the increase of the number of warehouses. In terms of the abort rate, **silo** shows a trend of falling first and then rising.

Fig. 16(a) shows the best performance of schemes tested with TPC-C NewOrder. **gacco** outperforms other schemes when $wc \geq 14$. The OCC schemes perform the worst in this experiment. The performance of other schemes is not much different. When it comes to abort rate, 2PL-based schemes are still at the top. The Abort rate of **mvcc** fluctuates with the change of wc .

4.3.2 *NewOrder*. Fig. 15 shows the impact of warehouse number. The throughput of **gacco** is much higher than other schemes and




Figure 11: YCSB-HC $bs = 2^{20}$




Figure 12: Block Size: YCSB-HC $wd = 2, bs = 2^{20}$




Figure 13: TPC-C Payment Different Warehouse $wd = 2, wc = 16, bs = 2^{20}$




Figure 14: Batch Size: TPC-C Payment

4.4 Discussion

The results show that the performance of each concurrency control scheme varies greatly under different parameters. For different




Figure 15: TPC-C NewOrder Different Warehouse $w_d = 2$, $w_c = 16$, $b_s = 2^{20}$




Figure 16: Batch Size: TPC-C NewOrder

benchmark and different CC schemes, the launch parameters that can achieve the highest performance are totally different. Due to the massive parallelism of GPUs, the probability of contentions between transactions is amplified. This leads to a sharp drop in throughput as the abort time rises, which becomes the bottleneck of CC schemes other than conflict graph ordering based schemes. Conflict graph ordering based schemes resolve the contentions in the preprocessing stages in a determined manner and thus can eliminate the uncontrollable contentions at runtime. These schemes also show advantages when transactions are more complex. On the other hand, CC schemes previously designed for CPUs also show some advantages. OCC schemes achieve high performance in some low contention and read heavy cases. The MVCC scheme implemented in gCCTB shows low abort rate in our experiment.

This work leaves a number of unresolved issues. The most important issue is that the specific relationship between the launch parameters and the GPU hardware architecture (streaming multiprocessor, cache) has not yet been clarified. Some parameters, such as the memory access and computations of transactions, have not been quantified. Detailed performance models need to be presented in order to determine the proper parameters for different schemes. These models may help to explain some results of this work. CC schemes tested in this work may not be well-optimized. Some optimizations of schemes may lead to totally different results.

5 RELATED WORK

GPU Accelerated DBMS: A number of GPU-accelerated DBMS[7, 15, 18, 29] have been proposed for both research and commercial purposes. These systems utilize GPUs to accelerate analytical processing. There are also a number of database operations that have their GPU-resident versions including sorting[23, 32, 33, 36],

join[21, 22, 30, 31, 35] and compaction[41], etc. The research trend of these operators in recent years is the use of high-speed interconnects to leverage the power of multiple GPUs. Moreover, index[1, 2, 46] is another area that can be accelerated with GPUs.

OLTP Benchmarking: DBx1000[44] is a lightweight main memory DBMS. The authors implement seven CC schemes on DBx1000 and use computer simulations to scale the system to 1024 cores. It is originally used to investigate the performance variation of CC schemes as the number of cores increases and adopted by subsequent researchers as a test-bed to test new CC schemes. DBx1000 inspired us to design our test-bed for benchmarking CC schemes on GPUs.

In-Memory Transaction Processing: We leave the implementation and benchmarking of schemes that combine MVCC and OCC for future work. These schemes are adopted by in-memory transaction processing engines such as Hekaton[11, 17] and Cicada[19]. In addition to the combinations of MVCC and OCC, there are also combinations of OCC and pessimistic locking. Mostly-Optimistic Concurrency Control (MOCC)[40] is a CC scheme that is based on modern OCC and incorporates pessimistic read locks to prevent writers from clobbering readers. Pessimistic Locking and Optimistic Reading (PLOR)[8] is another hybrid concurrency control protocol that delivers high throughput and low tail latency.

6 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

In this work, we present the first concurrency control test-bed gCCTB on GPU and implement eight CC schemes on it. The design and implementation of gCCTB with the schemes accumulate experience for transaction processing on GPUs. Furthermore, we give a comprehensive evaluation of these schemes on GPU with YCSB and TPC-C benchmark, which may assist the design of new CC schemes on GPUs in the future.

A number of directions for future research can be derived from this work. First, improving the performance of preprocessing stages for conflict graph based schemes is one of the promising directions. Another possible choice is the combination of MVCC and OCC, which shows high throughput and low abort rate respectively in our experiment.

REFERENCES

- [1] Muhammad A Awad, Saman Ashkiani, Rob Johnson, Martin Farach-Colton, and John D Owens. 2019. Engineering a high-performance gpu b-tree. In *Proceedings of the 24th symposium on principles and practice of parallel programming*. 145–157.
- [2] Muhammad A Awad, Serban D Porumbescu, and John D Owens. 2022. A GPU Multiversion B-Tree. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques*. 481–493.
- [3] Philip A Bernstein and Nathan Goodman. 1981. Concurrency control in distributed database systems. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 13, 2 (1981), 185–221.
- [4] Philip A Bernstein and Nathan Goodman. 1983. Multiversion concurrency control—theory and algorithms. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS)* 8, 4 (1983), 465–483.
- [5] Philip A. Bernstein, David W. Shipman, and Wing S. Wong. 1979. Formal aspects of serializability in database concurrency control. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 3 (1979), 203–216.
- [6] Nils Boeschen and Carsten Binnig. 2022. GaccO-A GPU-accelerated OLTP DBMS. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data*. 1003–1016.
- [7] Sebastian Breß. 2014. The design and implementation of CoGaDB: A column-oriented GPU-accelerated DBMS. *Datenbank-Spektrum* 14 (2014), 199–209.
- [8] Youmin Chen, Xiangyao Yu, Paraschos Koutris, Andrea C. Arpaci-Dusseau, Remzi H. Arpaci-Dusseau, and Jiwu Shu. 2022. Plor: General Transactions with Predictable, Low Tail Latency. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference*

- on *Management of Data* (Philadelphia, PA, USA) (*SIGMOD '22*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 19–33. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3514221.3517879>
- [9] Edgar F Codd. 1993. Providing OLAP (on-line analytical processing) to user-analysts: An IT mandate. <http://www.arborsoft.com/papers/coddTOC.html> (1993).
 - [10] Brian F Cooper, Adam Silberstein, Erwin Tam, Raghu Ramakrishnan, and Russell Sears. 2010. Benchmarking cloud serving systems with YCSB. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM symposium on Cloud computing*, 143–154.
 - [11] Cristian Diaconu, Craig Freedman, Erik Ismert, Per-Ake Larson, Pravin Mittal, Ryan Stonecipher, Nitin Verma, and Mike Zwilling. 2013. Hekaton: SQL server’s memory-optimized OLTP engine. In *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*, 1243–1254.
 - [12] Kapali P. Eswaran, Jim N Gray, Raymond A. Lorie, and Irving L. Traiger. 1976. The notions of consistency and predicate locks in a database system. *Commun. ACM* 19, 11 (1976), 624–633.
 - [13] Jim Gray and Andreas Reuter. 1992. *Transaction processing: concepts and techniques*. Elsevier.
 - [14] Bingsheng He and Jeffrey Xu Yu. 2011. High-throughput transaction executions on graphics processors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1103.3105* (2011).
 - [15] HeavyDB. 2022. HeavyDB. <https://github.com/heavyai/heavydb>.
 - [16] Hsiang-Tsung Kung and John T Robinson. 1981. On optimistic methods for concurrency control. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS)* 6, 2 (1981), 213–226.
 - [17] Per-Ake Larson, Spyros Blanas, Cristian Diaconu, Craig Freedman, Jignesh M Patel, and Mike Zwilling. 2011. High-performance concurrency control mechanisms for main-memory databases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1201.0228* (2011).
 - [18] Rubao Lee, Minghong Zhou, Chi Li, Shenggang Hu, Jianping Teng, Dongyang Li, and Xiaodong Zhang. 2021. The art of balance: a RateupDB™ experience of building a CPU/GPU hybrid database product. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 14, 12 (2021), 2999–3013.
 - [19] Hyeontaek Lim, Michael Kaminsky, and David G Andersen. 2017. Cicada: Dependably fast multi-core in-memory transactions. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM International Conference on Management of Data*, 21–35.
 - [20] Erik Lindholm, John Nickolls, Stuart Oberman, and John Montrym. 2008. NVIDIA Tesla: A unified graphics and computing architecture. *IEEE micro* 28, 2 (2008), 39–55.
 - [21] Clemens Lutz, Sebastian Breß, Steffen Zeuch, Tilmann Rabl, and Volker Markl. 2020. Pump up the volume: Processing large data on GPUs with fast interconnects. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*, 1633–1649.
 - [22] Clemens Lutz, Sebastian Breß, Steffen Zeuch, Tilmann Rabl, and Volker Markl. 2022. Triton join: efficiently scaling to a large join state on GPUs with fast interconnects. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data*, 1017–1032.
 - [23] Tobias Maltener, Ivan Ilic, Ilin Tolovski, and Tilmann Rabl. 2022. Evaluating multi-GPU sorting with modern interconnects. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data*, 1795–1809.
 - [24] NVIDIA. 2023. CUDA C++ Best Practices Guide Release 12.3. <https://docs.nvidia.com/cuda/cuda-c-best-practices-guide/index.html>.
 - [25] NVIDIA. 2023. CUDA C++ Programming Guide Release 12.3. <https://docs.nvidia.com/cuda/cuda-c-programming-guide/index.html>.
 - [26] NVIDIA. 2023. CUDA Thrust Release 12.3. <https://docs.nvidia.com/cuda/thrust/index.html>.
 - [27] NVIDIA. 2023. NVRTC 12.3 Documentation. <https://docs.nvidia.com/cuda/nvrtc/index.html>.
 - [28] NVIDIA. 2023. Volta Tuning Guide Release 12.3. https://docs.nvidia.com/cuda/pdf/Volta_Tuning_Guide.pdf.
 - [29] Christopher Root and Todd Mostak. 2016. MapD: A GPU-powered big data analytics and visualization platform. In *ACM SIGGRAPH 2016 Talks*, 1–2.
 - [30] Ran Rui, Hao Li, and Yi-Cheng Tu. 2015. Join algorithms on GPUs: A revisit after seven years. In *2015 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. IEEE, 2541–2550.
 - [31] Ran Rui, Hao Li, and Yi-Cheng Tu. 2020. Efficient join algorithms for large database tables in a multi-GPU environment. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 14, 4 (2020), 708–720.
 - [32] Nadathur Satish, Mark Harris, and Michael Garland. 2009. Designing efficient sorting algorithms for manycore GPUs. In *2009 IEEE International Symposium on Parallel & Distributed Processing*. IEEE, 1–10.
 - [33] Nadathur Satish, Changkyu Kim, Jatin Chhugani, Anthony D Nguyen, Victor W Lee, Daehyun Kim, and Pradeep Dubey. 2010. Fast sort on CPUs and GPUs: a case for bandwidth oblivious SIMD sort. In *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of data*, 351–362.
 - [34] Abraham Silberschatz, Henry F Korth, and Shashank Sudarshan. 2011. Database system concepts. (2011).
 - [35] Panagiotis Sioulas, Periklis Chrysogelos, Manos Karpathiotakis, Raja Appuswamy, and Anastasia Ailamaki. 2019. Hardware-conscious hash-joins on gpus. In *2019 IEEE 35th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 698–709.
 - [36] Elias Stehle and Hans-Arno Jacobsen. 2017. A memory bandwidth-efficient hybrid radix sort on gpus. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM International Conference on Management of Data*, 417–432.
 - [37] Robert H Thomas. 1979. A majority consensus approach to concurrency control for multiple copy databases. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS)* 4, 2 (1979), 180–209.
 - [38] Transaction Processing Performance Council. 2010. TPC-C Benchmark (Revision 5.11). https://www.tpc.org/TPC_Documents_Current_Versions/pdf/tpc-c_v5.11.0.pdf.
 - [39] Stephen Tu, Wenting Zheng, Eddie Kohler, Barbara Liskov, and Samuel Madden. 2013. Speedy transactions in multicore in-memory databases. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, 18–32.
 - [40] Tianzheng Wang and Hideaki Kimura. 2016. Mostly-Optimistic Concurrency Control for Highly Contended Dynamic Workloads on a Thousand Cores. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 10, 2 (oct 2016), 49–60. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3015274.3015276>
 - [41] Peng Xu, Jiguang Wan, Ping Huang, Xiaogang Yang, Chenlei Tang, Fei Wu, and Changsheng Xie. 2020. LUDA: Boost LSM Key Value Store Compactions with GPUs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.03054* (2020).
 - [42] Yunlong Xu, Lan Gao, Rui Wang, Zhongzhi Luan, Weiguo Wu, and Depei Qian. 2016. Lock-based synchronization for GPU architectures. In *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Computing Frontiers*, 205–213.
 - [43] I-L Yen, D-R Leu, and F Bastani. 1990. Hash table and sorted array: A case study of multi-entry data structures in massively parallel systems. In *Third Symposium on the Frontiers of Massively Parallel Computation*. IEEE Computer Society, 51–52.
 - [44] Xiangyao Yu, George Bezerra, Andrew Pavlo, Srinivas Devadas, and Michael Stonebraker. 2014. Staring into the Abyss: An Evaluation of Concurrency Control with One Thousand Cores. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 8, 3 (nov 2014), 209–220. <https://doi.org/10.14778/2735508.2735511>
 - [45] Xiangyao Yu, Andrew Pavlo, Daniel Sanchez, and Srinivas Devadas. 2016. Tictoc: Time traveling optimistic concurrency control. In *Proceedings of the 2016 International Conference on Management of Data*, 1629–1642.
 - [46] Kai Zhang, Kaibo Wang, Yuan Yuan, Lei Guo, Rubao Lee, and Xiaodong Zhang. 2015. Mega-kv: A case for gpus to maximize the throughput of in-memory key-value stores. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 8, 11 (2015), 1226–1237.