

Updating Graph-based Index with Fine-grained Blocks for Large-scale Streaming High-dimensional Vectors

Song Yu[†], Shengyuan Lin[†], Shufeng Gong[†], Yongqing Xie[§], Ruicheng Liu[§], Yijie Zhou[†], Pufan Zuo[†], Yanfeng Zhang[†], Ji Sun[§], Ge Yu[†]
[†]Northeastern University, China [§]Huawei Technology Co., Ltd
 yusong@stumail.neu.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

To meet the demand for large-scale high-dimensional vector approximate nearest neighbor search (ANNS), many graph-based ANNS systems have been widely adopted due to their excellent efficiency-accuracy trade-offs. Nevertheless, in dynamic scenarios involving frequent vector insertions and deletions, existing systems mitigate the overhead by employing batch update strategies, which improve update performance by increasing the batch size. However, excessively increasing the batch size leads to index update delays, which, in turn, cause a significant degradation in query accuracy. This work aims to improve the performance of graph-based ANNS systems in small-batch update scenarios, achieving a balance between update efficiency and query accuracy. We identify two key issues with existing batch update strategies during small-batch updates: (1) significant data waste in disk read/write operations, and (2) frequent triggering of large-scale pruning operations involving high-cost vector computations by the incremental algorithm. To address these issues, we introduce Greator, a disk-based system with a novel graph-based index update method. The core idea of Greator is to accumulate only a small number of vector updates per batch to prevent excessive index degradation, while designing an efficient fine-grained incremental update scheme that reduces data wastage during I/O operations. Additionally, we introduce a lightweight incremental graph repair strategy to reduce pruning operations, thereby minimizing the expensive vector computations. Based on extensive experiments on real-world datasets, Greator can integrate continuous updates faster than the state-of-the-art solutions, achieving up to 4.16 \times speedup, while maintaining stable index quality to produce low query latency and high query accuracy of approximate vector searches.

1 INTRODUCTION

Approximate nearest neighbor search (ANNS) for high-dimensional vectors has become a critical component in modern data-driven applications, with widespread usage in information retrieval [6, 37, 42, 53], recommendation systems [15, 36, 38, 43], and large language models [18, 29, 30, 32]. Graph-based index demonstrates an excellent trade-off between query efficiency and accuracy, even in high-dimensional scenarios [7, 20, 33, 49, 50]. It has been widely applied in a large number of vector search systems [12, 25, 26, 35, 44, 49]. However, the size of graph-based indexes always are too large to fit in main memory. For example, constructing an HNSW index for one billion 960-dimensional floating-point vectors requires over 3.5 TB of memory. As a result, many systems address this issue by placing the index on disks with larger capacities [26].




Figure 1: The update throughput (number of vectors processed per second) and the recall10@10 of FreshDiskANN vary with the size of the update batch.

Although existing graph-based vector search systems have demonstrated excellent performance in query efficiency, query accuracy, and scalability, they encounter significant performance bottlenecks when handling streaming vectors, where the vectors are inserted/deleted frequently. The root cause lies in the complexity of updating the graph topology when deleting vectors. Graph indexes are stored using directed graphs, where each vertex stores only its outgoing neighbors, without information on incoming neighbors. When a vertex (vector) is deleted, we first connect the incoming and outgoing neighbors and then trim the edges [44]. Since the incoming neighbors are not explicitly known, the entire graph must be traversed to identify them, resulting in high I/O overhead.

To amortize I/O overhead, graph topology update operations are usually performed after accumulating a batch of updates. However, we find that the batch update strategies face a trade-off between update efficiency and query accuracy. As shown in Figure 1, we evaluate a state-of-the-art batch-update ANNS system, FreshDiskANN, on the GIST and SIFT datasets (details in Table 2). The experiment shows that when the batch size increases from 0.1% to 1%, the update throughput increases by 3.79 \times , but the recall drops by more than 1%. This shows that blindly increasing the batch size to improve update performance will actually sacrifice the accuracy of the index. Is it possible to improve the throughput of graph index updates, even with a small update batch?

In this work, we aim to improve the update performance of graph-based index under small-batch updates, achieving an excellent balance between update performance and query accuracy. To achieve this goal, we comprehensively analyze and evaluate the underlying reasons for the poor update performance of the batch updates approach in existing systems under small-batch updates, taking the state-of-the-art graph-based system, FreshDiskANN, as an example (details are provided in Section 2.2). We observe the following issues: (1) *The existing update strategy leads to*

significant data waste in disk read/write operations. The existing batch updates approach adopts an out-of-place update strategy, where each small-batch update merges the updates with the original index file to generate a new file. However, in small-batch scenarios, only a portion of the data in the index file needs to be modified. As a result, while generating a new file takes advantage of the high storage bandwidth provided by sequential I/O, it also causes a significant amount of unnecessary read/write I/O. In addition, to identify the vertices affected by deleted vertices, i.e., the in-neighbors of deleted vertices, it needs to traverse the entire unidirectional graph topology. However, mainstream disk-based index [19, 26, 44, 49] stores both the graph topology and vector data in the same index file for optimize query performance. This leads to significant data waste during disk read/write operations as a large amount of unnecessary vector data is read when scanning the graph topology. (2) **The existing incremental algorithm frequently triggers expensive pruning operations.** Existing incremental algorithms repair affected vertices by reconstructing candidate neighborhoods. However, this approach often produces oversized candidate sets that exceed the neighbor capacity limit, leading to computationally intensive pruning operations. Due to the large number of pairwise distance computations between high-dimensional vectors, pruning incurs substantial overhead and severely degrades update throughput. Our key observation is that in small-batch processing scenarios, most affected vertices typically insert or delete only a few neighbors. This suggests that a lightweight incremental maintenance strategy can strategically preserve an optimized neighborhood structure while efficiently compensating for (or enhancing) connectivity lost (or gained) due to neighbor deletions (or insertions), rather than performing exhaustive reconstruction.

Based on the observations above, we design Greater, a disk-based ANNS system with a novel Graph-based index update method for high-dimensional stream vectors. The core idea of Greater is to accumulate only a small number of vector updates per batch to avoid excessive degradation of the index, while utilizing the characteristics of small-batch updates to design an efficient fine-grained incremental update scheme to support fast updates by reducing both I/O and computational overhead.

Specifically, Greater incorporates several key designs to achieve fast updates: (1) **Fine-grained update mechanism.** During the update process, the fine-grained update mode modifies only the index file blocks affected by the update, avoiding unnecessary data reads during I/O operations. Additionally, we fully leverage the parallel random I/O capabilities of SSDs (solid-state drives) to support an efficient implementation of fine-grained updates. (2) **Redundant topology design.** It stores a redundant copy of the graph topology to accelerate the identification of affected vertices, thus avoiding the need to scan the entire index file. This is based on our observation that the graph topology is typically much smaller than the vector data, especially in high-dimensional datasets (e.g., in GIST-960D, the topology accounts for only 3.32% of the total index file size, when the neighbor limit $R = 32$), so the additional storage overhead is minimal while significantly reducing unnecessary disk reads. (3) **Lightweight incremental graph repair strategy.** For the deletion stage, we use a degree-aware similarity-based method for vertices minimally affected by deletion, replacing them with a few nearest similar vertices of the deleted vertex, thereby avoiding

the frequent triggering of expensive pruning operations. For inserted data, we introduce a relaxed neighbor limit to delay pruning operations triggered by the addition of a few edges.

In summary, this paper makes the following contributions:

- A fine-grained update mechanism is employed to avoid significant data waste in disk read/write operations and fully utilize the parallel random I/O capabilities of SSDs to achieve efficient updates.
- A redundant topology design is used to accelerate the identification of vertices affected by deleted vectors, taking advantage of the fact that the graph topology is typically much smaller than the vector data.
- A lightweight incremental graph repair strategy is used to avoid the frequent triggering of expensive pruning operations.
- A large-scale streaming ANNS system, Greater, that supports fine-grained incremental updates, and a comprehensive evaluation to verify its efficiency. Experiments show that on all datasets, Greater is up to 4.16 \times faster than the state-of-the-art system FreshDiskANN.

2 BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

In this section, we first introduce the background of graph-based ANNS and then provide a detailed analysis of the limitations in the update performance of current graph-based indexes on disk.

2.1 Background of graph-based ANNS

Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denote the vector dataset of n vectors, where each element x_i represents a d -dimensional vector in \mathbb{R}^d . The distance between any two vectors $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is denoted as $dist(p, q)$. The Euclidean distance is typically used, which is denoted as $dist(p, q) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^d (p^i - q^i)^2}$, where i is an integer and $1 \leq i \leq d$, and p^i (q^i) represents the value of vector p (q) in the i -th dimension.

Approximate Nearest Neighbors Search (ANNS). Given a vector dataset X and a query vector $q \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the goal of approximate nearest neighbor search (ANNS) is to retrieve a set R_{knn} of k vectors from X that is closest to q , although the retrieved results are not guaranteed to be optimal.

Typically, the accuracy of the result R_{knn} is evaluated using the *recall*, defined as $k\text{-recall}@k = \frac{|R_{knn} \cap R_{exact}|}{k}$, where R_{exact} is the ground-truth set of the k closest vectors to q from X . The goal of ANNS is always to maximize the recall while retrieving results as quickly as possible, leading to a trade-off between recall and latency.

Graph. Given a directed graph $G = (V, E)$, where V is the set of vertices, and $E \subseteq V \times V$ is a set of edges. An edge between any two vertices p and q is denoted as $edge(p, q) \in E$. $N_{out}(p)$ and $N_{in}(p)$ denote the out-neighbor set and in-neighbor set of p , such as $N_{out}(p) = \{v | edge(p, v) \in E\}$ and $N_{in}(p) = \{v | edge(v, p) \in E\}$.

Graph Updates. Given a directed graph $G = (V, E)$, an insertion vertex set N , and a deletion vertex set D , N and D represent update operations on G . After applying these updates to G , the resulting graph is $G' = (V', E')$, where $V' = (V \cup N) \setminus D$ and $E' \subseteq V' \times V'$.




Figure 2: Illustrate the index update process for existing graph-based systems and Greator respectively.

Graph-based Vector Index. Given a vector dataset X and a graph-based vector index $G = (V, E)$ of X , where V is the set of vertices with a size equal to $|X|$, each vertex in V corresponds to a vector in X , i.e., x_p denote the vector data associated with vertex p , and $dist(x_p, x_q)$ represent the distance between two vertices p and q . E is the set of edges constructed by a specific indexing algorithm based on the similarity of the vectors corresponding to the vertices.

2.2 Graph-based Index Update Methods on Disk and Their Limitations

Graph-based indexing demonstrates an excellent trade-off between query performance and query quality, even in high-dimensional scenarios [7]. It is widely used by high-tech companies, such as Microsoft [12, 26], Yahoo [24]. However, achieving efficient dynamic updates in graph-based indexing is not straightforward. For instance, when deleting a vector p , the graph-based index needs to repair the affected vertices, i.e., all incoming neighbors of the deleted vector ($N_{in}(p)$). These neighbors must disconnect their edges pointing to the deleted vertex and construct new edges. However, querying the incoming neighbors of the deleted vertex p in the graph index typically requires traversing the entire graph topology in the index, because, due to consistency and update performance issues, graph-based indexes usually maintain a unidirectional graph topology [55].

To improve the update performance of graph-based index, existing systems typically adopt batch update methods to reduce the frequency of index updates [44, 48, 51]. For example, it would be unacceptable to incur the overhead of traversing the entire index file for each deleted vector. Therefore, these systems often accumulate a batch of updates and then incrementally merge them into the original index, thus distributing the indexing overhead of each update. Next, we will first review the index update process for existing graph-based systems [44], followed by a detailed analysis of the issues related to update performance.

2.2.1 Existing Batch Updates on Graph-based Indexes. The batch update process consists of three specific stages: deletion, insertion, and patching, as shown in Figure 2. Each of these stages will be explained in detail below.




Figure 3: Breakdown of update and delete operations.

Deletion Phase. This phase repairs the outgoing neighbors of vertices whose neighbors include the vertices in the deleted vertex set D . Since graph-based indexes do not store the incoming neighbors (i.e., $N_{in}(p)$) of each vertex, it cannot locate $N_{in}(p)$ by the deleted vertex p . As a result, it is necessary to load the vertices and their neighbors block by block from the disk, executes Algorithm 1 [26] on the vertices within each block, and writes the modified blocks to a temporary intermediate index file on the disk.

As shown in Algorithm 1, for each affected vertex p , a new candidate neighbor set C is constructed. The vertices in $N_{out}(p)$ that have not been deleted are added to C . Additionally, for each deleted neighbor vertex v in $N_{out}(p)$, the vertices in $N_{out}(v)$ that have not been deleted are also added to C . If the size of C does not exceed the user-specified neighbor limit R , C is assigned directly as the new neighbor set of p . Otherwise, C undergoes a pruning process (i.e., the RobustPrune algorithm [44]), and the pruned result is assigned as p 's new neighbor set. It is worth noting that the RobustPrune algorithm [26] has a computational complexity of $O(|C|^2 \times d)$, where d is the dimension of the vector.

Insertion Phase. This phase is consistent with the index construction process, where each vertex in the insertion vertex set N is individually inserted into the temporary index structure. Specifically, for each inserted vertex p , a greedy search (i.e., *GreedySearch* [44]) is performed on the graph, which requires random reads from the index file. Based on the search results, the neighbors $N_{out}(p)$ of the vertex are constructed. Additionally, for all outgoing neighbors of p (i.e., $N_{out}(p)$), a reverse edge to p needs to be added, i.e., $\{edge(p, p) | p \in N_{out}(p)\}$. However, inserting the vector, neighbors, and all reverse edges of vertex p causes random writes. To

Algorithm 1: Delete(L_D, R, α)

Input: Graph $G(V, E)$ with $|V| = n$, set of vertices to be deleted L_D

Output: Graph on nodes V' where $V' = V \setminus L_D$

```

1 begin
2   foreach  $p \in V \setminus L_D$  s.t.  $N_{out}(p) \cap L_D \neq \emptyset$  do
3      $\mathcal{D} \leftarrow N_{out}(p) \cap L_D$ ;
4      $C \leftarrow N_{out}(p) \setminus \mathcal{D}$ ; // initialize candidate list
5     foreach  $v \in \mathcal{D}$  do
6        $C \leftarrow C \cup (N_{out}(v) \setminus \mathcal{D})$ ;
7      $N_{out}(p) \leftarrow \text{RobustPrune}(p, C, \alpha, R)$ ;

```

avoid this, this phase will store these updates in a temporary in-memory structure Δ , as shown in Figure 2.

Patch Phase. This phase applies the updates stored in Δ from the insertion phase to the temporary index file and generates a new index file. Specifically, it sequentially retrieves all vertices p from the temporary index file on the SSD in blocks, adds the outgoing edges of each vertex p from Δ , and checks whether the new degree $|N_{out}(p) \cup \Delta(p)|$ exceeds a given threshold (e.g., R). If the threshold is exceeded, the neighbor list is pruned using the *RobustPrune* algorithm [44]. Finally, all updated blocks are written to the new index file on the SSD.

2.2.2 Limitations of Existing Batch Updates on Graph-based Indexes. As shown in Figure 1, graph-based index achieves high recall by reducing batch sizes. However, its update performance degrades significantly under small-batch updates. To explore the underlying reasons, we take the state-of-the-art graph-based index system FreshDiskANN [44] as an example to thoroughly evaluate and analyze the update process of existing batch updates under small batch conditions.

As introduced in Section 2.2.1, the update process is divided into three stages: insertion, deletion, and patch. We breakdown these stages. Specifically, in our experiments, we calculate the time proportion of each stage during random insertions and deletions of 0.1% of the vectors on three real-world datasets: SIFT1M, GIST, and DEEP (see Table 2 for details). The results are shown in Figure 3a. From the results, we observe that the deletion stage accounts for the largest portion of the total time, comprising approximately 60%. The patch stage follows, contributing around 30%, while the insertion stage only accounts for 2%-6%. Overall, the deletion and patch phases determine the update performance. Furthermore, in Figure 3b, we present the time breakdown of the deletion phase, showing the proportion of time spent on disk I/O and computation. It is evident that both computation and I/O are significant factors affecting performance during this phase.

Next, we summarize the main limitations that graph-based index faces in terms of batch update performance under small batch scenarios.

Limitation 1: The update strategy leads to significant data waste in disk read/write operations. As described in Section 2.2.1, existing batch-based update systems read and write entire




Figure 4: The Proportion of unnecessary page modifications.




Figure 5: Statistics on the number of candidate neighbors in the patch phase.

index files or temporary index files block by block in both the deletion and patch phases. However, in an incremental update scenario, only the data affected by updates needs to be modified. This inefficiency is particularly evident in small-batch updates, where only a few blocks require modification. Consequently, The read/write approach results in a large number of unnecessary blocks being read and written, leading to significant data waste. According to the above experiments, we quantify the proportion of unnecessary modified blocks (i.e., unnec. block) versus necessary blocks (i.e., necessary block) that require modification during updates for each dataset. As shown in Figure 4, the update strategy leads to 82%-97% of index blocks being read and written unnecessarily, meaning up to 82% of disk reads are wasted.

Limitation 2: The incremental algorithm frequently triggers expensive pruning operations. As introduced in Section 2.2.1, neighbor lists of affected vertices need to be updated in both the deletion and patch phases. During this process, its incremental algorithm constructs candidate neighbor lists, which may exceed the neighbor limit and trigger an expensive pruning operation. As shown in Algorithm 1, existing batch-based update systems perform pruning operations every time it constructs candidate neighbors during the deletion phase. Additionally, for the patch phase, pruning is triggered only when the number of neighbors exceeds the limit R . Based on our experiments in Section 2.2.2, we find that the number of candidate neighbors constructed during the patch phase often exceeds the neighbor limit R . Figure 5 shows that 80-92% of vertices in the patch phase have candidate neighbor counts that exceed the neighbor limit $R = 32$, triggering pruning operations. These frequent pruning operations, involving costly vector distance calculations, severely limit the system’s update performance.

3 OVERVIEW

Motivated by Section 2.2.2, we propose a new disk-based ANNS system, Greater, which enables fast updates of graph-based index structures in small-batch update scenarios. Its core idea is to leverage a small graph topology to quickly identify the affected vertices in the graph, apply lightweight incremental graph repair strategy to repair them, and utilize fine-grained updates mechanism to modify only the affected disk data, thereby eliminating unnecessary read and write I/O operations and reducing computational overhead.

Architecture. The architecture of Greater is shown in Figure 6, built upon the foundation of FreshDiskANN. To enable fast updates of graph-based indexes in small-batch update scenarios, Greater




Figure 6: Greator architecture

incorporates several novel designs: 1) **Lightweight Fine-Grained Updater**. It uses a fine-grained update mode to modify only the affected index file blocks, to avoid the significant redundant I/O overhead present in out-of-place updates. In addition, the update process is divided into three phases: deletion, insertion, and patch, with lightweight graph repair strategies designed for each phase to reduce the triggering of expensive pruning operations. 2) **Concurrency Controller**. It adopts a vertex-level read-write lock design to ensure read-write concurrency safety during in-place updates. 3) **I/O Controller**. It fully leverage the parallel random I/O capabilities of SSDs (solid-state drives) to support an efficient implementation of fine-grained updates. 4) **Cache Structure ΔG** . It efficiently caches updates using a block-grouped storage structure, merging identical I/O requests to reduce the number of random I/O requests. 5) **Graph Topology File**. It redundantly stores a copy of the graph topology information from the disk index to quickly locate vertices affected by deleted vertices. Moreover, since Greator focuses on dynamic updates to the index, it reuses several modules from FreshDiskANN (e.g., searcher module, in-memory index, and disks index), as shown in the gray module in Figure 6.

Workflow. The update workflow of Greator is illustrated in Figure 2b. In Greator, when vector updates arrive, such as inserting new vectors or deleting existing vectors, they are first added to the in-memory index, which serves as a fast cache structure for handling updates. As vector updates continue to accumulate, once the memory index reaches its capacity limit (i.e., the batch size of cached updates), it triggers the lightweight update controller to apply the cached updates to the disk-based index file. The lightweight update controller completes the index file updates through three stages: 1) **Deletion Phase**. This phase processes the deletion vectors first. It scans a graph topology file that is much smaller than the index file to locate the incoming neighbors affected by each deleted vertex quickly. It then loads only the affected blocks from the index file and repairs the neighbors of these affected vertices using a newly designed lightweight neighbor repair algorithm. Finally, the updated blocks are written back to the index file. 2) **Insertion Phase**. This phase processes the cached insertion vectors in the memory index one by one. For each inserted vector, it performs a search on the disk index and constructs the neighbors based on the search results. These new vertices, along with their neighbors and vector data, are written to the disk file. At the same time, the reverse edges of the outgoing neighbors of the newly inserted vertices are

cached in ΔG . 3) **Patch Phase**. Using the information in ΔG , this phase merges the reverse edges to be added for the same vertex. It then reads only the blocks corresponding to the affected vertices, updates their neighbors using a relaxed neighbor constraint, and writes the updated blocks back to the index file.

4 LIGHTWEIGHT FINE-GRAINED UPDATE DESIGN

This section presents the update strategy of Greator in detail. Its goal is to efficiently incorporate vector updates (insertions and deletions) stored in the memory index into the disk index while maintaining the high quality of the disk index. The core idea is to adopt a fine-grained update mechanism that modifies only the affected data, eliminating data waste in disk read/write operations. The update process is divided into three phases: deletion, insertion, and patch. Each phase incorporates novel designs to further reduce I/O overhead and mitigate computational costs.

4.1 Delete Phase

The deletion phase requires removing the data associated with the deleted vertices in the index structure and repairing the neighbors of vertices affected by these deletions. This phase is divided into three steps: deleting vertices, locating vertices affected by the deletions, and repairing affected vertices.

4.1.1 Deleting Vertices. This step involves removing the deleted vertices cached in the in-memory index from the disk index. To minimize random reads and writes on the disk index file, the data is not directly erased from the index file. Instead, the system maintains a mapping, *Local_Map*, which records the location of each vertex in the disk index file. To handle deletions, it is sufficient to remove the corresponding entry from this mapping rather than modifying the index file directly. Meanwhile, the space freed by the deleted vertices is recorded in a recycling queue *Free_Q*, which can later be used to store newly inserted vertices.

4.1.2 Locating vertices affected by the deletions. This step requires identifying all vertices affected by the deleted vertices, specifically those whose outgoing neighbors include the deleted vertices, which are effectively the incoming neighbors of the deleted vertices. However, existing systems typically only store the outgoing neighbors of each vertex, maintaining only a unidirectional graph topology. This design choice stems from the fact that graph-based indexes [17, 26, 34] restrict the maximum number of outgoing neighbors (e.g., 32 or 64) during construction, making outgoing neighbors easier to store and update. In contrast, incoming neighbors, with highly variable counts, are often difficult to dynamically maintain on disk. In addition, the consistency guarantees of bidirectional graphs during concurrent updates also affect the update performance.

As a result, systems like FreshDiskANN [44] resort to scanning the unidirectional graph topology to locate the incoming neighbors of the deleted vertices. To reduce random disk I/O during vector queries, existing systems typically store the vectors and neighbors of each vertex contiguously. However, this coupling of vector data and graph topology results in scanning the entire index file when




Figure 7: Illustrate the deleted neighbor repair process for baseline (FreshDiskANN) and FastFreshDiskANN respectively.

Table 1: Vector Size and Graph Topology Size

Dataset	Vector Size	Graph Topology Size
SIFT	79.50%	20.50%
DEEP	88.58%	11.42%
GIST	96.68%	3.32%

traversing the graph topology, which causes severe read amplification. Specifically, in large-scale high-dimensional vector scenarios, scanning the entire index file incurs significant and costly I/O overhead.

Observation. We analyze the proportion of vector data and graph topology in the index files constructed on three real-world datasets (see Table 2 for details), with the number of neighbors limited to 32 by default. The results are shown in Table 1. It can be observed that, for all three datasets, the graph topology accounts for no more than 20% of the index file size. Specifically, for the high-dimensional dataset (i.e., GIST with 960 dimensions), the graph topology occupies only 3.32% of the index file, resulting in a 96.68% read amplification during graph traversal. This observation motivates us to propose a redundant graph topology strategy to accelerate the identification of affected vertices while preserving query performance.

Leveraging Redundant Graph Topology for Accelerated Localization. Based on the above observations, we propose a *redundant graph topology strategy* to accelerate the identification of affected vertices while preserving query performance. As shown in Figure 2, Greater stores an additional graph topology file on the disk, which contains the same graph topology information as the index file. Since it only stores the graph topology, its size is much smaller than that of the index file. Therefore, during the deletion phase, the system traverses this smaller topology file instead of the whole index file to quickly identify vertices affected by deletions. It is important to note that the graph topology file is used solely for locating the impact of deletions. As such, it does not require real-time synchronization with the index file. Instead, the structural updates from the index file can be synchronized to the topology file in the background after the entire index update process is completed. Since this synchronization occurs in the background and updates only the affected data, it has a minimal impact on the overall system performance.

4.1.3 Repairing Affected Vertices. For each vertex p affected by deletion updates, the repair process needs to repair its outgoing




Figure 8: Distribution of the number of deleted and inserted neighbors.

neighbors $N_{out}(p)$, which include vertices that have already been deleted. The existing systems (such as FreshDiskANN [44]) adopt an incremental approach (i.e., Algorithm 1) to repair the neighbor set of each affected vertex. It constructs a candidate set C based on existing neighborhood information to avoid graph traversal searches. However, as analyzed in Section 2.2.1, if the candidate set C exceeds the neighbor limit R , it still requires a pruning process with a complexity of $O(|C|^2 \times d)$. Unfortunately, Algorithm 1 naively includes all neighbors of the deleted vertices into the candidate set C , which means that for almost every affected vertex, $|C|$ exceeds R , triggering the expensive pruning process. As shown in Figure 3b, this results in significant computational overhead.

Example 1: Figure 7(a) illustrates a simple example of an original graph-based index structure, where edge lengths represent the distances between vectors, and the maximum number of neighbors per vertex is limited to $R = 3$. Figure 7(b) demonstrates the process of Algorithm 1 repairing the neighbor set of vertex v_0 after its neighbor v_1 is deleted. First, the outgoing neighbors of v_1 , $N_{out}(v_1) = \{v_4, v_5, v_6\}$, are added to the remaining neighbors of v_0 as candidate neighbors. Since the size of v_0 's candidate set becomes 5, exceeding the limit R , an expensive pruning process is triggered. Ultimately, v_0 selects the pruned result set $\{v_2, v_3, v_5\}$ as its new neighbors.

Observation. We conduct an in-depth investigation into the number of neighbors deleted for affected vertices in small-batch update scenarios. Based on the experiments in Section 2.2.2, we analyze the number of neighbors deleted for each affected vertex in the real-world datasets. The results, as shown in Figure 8a, reveal that 96% of the vertices have only one neighbor deleted. However, as illustrated in Figure 7a, even when only one neighbor is deleted,

Algorithm 1 adds all neighbors of the deleted neighbor to the candidate set. This results in the size of the candidate set exceeding the neighbor limit, triggering the expensive pruning process every time.

Based on the observations above, we design a degree-aware deletion repair algorithm DASR, which performs lighter repairs on affected vertices by avoiding the triggering of expensive neighbor pruning operations.

Intuition. When an affected vertex has only a few neighbors deleted, it can still maintain good connectivity with other vertices in the graph through its remaining neighbors. A lightweight incremental algorithm should aim to reuse the existing neighborhood information as much as possible, compensating only for the connectivity information lost due to the deleted neighbors. A simple and efficient approach is to replace the deleted vertex with its approximate neighbors, as approximate neighbors often share similar connectivity information in graph-based indexes. Therefore, the original neighborhood information of the deleted vertex can be accessed directly or indirectly through its approximate neighbors. However, deciding on the number of approximate neighbors to replace a deleted vertex is challenging. Our primary goal is to avoid triggering pruning operations when adding neighbors. Therefore, the number of replacement neighbors for any deleted vertex must not exceed the available slots ($slot$). Additionally, it is important to consider the impact of the deletion. Intuitively, if a vertex has a high original degree, the impact of deleting one of its neighbors is relatively small, and fewer approximate neighbors can be used to replace it. Conversely, if a vertex has a low original degree, the impact of deleting a neighbor is more significant, requiring more approximate neighbors to replace it. As a result, we design the degree-aware approach described above to adaptively set the value of k_{slot} for each deleted vertex.

Degree-Aware Similarity-Based Deletion Repair. Based on the above observations, we design a degree-aware similarity-based deletion repair algorithm, DASR, to achieve a more lightweight repair of the affected vertices by avoiding the triggering of expensive neighbor pruning operations. The core idea of DASR is to replace deleted vertices with a small number of most similar vertices from their neighbors instead of adding all neighbors. This approach avoids exceeding the neighbor size limit and prevents the expensive distance computations triggered by pruning. The pseudocode of DASR is shown in Algorithm 2.

Specifically, for each affected vertex p , DASR first retrieves its deleted neighbors set \mathcal{D} and the non-deleted neighbors set C . Then, if the size of \mathcal{D} is smaller than a user-defined threshold T , the following steps are performed: First, the number of unfilled neighbor slots in the neighbor space of vertex p (i.e., $slot$) is calculated. Next, the number of similar neighbors to replace each deleted vertex (i.e., k_{slot}) is determined. The algorithm calculates k_{slot} based on the current number of available slots ($slot$) and the original neighbors of p , as follows: $k_{slot} \leftarrow \max\left(\left\lfloor \frac{slot}{|N_{out}(p)|} \right\rfloor, 1\right)$. Then, for each deleted neighbor $v \in \mathcal{D}$, the k_{slot} nearest undeleted vertices from $N_{out}(v)$ are selected and added to C . By controlling the size of k_{slot} , it ensures that $|C| \leq R$. After all the vertices in \mathcal{D} have been processed, C is used as the new $N_{out}(p)$ for vertex p . If the size of

Algorithm 2: DASR (L_D, R, α)

Input: Graph $G(V, E)$ with $|V| = n$, set of vertices to be deleted L_D
Output: Graph on nodes V' where $V' = V \setminus L_D$

```

1 begin
2   foreach  $p \in V_{affect}$  do
3      $\mathcal{D} \leftarrow N_{out}(p) \cap L_D$ ;
4      $C \leftarrow N_{out}(p) \setminus \mathcal{D}$ ; // initialize candidate
      list
5     if  $|\mathcal{D}| < T$  then
6        $slot \leftarrow |R| - |C|$ ; // number of unfilled
          neighbor slots
7        $k_{slot} \leftarrow \max\left(\left\lfloor \frac{slot}{|N_{out}(p)|} \right\rfloor, 1\right)$ ;
8       foreach  $v \in \mathcal{D}$  do
9          $C \leftarrow C \cup \text{SelectNearestNeighbor}(N_{out}(v) \setminus$ 
           $\mathcal{D}, k_{slot})$ ;
10       $N_{out}(p) \leftarrow C$ ;
11    else
12      foreach  $v \in \mathcal{D}$  do
13         $C \leftarrow C \cup (N_{out}(v) \setminus \mathcal{D})$ ;
14      if  $|C| > R$  then
15         $N_{out}(p) \leftarrow \text{RobustPrune}(p, C, \alpha, R)$ ;
16      else
17         $N_{out}(p) \leftarrow C$ ;

```




Figure 9: Illustrate an example of storing reverse edges for ΔG .

\mathcal{D} is greater than or equal to T , the same process as described in Algorithm 1 is followed.

Example 2: Figure 7(c) illustrates the process of DASR repairing the deletion of v_1 , a neighbor of v_0 , in the graph shown in Figure 7(a). First, DASR collects the remaining neighbors of v_0 , forming the set $C = \{v_2, v_3\}$. It then examines $N_{out}(v_1)$ to find the nearest undeleted vertex to v_1 , which is v_5 . Finally, v_5 is added to C as a new neighbor of v_0 .

4.2 Insert Phase

The goal of the insertion phase is to insert each cached vector x_p in the memory index as a new vertex p into the disk-based index. This process is divided into three main steps: constructing neighbors for the inserted vertex p (i.e., $N_{out}(p)$), determining p 's position in the index file and performing the write, and adding reverse edges for $N_{out}(p)$.




Figure 10: Illustrate the process of inserting a edge one at a time in two consecutive batches for the existing batch update methods (such as FreshDiskANN) and Greator respectively.

Specifically, for each vector x_p , its nearest neighbors are searched on the disk-based index, and the set of traversed vertices \mathcal{V} is collected as the candidate set. If $|\mathcal{V}| \geq R$, the *RobustPrune* algorithm [44] is applied to prune \mathcal{V} , resulting in $N_{out}(p)$ with $|N_{out}(p)| \leq R$. Next, a free storage location in the disk index file is obtained from *Free_Q*; if *Free_Q* is empty, a new location is allocated at the end of the file by default. The relevant data of vertex p , including x_p and $N_{out}(p)$, is then written to this storage location. Finally, following the graph construction strategies of existing systems (such as FreshDiskANN [44] and DiskANN [26]), reverse edges of $N_{out}(p)$ are added, i.e., $\{edge(p', p) | p' \in N_{out}(p)\}$. However, reverse edges for each inserted vertex are not immediately added to the corresponding vertices, as this would cause excessive random I/O. Similar to existing batch update methods in Section 2.2.1, we first cache the reverse edges of each inserted vertex in the in-memory structure ΔG . Once all vertices are inserted, the patch phase will be executed to handle these reverse edges.

Figure 9 illustrates the storage structure of ΔG in Greator, which caches all reverse edges from a batch of updates and merges those with the same source vertex or the same block operation to reduce redundant I/O. Specifically, for all reverse edges, their source vertices are resolved to block IDs in the disk-based index file using *Local_Map*. For example, $edge(v_0, v_1)$ determines the target data block as $block_0$ based on the source vertex v_0 and *Local_Map*. Next, the block ID is used to locate the corresponding vertex table in the block table of ΔG . If no such vertex table exists, a new one is created. Then, the source vertex ID is used to locate the associated edge set in the vertex table. If the edge set does not exist, it is created. Finally, the destination vertex ID of the edge is added to the edge set.

It is worth noting that, unlike Δ of existing system FreshDiskANN, our insertion phase stores only reverse edges in the in-memory structure ΔG , while the data associated with each newly inserted vector x_p is immediately written to the disk file. This is an advantage brought by the fine-grained update mode and efficient I/O mode, allowing direct modifications to the original index file. Compared to FreshDiskANN, our approach reduces memory overhead by storing significantly less data in ΔG .

4.3 Patch Phase

The patch phase updates the neighbors of corresponding vertices in the index file using the reverse edges stored in ΔG during the insertion phase. The patch phase consists of two main operations: reading/writing specific blocks in the index file and updating the block data using ΔG . Specifically, the system begins by reading the

blocks that need to be updated, as indicated in the block table of ΔG . For example, for $block_0$ of the block table in Figure 9, the system first reads the data of $block_0$ from the disk index file. Next, it retrieves the vertex table corresponding to $block_0$ from ΔG and iterates over each vertex in the table. For instance, it first processes v_0 , reading its edge set $\{v_1, v_7\}$, which represents the reverse edges to be added. By adding this edge set to $N_{out}(v_0)$ in $block_0$, the updated neighbor set $N'_{out}(v_0)$ is obtained. If $|N'_{out}(v_0)| \geq R$, pruning is performed to ensure the number of neighbors does not exceed R . Once the neighbor update of v_0 is completed, the process proceeds to the next vertex v_1 in the vertex table of $block_0$. After all data in $block_0$ is updated, it is written back to the index file, overwriting the original data.

Although the above approach achieves fine-grained updates by leveraging ΔG , addressing the data waste issue in the patch phase mentioned in Section 2.2.2, the constraint that the number of updated neighbors must not exceed R still leads to the computational challenges described in Section 2.2.2.

Observation. We investigate the details of the pruning operation triggered by adding reverse edges in small-batch scenarios. Based on the experiments in Section 2.2.2, we count the number of reverse edges added when pruning is triggered for all vertices in three real-world datasets (see Table 2 for details). The results, shown in Figure 8b, indicate that 90% of the pruning operations are triggered by the addition of only a single edge. As illustrated in Figure 10a, the existing batch update method (such as FreshDiskANN) enforces a strict neighbor limit when adding reverse edges. When a vertex’s neighbor set is full, adding even a single edge can cause the set to exceed the limit R , triggering an expensive pruning process.

Relaxed Neighbor Limit. To reduce the significant computational cost caused by adding a small number of reverse edges, we adopt a relaxed neighbor limit during the addition of reverse edges. Specifically, each vertex’s neighbors are constrained by two parameters: a strict neighbor limit R and a relaxed neighbor limit R' , where $R \leq R'$. When storing the neighbors of each vertex on disk, R' slots are allocated, with $R' - R$ reserved as additional space. Pruning is triggered under the strict neighbor limit, ensuring that the number of neighbors does not exceed R . When adding reverse edges to a vertex, the relaxed neighbor limit is applied, allowing up to R' neighbors before triggering pruning. As shown in Figure 10b, where $R = 3$ and $R' = 4$, vertex v_0 initially has three neighbors and one reserved slot in the first step. In the second step, a reverse edge $edge(v_0, v_4)$ is added, resulting in $|N_{out}(v_0)| = R'$. Thus, v_0

avoids pruning during this update. In the third step, another reverse edge $edge(v_0, v_7)$ is added, causing $|N_{\text{out}}(v_0)| > R'$. Pruning is then triggered, and the strict neighbor limit is applied, ensuring $|N_{\text{out}}(v_0)| \leq R$ after pruning.

As shown in Figure 10, adopting a relaxed neighbor limit during the addition of reverse edges reduces the number of pruning operations, thereby significantly lowering computational overhead. Theoretically, the larger $R' - R$ is, the fewer pruning operations are triggered. However, it is important to note that if $R' - R$ is too large, it increases the neighbor count, which may result in higher computational overhead during query processing due to the need to traverse more neighbors. To balance these trade-offs, Greator sets R' based on the results in Figure 8b—where 90% of pruning operations are triggered by the addition of a single edge—and defaults R' to $R + 1$. This setting significantly reduces the number of pruning operations while minimally impacting query performance.

Additionally, adopting a relaxed neighbor limit increases the neighbor storage space by $R' - R$, potentially affecting the file size. However, since $R' - R$ is typically small, the reserved space constitutes only a negligible portion of the total index size. Furthermore, the disk-based index storage is page/block-aligned, and there is usually some unused space in each page/block [14, 26, 44]. Our experiments in Section 6.4 reveal that the space used for $R' - R$ neighbors mostly comes from this unused space, resulting in no noticeable increase in file size.

5 IMPLEMENTATION

5.1 Asynchronous I/O Control

For the fine-grained update mechanism of Greator, this paper designs an efficient I/O controller based on the Linux asynchronous I/O library (libaio). The controller utilizes asynchronous, non-blocking, and parallel I/O mechanisms to enable efficient concurrent access to specified index file blocks. Its core process consists of three stages: request preprocessing, batch submission, and event polling. First, asynchronous I/O control blocks (iocbs) are constructed using the `io_prep_pread` and `io_prep_pwrite` interfaces, with explicit request parameters. Next, the `io_submit` system call is used to submit the batch requests to the kernel I/O scheduling queue in a non-blocking manner, significantly reducing the context switch overhead between user space and kernel space. This allows a single thread to handle multiple I/O operations concurrently, thus improving overall throughput. Finally, the `io_getevents` interface is used to actively poll the completion event queue, collect completed I/O results in batches, and return them to the update module for updating the corresponding index blocks. This design not only optimizes I/O performance but also provides efficient support for fine-grained updates.

5.2 Block-Based Fine-Grained Concurrency Control

Since Greator supports concurrent vector queries and vector updates, ensuring the safety of these operations in a concurrent read-write environment is crucial. In the fine-grained update mode, each update operation typically involves small file blocks, and the update operations for individual blocks are executed quickly. Based on this, we design a block-based fine-grained concurrency controller

Table 2: Dataset description. T and D denote the dimensionality and data type of vectors.

Dataset	T	D	# Vector	# Query	Contents
GIST	float	960	500,000	1,000	Image
DEEP	float	256	1,000,000	1,000	Image
SIFT1M	float	128	1,000,000	10,000	Image

that introduces a block-level read-write lock mechanism to ensure the safety of system reads and writes. This controller manages concurrent access at the block level, ensuring that when multiple queries and update operations are performed simultaneously, data contention and inconsistency issues are effectively avoided. This design not only maintains system performance but also preserves data integrity.

6 EVALUATION

6.1 Evaluation Setup.

Evaluation Platform. All experiments run on an AliCloud ecs.i2.4xlarge instance, which contains 16 hyperthread vCPU cores, 128GB memory (33MB L3 Cache), and 2 SSDs of 1.7TB, which can achieve up to 500MBps read/write sequential performance. The instance runs Ubuntu 18.04 with Linux kernel version 4.15.0-173-generic.

Datasets. We use three public real-world datasets in our experiments, with detailed statistics as shown in Table 2, including Gist [5], DEEP [56] and Sift1M [5]. These datasets cover diverse dimensions, numbers and contents, and they have been widely used in existing studies [17, 26, 34, 44, 48, 55] to benchmark ANNS systems.

Compared Systems and Parameters. In the experiments, we compare the following two systems:

- **FreshDiskANN** [44] is currently the state-of-the-art graph-based vector search system that supports dynamic scenarios on SSDs, developed and open-sourced by Microsoft. It adopts an out-of-place update strategy by incrementally repairing the graph structure in the index and rebuilding the entire index file, as introduced in section 2.2. In the experiments presented in this paper, the parameter settings for FreshDiskANN follow the original configuration. Specifically, the candidate neighbor limit MAX_C for graph construction is set to 500, the neighbor limit R for each point is set to 32, the insertion priority queue length limit L_{build} during vertex insertion is set to 75, and the query priority queue length limit L_{search} during vertex insertion is set to 120.
- **Greator** is our system, which adopts a fine-grained update strategy. It reduces unnecessary I/O overhead through fine-grained block read/write operations and employs a lighter incremental repair algorithm to minimize computational costs. Greator is developed based on FreshDiskANN, maintaining the same parameter settings, such as MAX_C , R , and L_{build} . Additionally, for Greator, the newly introduced deletion threshold T and relaxed neighbor limit R' are set by default to $T = 2$ and $R' = 33$, unless otherwise specified.




Figure 11: Throughput comparison of index updates.




Figure 12: I/O amount comparison.




Figure 13: Pruning operation count comparison.

Metrics. The main design goal of Greator is to achieve fast updates to the index structure while maintaining efficient indexing functionality (including both index quality and search performance). Therefore, this paper focuses on the following two categories of metrics:

- **Update Performance.** We measure the update performance of different systems using throughput, which represents the number of insertions/deletions the system can process per second.
- **Index Quality.** We measure the quality of the index structure using k -recall@ k , as introduced in Section 2, with k set to 10. We measure the search performance using the average search latency of all queries.

6.2 Update Performance

We first evaluate the update performance of different systems on three publicly available real-world vector datasets (details are shown in Table 2). Specifically, for each system, we first build a static index as the base from each dataset and then perform random insertions and deletions of 0.1% of the vectors from the dataset.

Throughput Comparison. To compare the update performance of different systems, we compare the average throughput of their continuous execution of 50 updates, as shown in Figure 11. We observe

that Greator achieves higher throughput than FreshDiskANN across all datasets, with an average speedup of 2.53 \times on different datasets. The primary performance gains of Greator come from our lighter-weight incremental design, such as reducing unnecessary I/O overhead through fine-grained block reads/writes and reducing computational overhead with a more lightweight incremental repair strategy.

One notable detail in Figure 11 is that Greator achieves 1.37 \times , 2.06 \times , and 4.16 \times speedups on SIFT (128 dimensions), DEEP (256 dimensions), and GIST (960 dimensions), respectively. This demonstrates that Greator performs increasingly better on datasets with higher dimensions. This is primarily because as the vector dimensionality increases, fewer vectors are stored in a single page or block, and our fine-grained updates can avoid more unnecessary I/O reads and writes. Furthermore, our redundant graph topology design also provides greater benefits, as the proportion of vector storage increases. We achieve greater gains by using smaller graph topology files to locate deletion impacts, as opposed to FreshDiskANN, which traverses the entire large index file (containing both graph topology and vector data).

I/O Amount Compaction. We also measure the read and write I/O amount generated by different systems during the update experiments, as shown in Figure 12. We observe that Greator exhibits a lower I/O amount across all datasets. This confirms the effectiveness of Greator’s fine-grained update strategy in reducing unnecessary read/write I/O operations in small-batch update scenarios. The result demonstrates similar performance trends to those shown in Figure 12 and further validates that disk I/O is a significant factor influencing update performance.

It cannot be ignored that the redundant topology design in Greator increases the amount of read and write I/O during the update process, because the redundant topology files need to be maintained in real time. However, according to the experimental results, Greator achieves as low as 23.71 \times and 11.99 \times lower average I/O amount than FreshDiskANN during the entire update process on reading and writing, respectively. This means that the additional I/O overhead generated by the redundant topology files is acceptable.

Pruning Operation Count Compaction. We further compare the proportion of pruning operations triggered in the delete and patch phases of different systems, as shown in Figure 13. We can observe that Greator achieves a lower proportion of pruning operation triggering on all datasets. In the delete phase, Greator reduces the proportion of pruning operations by an average of 98.36% compared




Figure 14: Comparison of pruning operation count per batch.

to FreshDiskANN, achieved through the DASR. In the patch phase, Greator further decreases the proportion of pruning operations by an average of 37.66% compared to FreshDiskANN, leveraging the relaxed neighbor limit strategy. A small number of pruning operations only produce lower computational overhead, because the computational overhead of the system is mainly reflected in the pruning operation. This means that Greator reduces a lot of computational overhead with its more lightweight incremental graph repair strategy, and also verifies that the proportion of pruning operation triggering in index updates is another important factor affecting update performance.

In order to explore the stability of Greator’s lightweight incremental graph repair strategy, we also count the changes in the proportion of triggered pruning operations, as shown in Figure 14. We observe that the pruning ratio of delete phase is stable at around 2%, and the pruning ratio of patch phase gradually tends to 30% after 30 rounds. This shows that Greator’s lightweight incremental graph repair strategy can stably reduce the triggering of pruning operations.

Update Stability. Figure 11 shows that Greator achieves 6.49ms average update latency and stable tail latency. On the other hand, FreshDiskANN suffers from unnecessary I/O and computation, resulting in higher latency and lower throughput. It is worth noting that the update throughput of Greator shows a trend of first increasing and then leveling off, which is related to the trend that the proportion of pruning operations triggered by Greator in the patch phase first decreases and then levels off (see Figure 14). This result once again verifies the effectiveness of Greator’s lightweight incremental graph repair strategy.

6.3 Index Quality

Although Greator achieves significant improvements in update performance with its lightweight graph update strategy, we now need to evaluate whether it can maintain index quality similar to FreshDiskANN. Based on the updated indexes after each update in Section 6.2, we test the query performance of different systems using the query vector sets provided with each dataset (details in Table 2). The experimental results are presented in terms of search accuracy and search latency.

Search Accuracy Comparison. Figure 15 shows that search accuracy of different systems on continuously updated index across different datasets. Greator’s search performance is better than FreshDiskANN on DEEP and GIST, and is on par with

FreshDiskANN on SIFT. This confirms that Greator’s lightweight incremental graph repair strategy can maintain similar or even higher index quality than FreshDiskANN, and also means that Greator has overcome the difficulty of FreshDiskANN in balancing high search accuracy and high update throughput.

Search Latency Comparison. Since Greator’s relaxed neighbor limit strategy increases the number of neighbors of each vector by $R' - R$ compared to FreshDiskANN, it means that its search latency may increase. To evaluate the search performance of Greator, we measure the search throughput of different systems on the continuously updated index across different datasets, as shown in Figure 16, and the tail (P90, P95, P99, P99.9) search latency on GIST (960 dimensions), as shown in Figure 17. The experimental results show that search throughput of Greator on different datasets, as well as the tail (P90, P95, P99, P99.9) search latency on the same dataset are consistent with FreshDiskANN. This reflects that Greator’s relaxed neighbor limit strategy has little impact on the search performance, which also verifies the feasibility of this strategy.

6.4 Index Size

Although Greator reduces I/O and improves update performance with its redundant topology design, we still need to evaluate whether it consumes a large amount of disk resources. Therefore, we count the index file size under different systems, as shown in Figure 18. We observe that the index file size of Greator is 1.21 \times , 1.10 \times and 1.03 \times of FreshDiskANN on SIFT, DEEP and GIST. From this, we draw the following two conclusions: 1) The size ratio of the index file is close to 1, reflecting that the redundant topology design of Greator does not occupy a lot of disk resources, and 2) The higher the dimension of the dataset, the closer the index file size of Greator is to FreshDiskANN, further confirming the superiority of Greator in high-dimensional scenarios.

7 RELATED WORK

Vector Indexes. The widespread application of ANNS has led to significant research in vector indexing [8, 9, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 26, 28, 34, 40, 41, 45, 58, 59], such as HNSW [34], IVFADC [28], and Vamana [26]. Most of these algorithms focus on offline constructing high-quality indexes for high precision and low-latency vector queries. However, only a few algorithms address the online construction and updating of index structures (including insertions and deletions), such as R-tree [9, 21] and FreshVamana [44]. R-tree indexes spatial data using multi-level bounding rectangles and




Figure 15: Distribution of the number of deleted and inserted neighbors.




Figure 16: Throughput comparison of vector search.




Figure 17: Search latency comparison.




Figure 18: Index size comparison.

supports efficient insertion and deletion operations within nodes, enabling dynamic updates to the data. When data is inserted or deleted, R-tree adjusts the size of bounding rectangles and reorganizes nodes as necessary to maintain the efficiency and balance of the index structure. Although R-tree [21] and its variants [9] provide reasonable and effective update strategies, these algorithms are only effective when the data dimensions are relatively low, and their performance significantly declines in high-dimensional data spaces [27, 57, 61]. FreshVamana [44] is the first graph-based index

to support insertions and deletions. It incrementally adjusts and optimizes the index based on updates to avoid the expensive overhead of rebuilding the graph index, while maintaining high index quality.

Vector Search Systems. To meet the vector search performance requirements in different real-world scenarios, numerous vector search systems have been developed [2, 10, 12, 13, 19, 22, 25, 26, 35, 39, 44, 47, 49, 52, 54, 55, 62]. These systems typically optimize vector search performance by combining specific index structures and search algorithm characteristics. Some work further explores combining disk and other external storage devices to support large-scale vector search under limited memory (e.g., [13, 26]). However, most of these works focus on query performance optimization in static vector data indexing. Only a few systems support the dynamic update (insertion and deletion) of index structures in dynamic vector scenarios, such as SPFresh [55] and FreshDiskANN [44]. As introduced in Section 2.2, SPFresh [55] uses a cluster-based index and performs poorly in high-dimensional vector scenarios, while FreshDiskANN presents several opportunities for improvement in update performance, which serves as the motivation for this work.

Vector Database. To efficiently manage vector data and support complex query requirements in various scenarios, numerous vector

databases have been developed [1, 3, 4, 11, 31, 46, 48, 51, 57, 60]. These vector databases can generally be categorized into two types: generalized vector databases and specialized vector databases [61]. Generalized vector databases integrate vector data management functionalities into existing relational database systems, such as AnalyticDB-V [51] and PASE [57]. This allows them to reuse many features of the existing systems, such as distributed architecture, high availability guarantees, and SQL support. Additionally, generalized vector databases provide more efficient implementation of complex hybrid query tasks (e.g., combining vector and relational data) by managing all data in a unified manner, while avoiding data replication and reducing maintenance costs [57]. However, they often sacrifice query performance to some extent due to the limitations of traditional database components that hinder fine-grained optimization of vector data [48]. Specialized vector databases, on the other hand, are purpose-built data management systems specifically for vector data, designed to efficiently store and search large-scale vector data [1, 4, 31, 46, 48]. The key distinction from generalized vector databases is that they treat vector data as a first-class citizen, which allows them to optimize system performance more effectively, typically achieving better performance. However, both existing types of vector databases have functional or performance limitations when it comes to executing vector updates, particularly for deletions. They often require periodically rebuilding the entire index to apply updates [55], which is costly. We believe that the lightweight incremental update methods in our system can serve as a valuable reference for them.

8 CONCLUSION

This paper introduces a new ANNS system, Greater, which leverages the characteristics of small-batch updates to enhance update performance while ensuring query quality. It employs three key design strategies to improve the system's update performance. First, we propose an efficient fine-grained update mechanism that avoids significant data wastage during disk read/write operations and fully utilizes the parallel random I/O capabilities of SSDs for efficient updates. Second, we introduce a redundant topology design that accelerates the identification of vertices affected by deleted vectors, leveraging the fact that graph topologies are typically much smaller than vector data. Finally, we present a lightweight incremental graph repair strategy to avoid frequently triggering costly pruning operations. Evaluation results confirm the effectiveness and efficiency of Greater.

REFERENCES

- [1] 2025. Faiss. <https://github.com/facebookresearch/faiss>.
- [2] 2025. Kgraph. <https://github.com/aaalg0/kgraph>.
- [3] 2025. pgvector. <https://github.com/pgvector/pgvector>.
- [4] 2025. Pinecone. <https://www.pinecone.io>.
- [5] Laurent Amsaleg and Hervé Jegou. 2010. Datasets for approximate nearest neighbor search. <http://corpus-texmex.irisa.fr/>. [Online; accessed 20-May-2018].
- [6] Akari Asai, Sewon Min, Zexuan Zhong, and Danqi Chen. 2023. Retrieval-based Language Models and Applications. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Tutorial Abstracts, ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 41–46.
- [7] Martin Aumüller, Erik Bernhardsson, and Alexander John Faithfull. 2020. ANN-Benchmarks: A benchmarking tool for approximate nearest neighbor algorithms. *Inf. Syst.* 87 (2020).
- [8] Ilias Azizi, Karima Echihiabi, and Themis Palpanas. 2023. Elpis: Graph-based similarity search for scalable data science. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 16, 6 (2023), 1548–1559.
- [9] Norbert Beckmann, Hans-Peter Kriegel, Ralf Schneider, and Bernhard Seeger. 1990. The R*-Tree: An Efficient and Robust Access Method for Points and Rectangles. In *Proceedings of the 1990 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, Atlantic City, NJ, USA, May 23-25, 1990*. ACM Press, 322–331.
- [10] Yuzheng Cai, Jiayang Shi, Yizhuo Chen, and Weiguo Zheng. 2024. Navigating Labels and Vectors: A Unified Approach to Filtered Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search. *Proc. ACM Manag. Data* 2, 6 (2024), 246:1–246:27.
- [11] Cheng Chen, Chenzhe Jin, Yunan Zhang, Sasha Podolsky, Chun Wu, Szu-Po Wang, Eric Hanson, Zhou Sun, Robert Walzer, and Jianguo Wang. 2024. SingleStore-V: An Integrated Vector Database System in SingleStore. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 17, 12 (2024), 3772–3785.
- [12] Qi Chen, Haidong Wang, Mingqin Li, Gang Ren, Scarlett Li, Jeffery Zhu, Jason Li, Chuanjie Liu, Lintao Zhang, and Jingdong Wang. 2018. SPTAG: A library for fast approximate nearest neighbor search.
- [13] Qi Chen, Bing Zhao, Haidong Wang, Mingqin Li, Chuanjie Liu, Zengzhong Li, Mao Yang, and Jingdong Wang. 2021. SPANN: Highly-efficient Billion-scale Approximate Nearest Neighborhood Search. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021, December 6-14, 2021, virtual*. 5199–5212.
- [14] Rongxin Chen, Yifan Peng, Xingda Wei, Hongrui Xie, Rong Chen, Sijie Shen, and Haibo Chen. 2024. Characterizing the Dilemma of Performance and Index Size in Billion-Scale Vector Search and Breaking It with Second-Tier Memory. *CoRR abs/2405.03267* (2024).
- [15] Paul Covington, Jay Adams, and Emre Sargin. 2016. Deep Neural Networks for YouTube Recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems, Boston, MA, USA, September 15-19, 2016*. ACM, 191–198.
- [16] Sanjoy Dasgupta and Yoav Freund. 2008. Random projection trees and low dimensional manifolds. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada, May 17-20, 2008*. ACM, 537–546.
- [17] Cong Fu, Chao Xiang, Changxu Wang, and Deng Cai. 2019. Fast Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search With The Navigating Spreading-out Graph. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 12, 5 (2019), 461–474.
- [18] Yunfan Gao, Yun Xiong, Xinyu Gao, Kangxiang Jia, Jinliu Pan, Yuxi Bi, Yi Dai, Jiawei Sun, Qianyu Guo, Meng Wang, and Haofen Wang. 2023. Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Large Language Models: A Survey. *CoRR abs/2312.10997* (2023).
- [19] Siddharth Gollapudi, Neel Karia, Varun Sivashankar, Ravishankar Krishnaswamy, Nikit Begwani, Swapnil Raz, Yiyong Lin, Yin Zhang, Neelam Mahapatro, Premkumar Srinivasan, Amit Singh, and Harsha Vardhan Simhadri. 2023. Filtered-DiskANN: Graph Algorithms for Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search with Filters. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023, WWW 2023, Austin, TX, USA, 30 April 2023 - 4 May 2023*. ACM, 3406–3416.
- [20] Yutong Gou, Jianyang Gao, Yuexuan Xu, and Cheng Long. 2025. SymphonyQG: Towards Symphonious Integration of Quantization and Graph for Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 3, 1 (2025), 1–26.
- [21] Antonin Guttman. 1984. R-Trees: A Dynamic Index Structure for Spatial Searching. In *SIGMOD'84, Proceedings of Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts, USA, June 18-21, 1984*. ACM Press, 47–57.
- [22] Han Hu, Jiye Qiu, Hongzhi Wang, Bin Liang, and Songling Zou. 2024. DIDS: Double Indices and Double Summarizations for Fast Similarity Search. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 17, 9 (2024), 2198–2211.
- [23] Qiang Huang, Jianlin Feng, Yikai Zhang, Qiong Fang, and Wilfred Ng. 2015. Query-Aware Locality-Sensitive Hashing for Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 9, 1 (2015), 1–12.
- [24] Masajiro Iwasaki. 2016. Pruned Bi-directed K-nearest Neighbor Graph for Proximity Search. In *Similarity Search and Applications - 9th International Conference, SISAP 2016, Tokyo, Japan, October 24-26, 2016. Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Vol. 9939. 20–33.
- [25] Shikhar Jaiswal, Ravishankar Krishnaswamy, Ankit Garg, Harsha Vardhan Simhadri, and Sheshansh Agrawal. 2022. OOD-DiskANN: Efficient and Scalable Graph ANNS for Out-of-Distribution Queries. *CoRR abs/2211.12850* (2022).
- [26] Suhas Jayaram Subramanya, Fnu Devvrit, Harsha Vardhan Simhadri, Ravishankar Krishnaswamy, and Rohan Kadekodi. 2019. Diskann: Fast accurate billion-point nearest neighbor search on a single node. *Advances in neural information processing Systems* 32 (2019).
- [27] Hervé Jégou, Matthijs Douze, and Cordelia Schmid. 2011. Product Quantization for Nearest Neighbor Search. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.* 33, 1 (2011), 117–128.
- [28] Hervé Jégou, Romain Tavenard, Matthijs Douze, and Laurent Amsaleg. 2011. Searching in one billion vectors: Re-rank with source coding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, ICASSP 2011, May 22-27, 2011, Prague Congress Center, Prague, Czech Republic*. IEEE, 861–864.

- [29] Patrick S. H. Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rottäschel, Sebastian Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. 2020. Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*.
- [30] Huayang Li, Yixuan Su, Deng Cai, Yan Wang, and Lemao Liu. 2022. A Survey on Retrieval-Augmented Text Generation. *CoRR abs/2202.01110 (2022)*.
- [31] Jie Li, Haifeng Liu, Chuanghua Gui, Jianyu Chen, Zhenyuan Ni, Ning Wang, and Yuan Chen. 2018. The Design and Implementation of a Real Time Visual Search System on JD E-commerce Platform. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Middleware Conference, Middleware Industrial Track 2018, Rennes, France, December 10-14, 2018*. ACM, 9–16.
- [32] Nan Li, Bo Kang, and Tijl De Be. 2023. SkillGPT: a RESTful API service for skill extraction and standardization using a Large Language Model. *CoRR abs/2304.11060 (2023)*.
- [33] Wen Li, Ying Zhang, Yifang Sun, Wei Wang, Mingjie Li, Wenjie Zhang, and Xuemin Lin. 2020. Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search on High Dimensional Data - Experiments, Analyses, and Improvement. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.* 32, 8 (2020), 1475–1488.
- [34] Yury A. Malkov and Dmitry A. Yashunin. 2020. Efficient and Robust Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search Using Hierarchical Navigable Small World Graphs. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.* 42, 4 (2020), 824–836.
- [35] Magdalen Dobson Manohar, Zheqi Shen, Guy E. Blelloch, Laxman Dhulipala, Yan Gu, Harsha Vardhan Simhadri, and Yihan Sun. 2024. ParlayANN: Scalable and Deterministic Parallel Graph-Based Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search Algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGPLAN Annual Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming, PPOPP 2024, Edinburgh, United Kingdom, March 2-6, 2024*. ACM, 270–285.
- [36] Yitong Meng, Xinyan Dai, Xiao Yan, James Cheng, Weiwen Liu, Jun Guo, Benben Liao, and Guangyong Chen. 2020. PMD: An Optimal Transportation-Based User Distance for Recommender Systems. In *Advances in Information Retrieval - 42nd European Conference on IR Research, ECIR 2020, Lisbon, Portugal, April 14-17, 2020, Proceedings, Part II (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Vol. 12036. Springer, 272–280.
- [37] Jason Mohoney, Anil Pacaci, Shihabur Rahman Chowdhury, Ali Mousavi, Ihab F. Ilyas, Umar Farooq Minhas, Jeffrey Pound, and Theodoros Rekatsinas. 2023. High-Throughput Vector Similarity Search in Knowledge Graphs. *Proc. ACM Manag. Data* 1, 2 (2023), 197:1–197:25.
- [38] Shumpei Okura, Yukihiko Tagami, Shingo Ono, and Akira Tajima. 2017. Embedding-based News Recommendation for Millions of Users. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, Halifax, NS, Canada, August 13 - 17, 2017*. ACM, 1933–1942.
- [39] James Jie Pan, Jianguo Wang, and Guoliang Li. 2024. Vector Database Management Techniques and Systems. In *Companion of the 2024 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD/PODS 2024, Santiago AA, Chile, June 9-15, 2024*, Pablo Barceló, Nayat Sánchez-Pi, Alexandra Meliou, and S. Sudarshan (Eds.). ACM, 597–604.
- [40] Liana Patel, Peter Kraft, Carlos Guestrin, and Matei Zaharia. 2024. ACORN: Performant and Predicate-Agnostic Search Over Vector Embeddings and Structured Data. *Proc. ACM Manag. Data* 2, 3 (2024), 120.
- [41] Jie Ren, Minjia Zhang, and Dong Li. 2020. Hm-ann: Efficient billion-point nearest neighbor search on heterogeneous memory. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33 (2020)*, 10672–10684.
- [42] Keshav Santhanam, Omar Khattab, Jon Saad-Falcon, Christopher Potts, and Matei Zaharia. 2022. ColBERTv2: Effective and Efficient Retrieval via Lightweight Late Interaction. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL 2022, Seattle, WA, United States, July 10-15, 2022*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 3715–3734.
- [43] Badrul Munir Sarwar, George Karypis, Joseph A. Konstan, and John Riedl. 2001. Item-based collaborative filtering recommendation algorithms. In *Proceedings of the Tenth International World Wide Web Conference, WWW 10, Hong Kong, China, May 1-5, 2001*. ACM, 285–295.
- [44] Aditi Singh, Suhas Jayaram Subramanya, Ravishankar Krishnaswamy, and Harsha Vardhan Simhadri. 2021. FreshDiskANN: A Fast and Accurate Graph-Based ANN Index for Streaming Similarity Search. *CoRR abs/2105.09613 (2021)*.
- [45] Yitong Song, Kai Wang, Bin Yao, Zhida Chen, Jiong Xie, and Feifei Li. 2024. Efficient Reverse k Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search Over High-Dimensional Vectors. In *40th IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE 2024, Utrecht, The Netherlands, May 13-16, 2024*. IEEE, 4262–4274.
- [46] Yongye Su, Yinqi Sun, Minjia Zhang, and Jianguo Wang. 2024. Vexless: A Serverless Vector Data Management System Using Cloud Functions. *Proc. ACM Manag. Data* 2, 3 (2024), 187.
- [47] Karthik V., Saim Khan, Somesh Singh, Harsha Vardhan Simhadri, and Jyothi Vedurada. 2024. BANG: Billion-Scale Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search using a Single GPU. *CoRR abs/2401.11324 (2024)*.
- [48] Jianguo Wang, Xiaomeng Yi, Rentong Guo, Hai Jin, Peng Xu, Shengjun Li, Xiangyu Wang, Xiangzhou Guo, Chengming Li, Xiaohai Xu, Kun Yu, Yuxing Yuan, Yinghao Zou, Jiquan Long, Yudong Cai, Zhenxiang Li, Zhifeng Zhang, Yihua Mo, Jun Gu, Ruiyi Jiang, Yi Wei, and Charles Xie. 2021. Milvus: A Purpose-Built Vector Data Management System. In *SIGMOD '21: International Conference on Management of Data, Virtual Event, China, June 20-25, 2021*. ACM, 2614–2627.
- [49] Mengzhao Wang, Weizhi Xu, Xiaomeng Yi, Songlin Wu, Zhiyang Peng, Xiangyu Ke, Yunjun Gao, Xiaoliang Xu, Rentong Guo, and Charles Xie. 2024. Starling: An I/O-Efficient Disk-Resident Graph Index Framework for High-Dimensional Vector Similarity Search on Data Segment. *CoRR abs/2401.02116 (2024)*.
- [50] Mengzhao Wang, Xiaoliang Xu, Qiang Yue, and Yuxiang Wang. 2021. A Comprehensive Survey and Experimental Comparison of Graph-Based Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 14, 11 (2021), 1964–1978.
- [51] Chuangxian Wei, Bin Wu, Sheng Wang, Renjie Lou, Chaoqun Zhan, Feifei Li, and Yuanzhe Cai. 2020. AnalyticDB-V: A Hybrid Analytical Engine Towards Query Fusion for Structured and Unstructured Data. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 13, 12 (2020), 3152–3165.
- [52] Jiuqi Wei, Xiaodong Lee, Zhenyu Liao, Themis Palpanas, and Botao Peng. 2024. Subspace Collision: An Efficient and Accurate Framework for High-dimensional Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search. *CoRR abs/2411.14754 (2024)*.
- [53] Kyle Williams, Lichi Li, Madian Khabsa, Jian Wu, Patrick C. Shih, and C. Lee Giles. 2014. A Web Service for Scholarly Big Data Information Extraction. In *2014 IEEE International Conference on Web Services, ICWS, 2014, Anchorage, AK, USA, June 27 - July 2, 2014*. IEEE Computer Society, 105–112.
- [54] Qian Xu, Juan Yang, Feng Zhang, Junda Pan, Kang Chen, Youren Shen, Amelie Chi Zhou, and Xiaoyong Du. 2025. Tribase: A Vector Data Query Engine for Reliable and Lossless Pruning Compression using Triangle Inequalities. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 3, 1 (2025), 1–28.
- [55] Yuming Xu, Hengyu Liang, Jin Li, Shuotao Xu, Qi Chen, Qianxi Zhang, Cheng Li, Ziyue Yang, Fan Yang, Yuqing Yang, Peng Cheng, and Mao Yang. 2023. SPFresh: Incremental In-Place Update for Billion-Scale Vector Search. In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles, SOSP 2023, Koblenz, Germany, October 23-26, 2023*. ACM, 545–561.
- [56] Mingyu Yang, Wentao Li, and Wei Wang. 2025. Fast High-dimensional Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search with Efficient Index Time and Space. *arXiv:2411.06158 [cs.DB]* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.06158>
- [57] Wen Yang, Tao Li, Gai Fang, and Hong Wei. 2020. PASE: PostgreSQL Ultra-High-Dimensional Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search Extension. In *Proceedings of the 2020 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD Conference 2020, online conference [Portland, OR, USA], June 14-19, 2020*, David Maier, Rachel Pottinger, AnHai Doan, Wang-Chiew Tan, Abdussalam Alawini, and Hung Q. Ngo (Eds.). ACM, 2241–2253.
- [58] Ziqi Yin, Jianyang Gao, Pasquale Balsebre, Gao Cong, and Cheng Long. 2025. DEG: Efficient Hybrid Vector Search Using the Dynamic Edge Navigation Graph. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 3, 1 (2025), 1–28.
- [59] Minjia Zhang, Jie Ren, Zhen Peng, Ruoming Jin, Dong Li, and Bin Ren. 2023. iQAN: Fast and Accurate Vector Search with Efficient Intra-Query Parallelism on Multi-Core Architectures. *IEEE Data Eng. Bull.* 46, 3 (2023), 22–38.
- [60] Qianxi Zhang, Shuotao Xu, Qi Chen, Guoxin Sui, Jiadong Xie, Zhizhen Cai, Yaoqi Chen, Yinxuan He, Yuqing Yang, Fan Yang, Mao Yang, and Lidong Zhou. 2023. VBASE: Unifying Online Vector Similarity Search and Relational Queries via Relaxed Monotonicity. In *17th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation, OSDI 2023, Boston, MA, USA, July 10-12, 2023*. USENIX Association, 377–395.
- [61] Yunan Zhang, Shige Liu, and Jianguo Wang. 2024. Are There Fundamental Limitations in Supporting Vector Data Management in Relational Databases? A Case Study of PostgreSQL. In *40th IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE 2024, Utrecht, The Netherlands, May 13-16, 2024*. IEEE, 3640–3653.
- [62] Zili Zhang, Chao Jin, Linpeng Tang, Xuanzhe Liu, and Xin Jin. 2023. Fast, Approximate Vector Queries on Very Large Unstructured Datasets. In *20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation, NSDI 2023, Boston, MA, April 17-19, 2023*. USENIX Association, 995–1011.