

# LST-BENCH: Benchmarking Log-Structured Tables in the Cloud

Jesús Camacho-Rodríguez, Ashvin Agrawal, Anja Gruenheid, Ashit Gosalia, Cristian Petculescu,  
Josep Aguilar-Saborit, Avriella Floratou, Carlo Curino, Raghu Ramakrishnan

Microsoft

{firstname.lastname}@microsoft.com

## Abstract

Log-Structured Tables (LSTs), also commonly referred to as table formats, have recently emerged to bring consistency and isolation to object stores. With the separation of compute and storage, object stores have become the go-to for highly scalable and durable storage. However, this comes with its own set of challenges, such as the lack of recovery and concurrency management that traditional database management systems provide. This is where LSTs such as Delta Lake, Apache Iceberg, and Apache Hudi come into play, providing an automatic metadata layer that manages tables defined over object stores, effectively addressing these challenges. A paradigm shift in the design of these systems necessitates the updating of evaluation methodologies. In this paper, we examine the characteristics of LSTs and propose extensions to existing benchmarks, including workload patterns and metrics, to accurately capture their performance. We introduce our framework, LST-BENCH, which enables users to execute benchmarks tailored for the evaluation of LSTs. Our evaluation demonstrates how these benchmarks can be utilized to evaluate the performance, efficiency, and stability of LSTs. The code for LST-BENCH is open sourced and is available at <https://github.com/microsoft/lst-bench/>.

## 1 Introduction

Over the past decade, the use of object stores [5, 20, 22, 27] for storing enterprise data has risen in popularity [35, 46]. The separation of storage and compute, and thus, the ability for multiple engines to access the same storage layer, results in greater flexibility and efficiency for organizations. However, many engines need guarantees such as consistency and isolation during complex *transactions of read and write operations*, and object stores are primarily designed for scalability and durability, and lack the concurrency and recovery capabilities to address the above challenges.

As a solution, several *log-structured table* (LST) implementations have emerged, such as Delta Lake [2, 49], Apache Iceberg [3], and Apache Hudi [1]. These LSTs add a metadata layer on top of object store files to describe tables and specify how engines and applications interact with them.<sup>1</sup> By adopting this approach, the storage layer and compute engines can emulate the behavior of traditional data warehouses, providing features such as single-table ACID transactions<sup>2</sup>, versioning, time travel, and schema evolution on top

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International License. Visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> to view a copy of this license. Copyright is held by the owner/author(s).

<sup>1</sup>While these implementations do not yet cover security and access control, we believe that they need to do so; in practice, most systems using them add a security layer.

<sup>2</sup>Multi-table transactions are a notable gap in comparison to traditional database systems; we expect this will also be addressed in future.

of object store files, while still preserving the advantages of storage and compute decoupling. Furthermore, one important aspect of these LSTs is that they are open-source, making them easy to modify and integrate with any engine.

LSTs represent a significant paradigm shift in the storage layer design from traditional warehouse systems. Unlike traditional systems that manage their own storage [4, 38, 41], LSTs rely on non-POSIX APIs provided by object stores to enable their features, which can be shared across compute engines. LSTs use column-oriented log-structured immutable files instead of row-oriented in-place updated page files used by traditional database systems [47], both OLTP and warehouses. While page-oriented row stores are likely to remain dominant for OLTP databases, LSTs are emerging as a strong alternative for warehouse databases. LSTs are designed specifically for processing large-scale data that receives continuous trickle updates, as opposed to infrequent, large-scale batch updates that traditional warehouses doing in-place updates are designed for [59, 68]. They use *multi-version concurrency control* [69], creating a new version of tables by ‘depositing’ a new immutable layer of files containing changes made to the dataset. This approach also enables features such as *time travel* queries. On the other hand, it creates a need for ongoing management tasks, e.g., to periodically compact changes to avoid query performance degradation.

### 1.1 Problem Description


The differences between LSTs and traditional warehouse systems introduce unique new challenges for users to learn how to operate and tune LSTs. Benchmarking is the go-to tool to learn the characteristics of these new systems. However, there has been limited research on developing innovative evaluation methodologies for LSTs aimed at formalizing the complexities of continuously changing performance in long-running deployments or the effect of concurrently running (and often expensive) maintenance operations on files stored on object stores.

As a result, users have been forced to rely solely on previously established benchmarks. Current evaluations typically rely on TPC-DS [61], which has long been the standard OLAP benchmark, and involve running a limited number of queries or using handcrafted queries to test a variety of operations [26, 58]. We observe that these evaluations suffer from two main limitations that restrict their ability to provide useful insights for LSTs, which we describe next along with examples to illustrate them. Our goal is to propose a framework that complements a base workload such as TPC-DS to address these limitations.

**L1: Failure to expose important characteristics of LSTs that are crucial in actual customer scenarios.** The current evaluation workloads, such as TPC-DS, do not accurately reflect the types of workloads

that LSTs support. Therefore, they cannot be used to evaluate, compare, and contrast the various LSTs design choices. Specifically, these evaluation workloads are not representative in aspects such as: (i) *longevity*, which involves handling data modifications over a long period of time; (ii) *resilience*, which involves handling multiple data modifications of varying sizes in a regularly optimized table; (iii) *read/write concurrency*, which involves handling multiple sessions reading and writing data simultaneously; or (iv) *time travel*, which involves querying data at different points in time.

We observe that popular LSTs support various execution modes (e.g., Copy on Write, Merge on Read, §2.1) that result in very different behavior with respect to the above characteristics. It is important to note that the base workload, e.g., TPC-DS, still plays a fundamental role in the benchmark by establishing the mix and nature of queries and updates.



**Figure 1: Execution time comparison of TPC-DS single-user & data-maintenance test iterations for SF=100,1000 for different LST systems.**

*Example 1.1.* As we mentioned previously, performance degradation due to accumulation of version files over time is an important evaluation factor for LSTs. The standard TPC-DS workload involves two rounds of interleaved read and write queries, typically reported together. Instead, we conducted experiments with increased number of TPC-DS read query runs, for various scale factors (100 and 1000), executing a single data maintenance step between iterations. Our results demonstrate consistent execution time deterioration for both single-user (read-heavy) and data-maintenance (write-heavy) tests, as shown in Figure 1 (details in §5.1). More importantly, by analyzing the results, we can observe interesting trends beyond the second phase, which would be overlooked if relying solely on the original TPC-DS workload.

**L2: Lack of metrics to capture important aspects—e.g., degradation over time—when comparing different LST implementations.** Similar to other classical benchmarks [42], the TPC-DS specification focuses on a single primary metric, which only provides a passive, ‘point-in-time’ performance measurement. While this approach simplifies the

ranking of multiple systems, it fails to capture essential dimensions that are relevant for evaluating LSTs. For instance, it is crucial to capture performance degradation over time in a single metric, as users can leverage this information to ensure that a specific configuration satisfies their requirements, while system designers can use it to optimize platforms that rely on LSTs effectively.

**Table 1: Latency increase between TPC-DS test iterations.**

LST	Throughput-QphDS	Inter-test Degradation
Delta	511K	2.7 -> 5.2 hrs (92%)
Hudi-CoW <sup>†</sup>	262K	6.2 -> 6.5 hrs (5%)
Hudi-MoR <sup>‡</sup>	112K	23 -> 24 hrs (6%)
Iceberg-CoW <sup>†</sup>	549K	2.7 -> 4 hrs (45%)
Iceberg-MoR <sup>‡</sup>	493K	2.9 -> 5 hrs (73%)

<sup>†</sup> Copy-on-Write mode    <sup>‡</sup> Merge-on-Read mode

*Example 1.2.* The results of standard TPC-DS<sup>3</sup> runs (scale factor 1000) for various configurations are presented in Table 1. TPC-DS evaluates performance based on execution latency, using *QphDS* (or throughput) as the primary performance metric. It involves running two read tests with a data maintenance step in between. *QphDS* misses a crucial insight, the performance degradation of the second run relative to the first (i.e., the increase in latency), depicted in the ‘Inter-test Degradation’ column. Observe that even the best-performing LSTs based on the *QphDS* metric experience significant performance drops of up to 92% after a single data maintenance step. This observation is alarming for LSTs, as their primary use case involves multiple updates and the responsibility to optimize the table data layout is often left to the user.

## 1.2 Contributions

This paper presents a benchmarking framework to evaluate open LSTs and overcome the limitations of existing benchmarks. Our contributions are as follows:

- We design a new benchmark specifically tailored to evaluate LSTs (§3). Our benchmark builds on TPC-DS, but proposes extensions such as a set of relevant workload patterns for LSTs, each designed to expose essential attributes required for real-world scenarios (**L1**), and metrics to evaluate critical characteristics of LSTs, including new metrics such as *stability* (**L2**).
- We implement LST-BENCH, a benchmarking tool that ties the workloads and formalized metrics together (§4). LST-BENCH automates the process of running the proposed workloads on any engine that relies on standard access methods (JDBC) and collects the required telemetry from the engine and other cloud services to compute the metrics necessary for evaluation. LST-BENCH is available as an open-source contribution<sup>4</sup>.
- We evaluate the performance, efficiency, and stability of Delta Lake, Apache Iceberg, and Apache Hudi using LST-BENCH and analyze the results to provide insights into their strengths and weaknesses in these different dimensions (§5). We use TPC-DS as the base workload, and OSS Spark as the engine.

<sup>3</sup>Standard dataset and execution rules were followed, but audit step was not performed.

<sup>4</sup><https://github.com/microsoft/lst-bench/>

We would like to emphasize that while we provide insights into the current state of LSTs, our main goal is not to declare a winner, but rather to propose a fair, comprehensive, and consistent benchmarking framework for evaluating LSTs. In particular, different results could accrue for several reasons in practice: (i) using a different base workload, (ii) impact of overall system, including aspects such as security and access control, or (iii) impact of engine and its level of integration with the LST.

## 2 Log-Structured Tables Overview

In this work, we discuss three different LSTs: Delta Lake v2.2.0, Apache Iceberg v1.1.0, and Apache Hudi v0.12.2. LSTs give users the ability to bring database-like ACID properties to object stores such as Azure Blob Storage or Amazon S3. In essence, users define tables over objects such as parquet files, which are then amended with LST-specific metadata and allow users from then on to query that data with consistency and versioning guarantees. We next present a brief overview of their architecture and features that are relevant to this work, explaining some of the key concepts as well as potential drawbacks. It is important to note that the functionalities offered by each format are not solely determined by their design and implementation, including the protocol to interact with them, but also by their integration with each compute engine, for instance Spark and Trino.

### 2.1 Data Layout

LSTs operate on the assumption that data files are immutable, thus requiring mechanisms for updating and deleting rows. Two common strategies for this are Copy-on-Write (CoW) and Merge-on-Read (MoR). CoW creates a new copy of the data files for each update or delete operation, while MoR writes changes to a separate file (often referred to as *delta file*) that is merged into the dataset during read operations. CoW is preferred for read-heavy workloads, while MoR is the preferred strategy for write-heavy workloads. Iceberg and Hudi currently support both CoW and MoR, while Delta only supports CoW.

**Partitioned tables.** Horizontal partitioning is used to organize the table data to allow the compute engine to filter data efficiently and (potentially) skip reading large portions of data. In object stores, partitioning typically involves prefixing the path with the value for the partition column [67].

### 2.2 Metadata Layout

In addition to the data, LSTs store metadata in within the corresponding file structure of table. Specifically, these formats maintain a commit log of operations performed on each table, such as adding or removing data files, or modifying the schema. How the (meta)data files are modified may change depending on the LST, and the way the metadata is laid out in the storage system is a key factor that affects the performance and features of different LSTs. A summary of the various metadata layouts is included in Figure 2.

For each commit, Delta stores a log file identified by a monotonically increasing ID. This file includes an array of actions that were applied to the previous version of the table, along with statistics such as the minimum and maximum values for each column. The metadata subdirectory also includes *checkpoint files* that store

non-redundant actions. These files are generated every 10 transactions by default and are referenced in the table metadata for quick access to the last checkpoint. In contrast, Iceberg takes a different approach by organizing files hierarchically to represent the table’s state. The top-level structure consists of a *metadata file* that is replaced atomically whenever changes occur. This file contains references to *manifest list files*, each of which represents a snapshot of the table at a specific point in time. The manifest list files, in turn, reference *manifest files*, which track the data files and provide statistics about them. Lastly, Hudi creates a *timeline* by storing the actions performed on the table as files identified by their start commit time. It also uses a nested metadata table [8], which is a Hudi table itself, to store physical file paths and indexed files that belong to the table, thereby enabling efficient file pruning.

### 2.3 Concurrency Control and Locking

Open LSTs leverage multi-version concurrency control (MVCC) [55, 62, 66] to allow for concurrent transactions to access the same data in the object store without interfering with each other. This is achieved by creating multiple versions or *snapshots* of the same logical data.

All three LSTs allow transactions to be executed within the context of a single table by implementing optimistic concurrency control [10, 13, 31]. However, they differ in their approaches to conflict resolution and the level of isolation they provide. Hudi and Iceberg support *snapshot isolation*, which means that even if other transactions are concurrently modifying the table, a transaction reads a consistent snapshot of the data as it existed at the start of the transaction. In turn, Iceberg and Delta provide a stricter isolation level by default, which guarantees that writes to the table will occur in a serial order.

The lock management requirements, and consequently their implementation, differ across the three LSTs due to their different designs. Delta and Iceberg have minimal lock management needs and rely only on atomic *put-if-absent* or *rename* operations provided by the underlying object store or file system [18, 49]. Hudi has a greater reliance on locking, particularly when using the metadata table to track table files [6].

### 2.4 Table Maintenance Operations

LSTs, similar to previous MVCC implementations [69], provide operations that ensure the data stored in a table optimized and efficient. These operations include (i) *compacting* data files within a table, which consolidates smaller files into larger ones and optionally sorts the data based on specific column values, reducing metadata overhead and improving query performance, and (ii) *vacuuming* data files within a table, which deletes expired data files after the retention period or ones that are no longer referenced by the table metadata because they are deemed useless after the compaction process.

Engines relying on LSTs typically provide an API to perform these maintenance operations on-demand. For instance, commands to execute them are often available to users as SQL extensions [32] or stored procedures [7, 17]. LSTs have different default settings for using these maintenance operations, for example, Hudi enables compaction and vacuum out-of-the-box while Iceberg and Delta




Figure 2: File layouts for LSTs under study.

require users to specify them. Users may execute these operations after modifying table data or schedule them to run automatically based on predetermined criteria such as the age or size of the data files. Additionally, some commercial platforms offer the automation of table maintenance [29, 37, 40].

## 2.5 Time Travel

LSTs introduce new capabilities, such as *time travel*, which permits the querying of historical versions of a table based on timestamp or version identifier. This feature is provided by all three LSTs and is particularly critical for applications that necessitate frequent data modifications or regulatory compliance that mandates tracking changes over time. By leveraging time travel, users can query the data at a specific point in time, using SQL extensions to specify the desired version of the table [11, 19, 65]. They can also retrieve the complete history of changes to a table, allowing for the analysis of trends and patterns over time.

## 3 Benchmark

TPC-DS [43] is widely used to evaluate decision support systems, covering various aspects such as data loading, query execution, sustained throughput, and data updates. Researchers and practitioners are also extensively using its dataset and workload to assess the efficiency of open LSTs [12, 26, 34, 58], often measuring query latency. In this section, we propose a new benchmark for LSTs that builds upon TPC-DS as a “base workload”. We create several workload patterns that invoke tasks of the base workload along with other LST specific tasks such as compaction or time travel (§3.1). Furthermore, we propose new metrics intended to capture performance characteristics specific to LSTs (§3.2).

### 3.1 Workload Patterns

We divide the work of extending the base workload into two parts. First, we enhance the benchmark’s customizability by proposing new tasks specific to LSTs, as well as making it easier to use existing ones to create custom workloads. This is discussed in detail in §3.1.1. Second, we utilize the proposed extensions to create workload patterns to gain insights into LST aspects overlooked by the base workload, such as *stability*, *resiliency*, *read/write concurrency*,



Figure 3: Workload components and their relationships.

and *time travel*. These workload patterns are presented in §3.1.2. Before discussing these extensions in detail, we introduce some terminology and, for completeness, briefly describe the original TPC-DS workload.

**Terminology.** Figure 3 depicts the components of a workload and their relationships. A *task* is a sequence of SQL *statements*, while a *session* is a series of tasks. A *phase* is a group of concurrent sessions that must be completed before the next phase can start. Lastly, a *workload* is a sequence of *phases*. If a phase consists of a single task, we may refer to it interchangeably by its task name.

**W0. Original TPC-DS.** According to these definitions, the TPC-DS benchmark executes multiple phases as shown in Figure 4a. These phases include (i) a *LOAD* phase where data is loaded into the tables used in the experiment, (ii) a *SINGLE USER* phase which runs a series of complex queries to determine the upper limit of the engine’s performance, (iii) *THROUGHPUT* phases involve running multiple sessions in parallel, each executing a *SINGLE USER* task with a different permutation of the query set, to assess the engine’s ability to handle multiple users and queries simultaneously, and (iv) *DATA MAINTENANCE* phases that are executed to test the engine’s ability to handle data inserts and deletes.

**3.1.1 Workload Composability.** Next we describe our extensions to enhance TPC-DS customizability. Note that although we will propose specific workload patterns in §3.1.2, our extensions offer flexibility for developing new patterns that can highlight characteristics that may have been overlooked in previous evaluations.

**Configurable sequence of phases.** As mentioned previously, the TPC-DS standard defines a strict sequence of phases that must be executed in a specific order. To evaluate specific aspects of LSTs, for example their longevity, we require a more flexible approach to the order of phases that is not captured by the standard sequence. For this reason, the sequence of phases that the benchmark executes should be configurable.




Figure 4: TPC-DS and extensions to evaluate LSTs characteristics.

**Ability to run multiple tasks concurrently within a phase.** TPC-DS sequences are linear, meaning that different tasks never overlap with each other (even though in the *throughput* phase multiple SINGLE USER tasks run in parallel). However, as other works have previously reported [48], a common use case for LSTs is querying the data while background operations, such as the incremental maintenance of downstream tables or materializations, are concurrently executing. Therefore, we want to be able to evaluate LSTs while running multiple, possibly different, tasks concurrently.

**OPTIMIZE task.** Given that table maintenance operations are frequently executed concurrently with other queries, it is critical to include them in the evaluation of LSTs to determine whether they (i) can restore the LST to its initial non-degraded performance state, and (ii) impact the performance of other queries running concurrently. To address this, we introduce a new OPTIMIZE task that involves running maintenance commands on LSTs.

**TIME TRAVEL task.** In §1.1, we mentioned that a benchmark should evaluate new features provided by LSTs, such as *time travel*, which allows querying of historical versions of a table based on timestamp or version. Therefore, we introduce a TIME TRAVEL task that executes the same queries as a SINGLE USER task but as of a given point in time.

**3.1.2 Workload Patterns for Evaluation of LSTs.** Based on these extensions, we propose four workload patterns to gain insights that cannot be obtained by executing the original TPC-DS workload. To design our experiments, we carefully selected various parameter values, including experiment length, based on empirical observations from customer workloads.

**WP1. Longevity.** This workload evaluates the performance, cost, and IO stability of LSTs over time. The proposed sequence is shown

in Figure 4b. The experiment involves six SINGLE USER phases, each followed by a DATA MAINTENANCE phase to add new metadata and data to the table. Repeating this process multiple times allows us to observe how the LST behaves over time and identify significant trends, if there are any.

**WP2. Resilience.** This workload, shown in Figure 4c, evaluates the impact of table maintenance operations such as compaction on degradation over time. Each OPTIMIZE phase is executed subsequent to an increase in the number of write statements executed on the source tables, thus measuring the performance of OPTIMIZE operations as the ratio of refreshed data in a table increases.

**WP3. Read/Write Concurrency.** This workload evaluates the impact of the concurrent execution of read and write statements. As shown in Figure 4d, we run SINGLE USER phases concurrently with the DATA MAINTENANCE and OPTIMIZE phase respectively to simulate this scenario. Note that by leveraging the separation of storage and compute and the on-demand availability of cloud computing resources, our framework has the ability to run concurrent operations on separate compute clusters, which allows us to evaluate the storage layer’s impact without the complication of interleaving these operations at the compute layer.

**WP4. Time Travel.** The workload shown in Figure 4e evaluates the new feature of time travel available in LSTs. We execute multiple DATA MAINTENANCE phases on the original data, followed by the same number of TIME TRAVEL phases, each executed on a version of the table produced by a previous LOAD or DATA MAINTENANCE phase.

**Discussion.** We could enhance our proposal through additional extensions, such as new tasks to cover dimensions that are still overlooked in the current proposal, e.g., schema evolution [9, 16, 64],

partition evolution [15], or deep and shallow table cloning [30]. Additionally, incorporating workload patterns consisting of a more intricate mix of concurrent tasks would further assist in evaluating LSTs. Implementing these extensions into our framework is straightforward, and we plan to explore it in the future.

### 3.2 Metrics

This section explores metrics for a comprehensive and fair evaluation of LSTs unique features. We first discuss traditional metric categories applicable to LSTs, such as performance, and storage and compute efficiency (§3.2.1). We then introduce a stability metric that builds upon the aforementioned metrics to reveal crucial degradation characteristics of cloud data warehouses (§3.2.2). Our multi-metric approach draws from prior research [42, 53] and our own observations, and importantly, it can be easily extended to cover unexplored dimensions.

**3.2.1 Traditional Metrics.** We start by describing metrics that are commonly used by benchmarks to assess diverse system qualities and that are applicable to LSTs as well.

**Performance.** Data warehouse performance is traditionally evaluated using two measurements, latency and throughput. While both are important measures and indicators of responsiveness, there exists characteristic trade-off between them. *Latency* refers to the response time from the application perspective, from the moment a request is sent until the result is retrieved, and a lower value is an important and desired factor. *Throughput*, on the other hand, refers to the number of query requests that can be served in a given amount of time, often determined by initiating multiple user sessions concurrently. A well-designed system achieves a good balance between the two, leading to improved overall performance.

**Storage Efficiency.** This category refers to the assessment of various facets of cloud storage service. A key aspect of LSTs, as discussed in §1, is the reliance on cloud (object) storage. Unlike local disks, cloud IOPS are charged on a pay-as-you-go basis. This means that managing storage utilization is not the only factor to consider, but also total API operations and data transfers, and peak rates. *Utilization* is the amount of storage space currently being consumed. *API operations* refers to type and count of storage API requests. *Transfer* metrics monitor the amount of data transferred to (i.e., writes) or transferred from (i.e., reads) object store. Data transfer and *API Rate* metrics help identify potential throttling issues. The objective of systems using cloud storage should be to maintain low values for the metrics, while maximize performance, which helps to minimize overall costs.

**Compute Efficiency.** This category refers to the range of metrics used to measure resource utilization during workload execution. Compute clusters are essential components in executing benchmark workloads, as they not only ensure efficient workload execution, but also to maintain the storage layer. The latter includes execution of optimize (a.k.a. compaction) operation, triggered automatically or manually, which involves rewriting data and metadata files for optimizing data access performance and storage costs. Similar to *storage efficiency*, a compute efficient LST achieves high *performance* while occupying a small amount of resources. Low resource utilization is especially crucial on shared clusters. Key metrics includes *CPU*




Figure 5: Example for *stability* computation.

*utilization, memory utilization, and disk utilization*, which measure the amount of CPU, memory, and local disk used for processing the workload, respectively.

**3.2.2 Stability.** LSTs are designed to receive continuous trickle updates, which, over time, can result in accumulation of delta files in the object store. Intuitively, the oftentimes smaller delta files degrade the system’s efficiency as it causes the compute to consume additional resources to successfully execute a workload. The extent of the degradation depends on several factors, including the number of new files and data layout in the files. A well designed system is less susceptible to the degradation as more data updates are performed, or may have features to auto-mitigate adverse side effects of updates. To measure degradation, we introduce a new metric category, *stability*, which examines a system’s ability to sustain its performance and efficiency (e.g., latency) consistently and exhibit minimal degradation. The process of calculating degradation involves dividing a workload’s timeline into different phases, as described in §3.1, and then comparing the performance and efficiency measurements taken during each phase of the same type. For example, SINGLE USER phase SU-*i* would only be used for the computation of stability pertaining to SINGLE USER phase performance. We formally define the degradation rate below.

$$S_{DR} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{M_i - M_{i-1}}{M_{i-1}} \quad (1)$$

where

- $M_i$  is metric value of the  $i^{th}$  iteration of a workload phase,
- $n$  is the number of iteration of the phase, and
- $S_{DR}$  is the degradation rate.

Intuitively,  $S_{DR}$  is the rate at which a metric is growing or shrinking, due to the cumulative effects of changes in the underlying system’s state. It provides information about how quickly a system degrades. A *stable* LST exhibits low  $S_{DR}$ . Note that  $M$  can be selected from the metrics introduced in §3.2.1; for metrics where higher values indicate better performance (e.g., throughput), the same function can be used by replacing  $M$  with its reciprocal  $1/M$ .

**Example 3.1.** Figure 5 shows  $S_{DR}$  evaluation of a system  $D$ ,  $S(D)_{DR}$ , and a system  $H$   $S(H)_{DR}$  base on latency measurements over time. For  $D$ , we calculate the degradation rate as  $(\frac{28}{47} + \frac{31}{75} + \frac{25}{106} + \frac{32}{131} - \frac{6}{163}) * \frac{1}{5} \approx 0.29$ , while  $S(H)_{DR} \approx 0.021$ . This indicates that system  $D$  is less stable than system  $H$ , and, without any mitigation actions, it will under perform over time.

**Discussion** Other reasonable metrics can be incorporated in this scheme. One example is relative standard deviation, which remains impartial to the sequence in which the measurements are presented. We opted for the current metric because it forms an essential building block for making predictions and taking appropriate actions. Over and above the particular metric used to capture stability, we want to emphasize the importance of stability as a new characteristic to measure and optimize for.

## 4 LST-BENCH Benchmarking Tool

This section presents the implementation details of LST-BENCH, a system designed to benchmark and compare LSTs in the cloud, building on the ideas discussed in §3. Similar to existing benchmarking systems like BenchBase [25, 56] and DIAMetrics [54], LST-BENCH includes an application written entirely in Java that executes SQL workloads against a database management system using JDBC (§4.1). Moreover, LST-BENCH features a processing module written in Python that consolidates experimental results and calculates metrics to provide insights into LSTs and cloud data warehouses (§4.2).

### 4.1 Client Application

LST-BENCH’s client is a flexible and modular benchmarking application that enables users to easily combine various configurations, LSTs, and workloads. As depicted in Figure 6, it follows a *configuration-driven approach* that allows users to define (i) clusters connection details, (ii) specific options for the experiment, including System-Under-Test (SUT) and LST-Under-Test (LUT), (iii) telemetry collection configuration, and (iv) the workload to execute.

**Experiment Definition.** The configuration APIs enable users to define the workload for an experiment as a series of phases, with each phase identified by a unique, user-defined name. LST-BENCH provides a default library containing the TPC-DS and new tasks described in §3.1. Each task consists of a sequence of SQL statements stored in files in a folder hierarchy. More concretely, for each task, there are different files for the various SQL dialects supported by the task. In addition, certain tasks, such as OPTIMIZE, have separate files for each LST under each engine, as LSTs have distinct syntax for executing their table maintenance operations. LST-BENCH selects the appropriate files for an experiment based on the SUT, LUT, and possibly other configuration values provided by the user.

**Customizability and Extensibility.** The SQL files can contain variables that LST-BENCH replaces before executing a particular task. Users can use this mechanism to pass configuration values to a task, such as the catalog name, database name, or desired table location in the object store. Additionally, LST-BENCH utilizes this feature internally to inject necessary information to run certain tasks, such as the timestamp value for TIME TRAVEL.

Incorporating new tasks into the LST-BENCH library is straightforward. Users can add the files with the SQL statements that need to be executed and register the new task in the LST-BENCH task library. Once done, the new task can be referenced from the workload definition files.

**Experiment Execution.** It is important to note that LST-BENCH does not deploy and configure the compute cluster automatically;




Figure 6: LST-BENCH components and execution model.

we are exploring this extension as future work. Instead, it is the user’s responsibility to deploy the engine with the corresponding LST libraries. To run an experiment, LST-BENCH utilizes JDBC and engine-provided drivers to connect to the SUT. Specifically, LST-BENCH creates a *JDBC connection pool* with a size that is equal to the maximum number of concurrent sessions required by any phase in the experiment. During initialization, LST-BENCH creates a set of predefined external tables in the engine catalog, pointing to object store directories. These directories contain TPC-DS data generated by the benchmark tool at the specified scale factors, which is currently used in LOAD and DATA MAINTENANCE tasks, and remains accessible throughout the entire benchmark execution. Next, LST-BENCH loads the workload configuration and begins executing each phase sequentially until the experiment’s end is reached.

**Telemetry Collection.** LST-BENCH collects and stores a detailed breakdown of the start and end times of each experiment, phase, task, and statement, as well as other important configuration values, such as the working folder for the experiment in the object store. This information is uploaded to the cloud object store. This detailed breakdown allows for correlation between the internal and external cloud telemetry, as we discuss in more detail next.

### 4.2 Metrics Processor

The metrics processor module in LST-BENCH computes the metrics in §3.2 using telemetry data collected from various sources during experiment execution. This includes telemetry within LST-BENCH, as well as from the storage layer and cluster gathered through cloud services. Setting up the required services for telemetry collection is currently the user’s responsibility, but we plan to automate this process in the future. It is also worth noting that while the current implementation of LST-BENCH relies on Azure services, it can easily be extended to support similar services by other cloud providers.

To compute the values for the metrics, the processor retrieves the experiment breakdown from the object store and correlates it with telemetry data gathered from other services. The computed results are then used for evaluation and comparison.




Figure 7: Performance and storage efficiency evaluation of 5 different LST setups using WP1 (SF1000). Results showcase impact of increased network IO on phase latency IO and the performance storage-efficiency trade off.

## 5 Evaluation

In this section, we present benchmarking results for the workloads described in §3.1 using LST-BENCH with Delta Lake, Apache Iceberg, and Apache Hudi, all running on Apache Spark [21]. We chose Spark as the compute engine for the evaluation because it offers the most mature integration with the LSTs examined in this study, based on our experience. We observe that our benchmarking framework can readily be used with other engines, and the extent to which those engines are integrated with different LSTs will materially impact the performance across LSTs. In brief, our results show:

- The accumulation of immutable layers of data and metadata files significantly degrades LST’s performance, up to 6.8x in our study, unless maintenance is performed to mitigate its impact.
- CoW and MoR modes have significant trade-offs regarding their read and write interaction with the storage layer. For example, Hudi-MoR and Iceberg-MoR lead to high I/O volume and calls, respectively, resulting in higher read query latency than CoW.
- Table maintenance has a big impact on Delta and Iceberg performance stability, whereas Hudi maintains stable performance without periodic maintenance by doing more upfront work.
- Tuning LSTs involves trade-offs depending on user goals. For example, Iceberg’s default file group-by-group compaction reduces disruption on read queries running on the same cluster, but significantly increases compaction time.
- Concurrent read/write sessions have non-trivial impact on query performance and further exploration in multi-compute cluster environments is necessary. Running maintenance operations on the same cluster with read queries can improve idle resource utilization with negligible impact on the latency of the latter.

We want to emphasize that the results we report are specific to the versions and configurations of the engine and LST libraries that we tested, and their performance can be subject to change and improvement due to further tuning and future developments. Furthermore, the integration of the LST with the engine plays a crucial role in its performance, and hence, any conclusions drawn for Spark may not be applicable for the same LST running on

a different engine, such as Trino [44] or Presto [39]. Such cross-engine comparisons are an interesting direction for future work, but outside the scope of this paper. Our main objective in sharing these findings is to demonstrate LST-BENCH’s ability to quantify noteworthy trade-offs across combinations of engines and LSTs.

Our results highlight an important point—each LST offers opportunities to tune performance by making careful choices, e.g., when to do maintenance. In general, these choices depend upon the target workload.

**Hardware and software setup.** Our experiments were conducted on a Spark 3.3.1 cluster, consisting of 1 head and 16 worker nodes (provisioned by Azure VMSS [24]). All nodes were Azure Standard E8as v5 instances with AMD EPYC™ 7763 CPU @ 2.45GHz (8 virtual cores) and 64GB RAM. We did not perform any special tuning for any of the LSTs we evaluated: Delta Lake v2.2.0, Apache Iceberg v1.1.0, and Apache Hudi v0.12.2. The data sets for evaluation were stored in Azure Data Lake Storage Gen2 (ADLS) [22]. We utilized Azure Monitor [23] to collect telemetry from the compute cluster and data storage. Additionally, we relied on Logs Analytics [36] to execute queries against the collected data.

**Experimental setup.** We use the TPC-DS benchmark [43] as the basis for our experimentation with LST-BENCH. To generate data at different scale factors (SF100, SF1000), we employed the *dbgen* tool and stored the generated data in ADLS. Similarly, we generated the data streams required for the DATA MAINTENANCE tests at those scale factors using the same tool and stored them in ADLS as well. Our SINGLE USER test was a permutation of the 99 queries in the benchmark. Note that for the THROUGHPUT phases in the original TPC-DS run, different permutations are used, as specified in the benchmark. For our evaluation, we use the workload patterns discussed in §3.1 and discuss their results next.

### 5.1 Longevity

The aim of the *longevity workload* (WP1, §3.1.2), consisting of six SINGLE USER and five interleaved DATA MAINTENANCE phases, is to measure an LST’s ability to maximize key performance, efficiency, and stability metrics. In this section, we establish that accomplishing

these objectives and the ability to manage big data workloads is determined not only by the volume of data scanned but also by the volume of network calls made to the object store.

We ran WP1 against five experimental setups, each with two different scale factors to account for the impact of scaling. We recorded latency of each phase within a run, along with storage and compute tier metrics (§3.2). Figure 1 displays the execution time of each phase relative to the execution time of the first phase in the same run. Almost invariably, an increase in phase latency is observed in all runs, regardless of scale factor or phase type.


**Performance : Storage Efficiency Trade-off.** For further analysis, we focus on performance and storage tiers of SINGLE USER phase iterations at SF1000 in Figure 7. Figure 7a displays the execution time for each phase iteration and indicates the highest increase in latency in the case of Delta and Iceberg-MoR. Figure 7b and Figure 7c presents the count of network requests to ADLS for each phase and the total bytes read, and provides the essential signals to explain the observed degradation. Figure 7b shows elevated and increasing network calls as workload run progresses for both Delta and Iceberg-MoR. This implies that both these LSTs are blocked on I/O most of the time, resulting in the performance decline. Note that the total bytes read does not increase proportionally, indicating a decline in bytes read per network round trip. This suggests the LSTs are spending a significant amount of time reading new and relatively smaller delta files.

Next, we analyze Hudi (Figure 1 and Figure 7a). It exhibits distinct behavior compared to Delta and Iceberg, as the execution time of SINGLE USER iterations remains stable. While this attribute is highly desirable, it has trade-offs. Observe that Hudi-CoW performs poorly initially (iterations 1 and 2), while Hudi-MoR exhibits the worst performance overall. Figure 7c offers clues to the design choice driving Hudi’s advantages (stable performance) and disadvantages (high latency). We observe that, in contrast to Iceberg and Delta, Hudi reads up to ~6x more data from ADLS. This implies that Hudi incurs an initial cost of bulk loading data to achieve unblocked performance in the future; this is confirmed by other recent studies [58].

**Performance Stability Analysis.** To enable convenient stability comparisons despite the observed variability, we evaluate the effective performance degradation between two phases,  $S_{DR}$  (§3.2.2), for each experiment setup. The results are summarized in Figure 8. Each cell presents the combined performance  $S_{DR}$  value for SINGLE USER, DATA MAINTENANCE and OPTIMIZE phases across workloads WP1,2,3, as well as the average for each setup. Figure 8 is consistent with our prior discussion, confirming Hudi as the most stable LST, particularly in read-intensive scenarios as indicated by  $S_{DR}$  below 0.07. Conversely, except in one instance against WP1, Iceberg consistently exhibits lower stability, with a  $S_{DR}$  up to 0.89. Further analysis against WP2,3, which involves optimization and concurrency, is presented in §5.2 and §5.3.

## 5.2 Resilience

Next, we consider how the performance of LSTs changes when maintenance operations are introduced into the workload. We use the *resilience workload* (WP2, §3.1.2), which evaluates the impact of the OPTIMIZE phase, i.e., compacting small data files into larger



**Figure 8: Performance Degradation,  $S_{DR}$ , Evaluation. As lower  $S_{DR}$  is desired, Hudi emerges as most Stable LST.**

files for higher efficiency. The results for SF1000 are shown in Figure 9a. WP2 iteratively executes a sequence of SINGLE USER (labeled SU- $i$ ), DATA MAINTENANCE (with an increasing number of tasks), OPTIMIZE, and SINGLE USER (labeled SU- $i$ -O) tasks. Note for a given  $i$ , SU- $i$  and SU- $i$ -O query the same logical version of the data. Results for SU-1 and SU-2 are not shown since they were discussed in §5.1.

We observe significantly different behavior for the three LSTs. Similar to the performance development in previous workloads, we observe that the addition of OPTIMIZE phases does not impact the performance of Hudi since its performance remains stable and only degrades minimally. For both Iceberg and Delta, on the other hand, we observe that the OPTIMIZE phase has a significant impact on subsequent query execution of SINGLE USER phases, as shown by comparing SU-3 to SU-3-O and SU-4 to SU-4-O. We observe that the latency drops by 2.3x (1.5x for Iceberg-CoW and 2.2x for Iceberg-MoR) for the first pair and 2.6x (1.8x for Iceberg-CoW and 3.2x for Iceberg-MoR) for the second pair. This indicates that periodic data maintenance operations are crucial for these LSTs to reduce the number of storage layer access calls (see Figure 9b) which are significantly higher in ‘unoptimized’ phases. For Hudi, we observe a high I/O volume in the SINGLE USER phase, solely composed of file read operations. Furthermore, we see a relatively low amount of read or write activity for CoW in the DATA MAINTENANCE and OPTIMIZE phases (similar to Iceberg-CoW) while Hudi-MoR has a disproportionately high data volume in the DATA MAINTENANCE phase (similar to but more prominent than for Iceberg-MoR).

Interestingly, we observe a drastic increase in latency for Iceberg when executing OPTIMIZE phases, which cannot be observed for any other LST. Both I/O and CPU utilization remain comparatively low during these phases but by looking at the storage access calls in detail, we observe that Iceberg issues a large number of (sequentially executed) storage layer access calls. The reason is that for each table, Iceberg’s data compaction operation is executed file group-by-group by default [14]. The operation parameters can be adjusted to run in parallel for  $n$  groups, which can result in a significant performance boost, but making such tuning adjustments requires additional use case context. Another interesting observation when looking at data maintenance cycles is a spike in I/O cost for the first OPTIMIZE phase executed by Delta. This suggests that the operation makes significant changes to the data layout of the table generated after LOAD, reducing latency and I/O cost for subsequent data maintenance operations.




Figure 9: Performance and storage efficiency evaluation of WP2 phases (SF1000).




Figure 10: Evaluation of WP3's phase & task runs (SF1000).

Finally, we observe that for this particular workload, CoW-based outperform MoR-based execution models, i.e., they have a lower latency and incur lower I/O cost.

### 5.3 Read/Write Concurrency

Thus far phases were executed sequentially and have been able to use all available resources. However, LSTs are designed with concurrency in mind. In this section, we analyze the impact of running read and write sessions concurrently using WP3. Note that both WP2 and WP3 contain the same set and sequence of phases and tasks. The only difference is that the phases of WP3 execute SINGLE USER task concurrently with either DATA MAINTENANCE or OPTIMIZE. Accordingly, as shown in Figure 10c, we use WP2 as the baseline, to evaluate execution speedup and overheads. We compare the execution time of the individual tasks, referred to as *TaskTime*, as well as the phase execution time, which we call *PhaseTime*.

*TaskTime* is calculated by summing up the execution time of all tasks. Concurrent tasks are expected to run more slowly due to resource contention. Figure 10c corroborates this notion, as all WP3 tasks report at-least a 30% increase in *TaskTime* compared to WP2 *TaskTimes*. Hudi-MoR is the slowest among all, with its *TaskTimes* 67% higher than corresponding *TaskTimes* against WP2. *PhaseTime* is the end-to-end time taken for tasks of a phase to complete. Contrary to *TaskTime*, concurrency results in speedups against WP3 across the board. Phases of both Iceberg-CoW and Hudi-CoW finish 20% earlier than the WP2 counterparts, which can be attributed to their higher storage efficiency (§5.1) compared to Delta and MoR variants.

#### Concurrent SINGLE USER and DATA MAINTENANCE phases.

Our first observation is a consistent decline in performance across all LSTs, aligning with the discussion in §5.1. Hudi-MoR in addition




Figure 11: Latency measurements for WP4 (SF1000).

to being the slowest, exhibits largest degradation. However, Iceberg-MoR has the highest performance degradation, as also confirmed by a high  $S_{DR}$  shown in Figure 8.

We take a closer look at the tasks (Figure 10a). We observe that in Delta, read queries experience a slowdown of ~22-35 minutes, while data maintenance queries experience a slowdown of ~8-35 minutes. This indicates that while the degradation in the performance of read queries is more significant, the slowdown in data maintenance grows at a faster rate as the size of the modified data increases. In contrast, Iceberg exhibits the opposite behavior. The slowdown of read queries ranges from ~3-17 minutes, while data maintenance queries experience a slowdown of ~19-40 minutes. Lastly, Hudi read queries do not present evident slowdown, while data modification queries show the highest slowdown of CoW variants (up to ~81 minutes) but it remains almost constant throughout the duration of the experiment. For MoR variants, Hudi and Iceberg read query latency increases by ~19-41 minutes and ~27-72 minutes, respectively, during the experiment. For Iceberg, the data maintenance slowdown is comparable to its CoW variant. However, for Hudi, the performance degradation in data maintenance queries is much more significant, ~4.7-5.8 hours. Further analysis of the telemetry reveals a sharp and sustained increase in CPU utilization in the worker nodes, indicating potential bottlenecks in the system.

**Concurrent SINGLE USER and OPTIMIZE phases.** When it comes to read queries, the different LSTs mostly do not exhibit significant slowdown. At most, there is a 10% decrease in performance. Optimize statements show a different behavior though. As illustrated in Figure 10b, Delta shows a gradual increase in slowdown as the size of modified data increases, up to ~83 minutes or ~2.5x. Meanwhile, with Hudi, performance decrease remains consistent throughout the experiment, with a maximum of ~15 minutes for CoW and ~42 minutes for MoR. On the other hand, Iceberg experiences a significant decrease in performance, ranging from ~8-346 minutes for CoW, and from ~40-280 minutes for MoR.

## 5.4 Time Travel

Lastly, we study the performance of time travel queries<sup>5</sup>, depicted in Figure 11 for SF1000. In the figure, we use the notation SU- $i.v$  to represent the execution of a SINGLE USER task  $i$  that queries version  $v$  of the table. Here,  $v = 0$  corresponds to the table after the LOAD phase, while  $v = j$  (where  $j > 0$ ) corresponds to the table after  $j$  iteration of DATA MAINTENANCE. The results are consistent with

<sup>5</sup>Hudi excluded due to SQL extension bug for time travel queries: HUDI-xxxx.

our expectations. We observe that the query latency increases as additional data files are written into the tables, matching the latency observed for WP1, i.e., as if no new data had been written after that version was created. In addition, we analyze the storage efficiency (e.g. I/O and call counts) and find no significant difference between queries run on the latest version of the data and corresponding time travel queries that query that version after data modifications have been applied. This indicates that these LSTs can efficiently support time travel queries without incurring any significant overhead in query performance or storage.

## 6 Discussion

LST-BENCH’s goal is to provide an accessible and extensible tool for evaluating existing LSTs and their engine integrations, as well as future ones. We have started using LST-BENCH to evaluate our system deployments within Azure and have gained valuable insights from these evaluations. By using LST-BENCH, we have been able to compare different engine and LST combinations, and we plan to automate this process to track their progress over time. The flexible workload generation and metrics processor built into LST-BENCH makes it easy to extend the tool to explore aspects that are currently overlooked. Examples of future extensions include evaluation of schema evolution, partition evolution, or security integration.

Moreover, beyond performance evaluation, LST-BENCH can assist in studying best practices and tuning configurations for specific use cases. For instance, we can analyze the impact of choosing between CoW and MoR modes, which result in different trade-offs between read and write performance as demonstrated in §5, and automate the selection of the optimal configuration for a table. Additionally, the flexibility to run concurrent workloads provides an opportunity to understand the interaction of read/write operations on single and different clusters. When combined with *stability*, a new metric that represents the degradation of the systems over time, this can help us to develop intelligent scheduling of maintenance operations for a particular configuration. This feature is valuable as it can alleviate a burden often borne by end users and system administrators while increasing the efficiency of systems relying on LSTs.

Finally, our results show the potential for tuning each LST. While such tuning is workload-dependent, it is worth exploring whether there are some “no-regret” defaults for each LST, and to compare across LSTs (and possibly engines) that are each tuned to the best defaults for the given LST. Such an evaluation is enabled by the LST-BENCH framework, but is beyond the scope of this paper.

## 7 Related Work

The research and methods of evaluation of open LSTs are rapidly evolving, with new insights being published on a monthly basis. The bulk of literature is in the form of blog posts by vendors or users and is based on established benchmarks that were originally intended for a different category of systems. In this section, we first focus on works that compare LSTs both theoretically and empirically, then we discuss benchmarking methodology that is relevant for LSTs, and lastly, we discuss frameworks proposed in previous work.

**Comparing LSTs.** Blog posts and papers focusing on the comparison of LSTs can be split into two categories. The first category is a

theoretical evaluation of the different approaches, looking at features such as transaction management, schema evolution, and time travel [50, 51, 58]. Blog posts also commonly mention open-source statistics such as number of committers, pull requests, and Github ratings [28, 45]. After examining features and statistics, these blog posts often endorse one LST over others. In contrast, our objective is to establish a standardized approach to evaluate the performance and stability of LSTs, and to offer a framework that allows for empirical comparisons rather than just theoretical discussions.

The second category comprises comparisons of LSTs based on experimental evaluations. For instance, in a recent paper, Jain et al. [58] used TPC-DS benchmarking strategies adapted for LSTs to identify the strengths and weaknesses of each of them: (i) They evaluate the impact of data updates on performance by running five sample queries, then merging changes into a table multiple times, and running the same queries again, and (ii) they create a synthetic micro-benchmark with varying data refresh sizes to test the impact of the update size on the performance of the LST. Similarly, other recent blog posts [12, 34] have also used the `LOAD` task (which has been modified to use Parquet as the source format [33]) and the `SINGLE USER` task from TPC-DS to compare performance of LSTs.

Drawing conclusions about the superiority of a specific LST from the aforementioned works is challenging. For instance, [58] found that (i) Delta outperforms both Iceberg and Hudi in TPC-DS query performance, (ii) Delta and Iceberg have significantly faster load times than Hudi, and (iii) Delta provides better query performance after data has been modified than either Iceberg or Hudi. Other works [12, 34] suggest that Hudi is competitive with Delta in these same dimensions. However, this does not mean that the results are misrepresented by any of those works, as engine setup and configuration parameters can significantly impact these evaluations [60, 70]. Additionally, most evaluations use different versions of the LSTs and underlying execution engines further complicating objective comparisons. To address these issues, we proposed an evaluation methodology and framework that is open source, customizable, repeatable, and easy to use, providing users with a one-stop solution to evaluate these formats objectively.

**Benchmarking LSTs.** Prior research has used various benchmarks to compare LSTs, but the most commonly used benchmark is TPC-DS. It is important to note that while TPC-DS V1 [61] was designed to evaluate monolithic RDBMSs, TPC-DS V2 [63] was specifically developed to cater to SQL-based big data systems. However, even though TPC-DS V2 already considered SQL engines running on a common storage layer (e.g., HDFS) that could be accessed by multiple systems, it ignored key elements in evaluating LSTs, such as data layout optimization, time travel, or the impact of data manipulations over extended time periods. Furthermore, the TPC-DS result consists of a single performance metric, which, although straightforward for ranking purposes, is insufficient in capturing critical LST-based concepts like *stability* (§3.2). We have therefore proposed metrics that complement the TPC-DS performance score and can help to evaluate a system across these additional dimensions.

As mentioned above, prior work [58] has taken a first step towards modifying TPC-DS by evaluating the performance difference of a set of queries before and after a series of SQL `MERGE INTO` statements were executed. With our work, we take the idea of long-term

impact evaluation one step further and make TPC-DS composable, i.e., we allow users to create their own workloads based on TPC-DS by mixing and matching the different TPC-DS phases. This modification allows us to evaluate all of the previously unaddressed elements that are unique to LSTs.

Prior work has also examined customized micro-benchmarks designed to evaluate the read and write capabilities of different LSTs. For instance, these benchmarks include operations that append and remove data from an existing table, and mimic GDPR deletions [26]. Integrating these workloads into our benchmarking framework to further extend the evaluation should be a straightforward process.

**Benchmarking Frameworks.** It is important to note that previous research has developed several benchmarking frameworks mainly geared towards evaluating SQL systems. For example, OLTP-Bench [56] can execute several standardized workloads using different database backends such as PostgreSQL or SQL Server. Similarly, DIAMetrics [54] was designed to allow its users to compare and contrast the execution of different (customizable) benchmarks, also extending the idea of benchmarking to include other aspects such as data movement and data security. In this paper, we describe a framework that is specifically focused on LSTs. In addition to their specific SQL dialects, LSTs may be executed on different types of clusters, with different optimization parameters, for which we deploy different (and novel) benchmarks in their evaluation.

YCSB [53] presents a framework to compare cloud data *servicing* systems like Cassandra or HBase using tiers and workloads. YCSB and LST-BENCH share similarities in their approach, but YCSB focuses solely on this category of systems, and does not cover aspects such as the composability of workloads, which is a key contribution of our work. DSB [57] focuses on workload-driven RDBMSs that adapt over time using ML techniques, extending TPC-DS with more complex data distribution, query templates, and dynamic workloads. In contrast, LST-BENCH concentrates on LSTs but could easily integrate DSB’s modifications to expand the range of evaluated scenarios. Finally, PEEL [52] is designed for benchmarking distributed systems, with a focus on reproducibility and automated experiment processes. Our implementation also takes inspiration from PEEL, although we recognize the need for further automation in LST-BENCH to run evaluations more effectively in cloud deployments, which we plan to explore in future work.

## 8 Conclusion

In this paper, we presented LST-BENCH, our benchmarking framework for evaluation of LSTs using workload patterns that mimic real-world customer scenarios, such as those found within Azure, while at the same time providing means to fairly evaluate those workloads. We discuss in-depth how we enable users to create their own custom workloads using the extendable plug and execute functionality within LST-BENCH and showcase how we use LST-BENCH to evaluate and compare existing LSTs. Our extensive evaluation finds that these LSTs vary significantly in terms of their performance, storage efficiency, and stability. This demonstrates that LST-BENCH can be used to evaluate LSTs effectively and comprehensively.

## References

- [1] 2017. Apache Hudi. <https://hudi.apache.org/>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [2] 2019. Delta Lake. <https://delta.io/>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [3] 2021. Apache Iceberg. <https://iceberg.apache.org/>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [4] 2022. Amazon Redshift - Cloud Data Warehouse. <https://aws.amazon.com/redshift/>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [5] 2022. Amazon S3 - Cloud Object Storage. <https://aws.amazon.com/s3/>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [6] 2022. Apache Hudi - Deployment considerations. <https://hudi.apache.org/docs/0.12.2/metadata/#deployment-model-c-multi-writer>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [7] 2022. Apache Hudi - Optimization Procedures. <https://hudi.apache.org/docs/procedures#optimization-table>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [8] 2022. Apache Hudi - RFC - 15: Metadata Table. <https://cwiki.apache.org/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=147427331>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [9] 2022. Apache Hudi - Schema Evolution. [https://hudi.apache.org/docs/0.12.2/schema\\_evolution/](https://hudi.apache.org/docs/0.12.2/schema_evolution/). Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [10] 2022. Apache Hudi - Supported Concurrency Controls. [https://hudi.apache.org/docs/0.12.2/concurrency\\_control/#supported-concurrency-controls](https://hudi.apache.org/docs/0.12.2/concurrency_control/#supported-concurrency-controls). Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [11] 2022. Apache Hudi - Time Travel Query. <https://hudi.apache.org/docs/0.12.2/quick-start-guide#time-travel-query>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [12] 2022. Apache Hudi vs Delta Lake - Transparent TPC-DS Lakehouse Performance Benchmarks. <https://www.onehouse.ai/blog/apache-hudi-vs-delta-lake-transparent-tpc-ds-lakehouse-performance-benchmarks>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [13] 2022. Apache Iceberg - Concurrent write operations. <https://iceberg.apache.org/docs/1.1.0/reliability/#concurrent-write-operations>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [14] 2022. Apache Iceberg - MAX\_CONCURRENT\_FILE\_GROUP\_REWRITES. [https://iceberg.apache.org/javadoc/1.1.0/org/apache/iceberg/actions/RewriteDataFiles.html#MAX\\_CONCURRENT\\_FILE\\_GROUP\\_REWRITES](https://iceberg.apache.org/javadoc/1.1.0/org/apache/iceberg/actions/RewriteDataFiles.html#MAX_CONCURRENT_FILE_GROUP_REWRITES). Accessed: 2023-03-23.
- [15] 2022. Apache Iceberg - Partition evolution. <https://iceberg.apache.org/docs/1.1.0/evolution/#partition-evolution>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [16] 2022. Apache Iceberg - Schema evolution. <https://iceberg.apache.org/docs/1.1.0/evolution/#schema-evolution>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [17] 2022. Apache Iceberg - Spark Procedures. <https://iceberg.apache.org/docs/latest/spark-procedures/>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [18] 2022. Apache Iceberg - Specification. <https://iceberg.apache.org/spec/>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [19] 2022. Apache Iceberg - Time travel. <https://iceberg.apache.org/docs/1.1.0/spark-queries/#time-travel>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [20] 2022. Apache Ozone. <https://ozone.apache.org/>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [21] 2022. Apache Spark. <https://spark.apache.org/>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [22] 2022. Azure Data Lake Storage. <https://azure.microsoft.com/products/storage/data-lake-storage>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [23] 2022. Azure Monitor. <https://azure.microsoft.com/products/monitor>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [24] 2022. Azure Virtual Machine Scale Sets. <https://azure.microsoft.com/products/virtual-machine-scale-sets/>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [25] 2022. BenchBase - Multi-DBMS SQL Benchmarking Framework via JDBC. <https://github.com/cmu-db/benchbase>. Accessed: 2022-12-06.
- [26] 2022. Brooklyn Data Co., Setting the Table: Benchmarking Open Table Formats. <https://brooklyndata.co/blog/benchmarking-open-table-formats>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [27] 2022. Cloud Storage - Google Cloud. <https://cloud.google.com/storage>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [28] 2022. Comparison of Data Lake Table Formats (Apache Iceberg, Apache Hudi and Delta Lake). <https://www.dremio.com/blog/comparison-of-data-lake-table-formats-apache-iceberg-apache-hudi-and-delta-lake/>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [29] 2022. Databricks. <https://www.databricks.com/>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [30] 2022. Databricks - CREATE TABLE CLONE. <https://docs.databricks.com/sql/language-manual/delta-clone.html>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [31] 2022. Delta Lake - Optimistic concurrency control. <https://docs.delta.io/2.2.0/concurrency-control.html#optimistic-concurrency-control>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [32] 2022. Delta Lake - Optimizations. <https://docs.delta.io/latest/optimizations-oss.html>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [33] 2022. Delta OSS TPC-DS Benchmark. <https://github.com/delta-io/delta/tree/master/benchmarks>. Accessed: 2023-03-09.
- [34] 2022. Delta vs Iceberg vs Hudi : Reassessing Performance. <https://databeans-blogs.medium.com/delta-vs-iceberg-vs-hudi-reassessing-performance-cb8157005eb0>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [35] 2022. Leading Cloud Object Storage Companies. <https://www.emergenresearch.com/blog/top-6-leading-cloud-object-storage-companies-in-the-world>. Accessed: 2023-03-23.
- [36] 2022. Log Analytics in Azure Monitor. <https://learn.microsoft.com/azure/azure-monitor/logs/log-analytics-overview>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [37] 2022. OneHouse. <https://www.onehouse.ai/>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [38] 2022. Oracle Exadata. <http://www.oracle.com/exadata>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [39] 2022. Presto. <https://prestodb.io/>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [40] 2022. Tabular. <https://tabular.io/>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [41] 2022. Teradata. <https://www.teradata.com/>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [42] 2022. TPC Benchmarks Overview. <https://www.tpc.org/information/benchmarks5.asp>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [43] 2022. TPC-DS Specification Version 3.2.0. [https://www.tpc.org/tpc\\_documents\\_current\\_versions/pdf/tpc-ds\\_v3.2.0.pdf](https://www.tpc.org/tpc_documents_current_versions/pdf/tpc-ds_v3.2.0.pdf). Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [44] 2022. Trino. <https://trino.io/>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [45] 2023. Apache Hudi vs Delta Lake vs Apache Iceberg - Lakehouse Feature Comparison. <https://www.onehouse.ai/blog/apache-hudi-vs-delta-lake-vs-apache-iceberg-lakehouse-feature-comparison>. Accessed: 2023-02-23.
- [46] 2023. Cloud Storage Market Growing at 24.8% CAGR. <https://www.globenewswire.com/en/news-release/2023/02/14/2608218/0/en/Cloud-Storage-Market-Size-Growing-at-24-8-CAGR-Set-to-Reach-USD-490-8-Billion-By-2030.html>. Accessed: 2023-03-23.
- [47] Daniel Abadi, Peter Boncz, Stavros Harizopoulos, Stratos Idreos, and Samuel Madden. 2013. The Design and Implementation of Modern Column-Oriented Database Systems. *Foundations and Trends® in Databases* 5, 3 (2013), 197–280. <https://doi.org/10.1561/19000000024>
- [48] Michael Armbrust, Bilal Aslam, Yingyi Bu, Sourav Chatterji, Yuhong Chen, Yijia Cui, Vuk Erecogovac, Ali Ghodsi, Rahul Govind, Aakash Japi, et al. 2023. Making Data Engineering Declarative. *CIDR* (2023).
- [49] Michael Armbrust, Tathagata Das, Sameer Paranjypte, Reynold Xin, Shixiong Zhu, Ali Ghodsi, Burak Yavuz, Mukul Murthy, Joseph Torres, Liwen Sun, Peter A. Boncz, Mostafa Mokhtar, Herman Van Hovell, Adrian Ionescu, Alicja Luszczyk, Michal Swiatkowski, Takuya Ueshin, Xiao Li, Michal Szafranski, Pieter Senster, and Matei Zaharia. 2020. Delta Lake: High-Performance ACID Table Storage over Cloud Object Stores. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 13, 12 (2020), 3411–3424. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3415478.3415560>
- [50] Michael Armbrust, Ali Ghodsi, Reynold Xin, and Matei Zaharia. 2021. Lakehouse: a new generation of open platforms that unify data warehousing and advanced analytics. In *Proceedings of CIDR*. 8.
- [51] Vladimir Belov and Evgeny Nikulchev. 2021. Analysis of Big Data Storage Tools for Data Lakes based on Apache Hadoop Platform. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications* 12, 8 (2021).
- [52] Christoph Boden, Alexander Alexandrov, Andreas Kunft, Tilmann Rabl, and Volker Markl. 2017. PEEL: A Framework for Benchmarking Distributed Systems and Algorithms. In *TPCTC*.
- [53] 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* (Indianapolis, Indiana, USA) (SoCC '10). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 143–154. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1807128.1807152>
- [54] Shaleen Deep, Anja Gruenheid, Kruthi Nagaraj, Hiro Naito, Jeff Naughton, and Stratis Viglas. 2020. DIAMetrics: Benchmarking Query Engines at Scale. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 13, 12 (sep 2020), 3285–3298. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3415478.3415551>
- [55] 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* (New York, New York, USA) (SIGMOD '13). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1243–1254. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2463676.2463710>
- [56] Djelle Eddine Difallah, Andrew Pavlo, Carlo Curino, and Philippe Cudre-Mauroux. 2013. OLTP-Bench: An Extensible Testbed for Benchmarking Relational Databases. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 7, 4 (dec 2013), 277–288. <https://doi.org/10.14778/2732240.2732246>
- [57] Bailu Ding, Surajit Chaudhuri, Johannes Gehrke, and Vivek Narasayya. 2021. DSB: A Decision Support Benchmark for Workload-Driven and Traditional Database Systems. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 14, 13 (sep 2021), 3376–3388. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3484224.3484234>
- [58] Paras Jain, Peter Kraft, Conor Power, Tathagata Das, Ion Stoica, and Matei Zaharia. 2023. Analyzing and Comparing Lakehouse Storage Systems. *CIDR* (2023).
- [59] Ralph Kimball and Margy Ross. 2013. *The Data Warehouse Toolkit: The Definitive Guide to Dimensional Modeling* (3rd ed.). Wiley Publishing.
- [60] Chen Lin, Junqing Zhuang, Jiadong Feng, Hui Li, Xuanhe Zhou, and Guoliang Li. 2022. Adaptive Code Learning for Spark Configuration Tuning. In *38th IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE 2022, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, May 9-12, 2022*. IEEE, 1995–2007. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE53745.2022.00195>
- [61] Raghunath Othayoth Nambiar and Meikel Poess. 2006. The Making of TPC-DS. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Very Large Data Bases, Seoul, Korea, September 12-15, 2006*, Umeshwar Dayal, Kyu-Young Whang, David B. Lomet, Gustavo Alonso, Guy M. Lohman, Martin L. Kersten, Sang Kyun Cha, and Young-Kuk Kim (Eds.). ACM, 1049–1058. <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1164217>

- [62] Thomas Neumann, Tobias Mühlbauer, and Alfons Kemper. 2015. Fast Serializable Multi-Version Concurrency Control for Main-Memory Database Systems. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data* (Melbourne, Victoria, Australia) (SIGMOD '15). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 677–689. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2723372.2749436>
- [63] Meikel Poess, Tilmann Rabl, and Hans-Arno Jacobsen. 2017. Analysis of TPC-DS: the first standard benchmark for SQL-based big data systems. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Symposium on Cloud Computing, SoCC 2017, Santa Clara, CA, USA, September 24-27, 2017*. ACM, 573–585.
- [64] Matthew Powers. 2023. Delta Lake Schema Evolution. <https://delta.io/blog/2023-02-08-delta-lake-schema-evolution/>.
- [65] Matthew Powers. 2023. *Delta Lake Time Travel*. <https://delta.io/blog/2023-02-01-delta-lake-time-travel/>
- [66] Michael Stonebraker and Lawrence A. Rowe. 1986. The Design of POSTGRES. In *Proceedings of the 1986 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data* (Washington, D.C., USA) (SIGMOD '86). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 340–355. <https://doi.org/10.1145/16894.16888>
- [67] Ashish Thusoo, Joydeep Sen Sarma, Namit Jain, Zheng Shao, Prasad Chakka, Ning Zhang, Suresh Anthony, Hao Liu, and Raghotham Murthy. 2010. Hive - a petabyte scale data warehouse using Hadoop. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE 2010, March 1-6, 2010, Long Beach, California, USA*, Feifei Li, Mirella M. Moro, Shahram Ghandeharizadeh, Jayant R. Haritsa, Gerhard Weikum, Michael J. Carey, Fabio Casati, Edward Y. Chang, Ioana Manolescu, Sharad Mehrotra, Umeshwar Dayal, and Vassilis J. Tsotras (Eds.). IEEE Computer Society, 996–1005. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE.2010.5447738>
- [68] Paul Westerman. 2001. *Data warehousing: using the Wal-Mart model*. Morgan Kaufmann.
- [69] Yingjun Wu, Joy Arulraj, Jiexi Lin, Ran Xian, and Andrew Pavlo. 2017. An Empirical Evaluation of In-Memory Multi-Version Concurrency Control. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 10, 7 (mar 2017), 781–792. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3067421.3067427>
- [70] Yiwen Zhu, Subru Krishnan, Konstantinos Karanasos, Isha Tarte, Conor Power, Abhishek Modi, Manoj Kumar, Deli Zhang, Kartheek Muthyala, Nick Jurgens, Sarvesh Sakalanaga, Sudhir Darbha, Minu Iyer, Ankita Agarwal, and Carlo Curino. 2021. KEA: Tuning an Exabyte-Scale Data Infrastructure. In *Proceedings of the 2021 International Conference on Management of Data* (Virtual Event, China) (SIGMOD '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2667–2680. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3448016.3457569>