

# F<sup>2</sup>: Designing a Key-Value Store for Large Skewed Workloads

Konstantinos Kanellis\*  
University of Wisconsin-Madison  
kkanellis@cs.wisc.edu

Badrish Chandramouli  
Microsoft Research  
badrishc@microsoft.com

Shivaram Venkataraman  
University of Wisconsin-Madison  
shivaram@cs.wisc.edu

## ABSTRACT

Today’s key-value stores are either disk-optimized, focusing on large data and saturating device IOPS, or memory-optimized, focusing on high throughput with linear thread scaling assuming plenty of main memory. However, many practical workloads demand high performance for read and write working sets that are much larger than main memory, over a total data size that is even larger. They require judicious use of memory and disk, and today’s systems do not handle such workloads well. We present F<sup>2</sup>, a new key-value store design based on *compartmentalization* – it consists of five key components that work together in well-defined ways to achieve high throughput – saturating disk and memory bandwidths – while incurring low disk read and write amplification. A key design characteristic of F<sup>2</sup> is that it separates the management of hot and cold data, across the read and write domains, and adapts the use of memory to optimize each case. Through a sequence of new latch-free system constructs, F<sup>2</sup> solves the key challenge of maintaining high throughput with linear thread scalability in such a compartmentalized design. Detailed experiments on benchmark data validate our design’s superiority, in terms of throughput, over state-of-the-art key-value stores, when the available memory resources are scarce.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Key-value stores are an essential part of every system infrastructure, due to their ability to provide a large-scale storage solution for cloud-based applications. They have been widely adopted in a wide range of applications, such as web caching [5, 30], session stores [7, 35], and messaging platforms [2, 32, 35]. They are also commonly used as the underlying data storage layer in many distributed systems [13, 18], and as a cache to accelerate database workloads [1, 29].

Traditional key-value stores focused on cost-optimized disk-focused designs, which emphasize a judicious use of memory and effective use of the available disk bandwidth [3, 27, 40]. These stores are organized with an in-memory component, which is typically used to absorb user updates, and a disk component which stores the actual data. Popular examples of such stores include RocksDB [6] and Cassandra [18] which are both based upon the Log-Structured Merge (LSM) tree paradigm [33]. These stores can effectively store billions of keys with minimal memory footprint. The large majority of them handle both range and point queries, at the higher cost of maintaining data ordered by key, resulting in throughputs that rarely exceed a million operations per second.

On the other hand, a modern class of stores focuses on the caching use case with point-based lookup, updates, and inserts [5, 9, 21]. They prioritize extremely high throughput and some achieve linear thread scalability with latch-free concurrent designs [7, 20, 22, 38]. Here, the general assumption is that most of the working set resides in main memory, but they also saturate disk IOPS for random

reads over larger-than-memory data. An example is FASTER [7], our earlier work that achieves these goals using a latch-free cache-optimized hash index that chains records stored in a HybridLog – a log structured record store that allows in-place updates at the tail in memory. When the disk is full, FASTER can perform a *log compaction* process that safely copies live records from the beginning of the HybridLog to the tail.

While FASTER is widely used<sup>1</sup>, we observe that many real-world workloads demand a related but different set of characteristics. Point operations are still sufficient, and high throughput is still of paramount importance. However, their working sets are much larger than main memory [12, 28], and the total indexed data is an order of magnitude larger, with a large fraction of data being rarely updated or accessed [6, 39]. Further, memory is a scarce resource in such scenarios [11, 23, 26], and disk wearing due to excessive writes over the long term is a practical concern [31]. Finally, there is a natural skew in key access patterns for both reads and writes [4, 39]. We describe one such workload below.

*Example 1.1 (Search Ads).* Consider a search engine that stores and tracks per-ad clicks and impressions as well as per-user sketch of ad activity, in a key-value store. Queries (give me the sketch for a given user, or the number of clicks on a given ad) are point based. Updates are either blind inserts (insert a new ad into the system) or read-modify-writes (update the counter or sketch for a given ad or user). The number of users and ads being actively served may be large, with the aggregate data not fitting in main memory. Further, a long tail of users and ads that are not actively being read or updated needs to still be available for immediate queries and updates. Finally, both reads and writes exhibit key skewness, with the set of read-hot keys (e.g., users actively browsing and needing a lookup of their sketches) different from the set of write-hot keys (e.g., ads being frequently shown).

In spite of being optimized for point operations, this class of *large skewed workloads* is not well handled by the original FASTER design. First, the hash index takes up too much memory: at 8 bytes per key, even though the index does not keep the actual keys in memory, a collision-free hash index would incur 8GB of memory overhead for a billion keys. Reducing the index size to a more reasonable 1GB would create too many hash collisions that make Read operations expensive (incurring ~ 8 random I/O operations per Read). Second, compaction in such a design incurs prohibitive disk and write amplification costs. Since the working set is larger than main memory, write-hot records can escape to disk and get re-created at the tail, leading to record duplication and disk amplification. Further, the large set of write-cold records reach the begin of the log and get compacted to the tail regularly, adding to tail contention and write amplification overheads. Thus, we need to fundamentally evolve the

\*Work started during internship at Microsoft Research.

<sup>1</sup>FASTER is available in open source, at <https://github.com/microsoft/FASTER>.




Figure 1: Original FASTER Architecture

design of point-optimized stores in order to efficiently serve such workloads in memory- and resource-constrained environments.

In this paper, we present  $F^2$  (which stands for a *Faster* FASTER), a new key-value store design that evolves our original design to handle large skewed workloads:

- $F^2$  adopts a fundamentally new design pattern based on *compartmentalization*, that explicitly targets the workload characteristics identified above.  $F^2$  consists of five key components: (1) a hot index; (2) a hot hybrid log; (3) a cold index; (4) a cold log; and (5) a read cache. These five components work together and interact in well-defined ways to achieve extremely high throughput – saturating disk and memory bandwidths – while incurring low disk read and write amplification.
- A key design characteristic of  $F^2$  is that it separates write-cold data into a cold log and read-hot data into a read cache. This approach limits amplification and prevents write-cold records from contending at the tail of the hot log during log compaction. Safely supporting normal operations and compaction over such a two-log design, while maintaining latch-freedom, is a key technical challenge addressed in this paper.
- The two-log design of  $F^2$  allows us to design a new memory-optimized index design for the cold index, which incurs only around two I/Os for each cold data access, and takes up only around one byte per key of space overhead in memory.
- Read-hot data from both logs is maintained in a read cache that is situated on the hash chain, between the hot index and the log, thereby serving hot records from both logs with a single cache miss in the common case.

The result is a new compartmentalized design that achieves low memory utilization and incurs low disk and write amplification, yet maintains high throughput, linear thread scalability, and disk IOPS saturation for large skewed workloads. Detailed experiments on  $F^2$ , implemented based on the C++ port of FASTER, using benchmark workloads, validate our design’s superiority – in terms of throughput, memory usage, and disk overheads – for our targeted class of workloads, as compared to state-of-the-art key-value store designs.

## 2 BACKGROUND

Before discussing the design of  $F^2$ , we provide a brief background on the basic FASTER design as presented in our prior work [7].

### 2.1 Hash Index

At its core, FASTER consists of a lock-free hash table that resides entirely in main memory and is divided into cacheline-sized buckets (Figure 1). Each 8 byte bucket entry contains a pointer to a record whose key hashes to that bucket. Each record points to another record, forming a logical linked list of records with common significant key hash bits (i.e., *hash chain*). Each bucket entry contains additional bits from the associated records’ key hash, increasing

hashing resolution and further disambiguating what records the bucket entry points to without extra cache misses and without full key comparisons. FASTER defines four basic operations on the hash index: Read, Upsert, RMW, and Delete. Latch-free algorithms are used to add and remove entries in the hash table, and inserting records at the tail of the linked list. Note that each linked list rooted in the hash index takes up 8 bytes of space in main memory.

### 2.2 Hybrid Log

Each record pointed to by the hash table is stored in a log that spans disk and main memory, called HybridLog. Each record consists of an 8-byte RecordInfo header, a key, and a value. This header, among other information, stores a pointer to the *previous* address, the log address of the previous record in the hash chain (linked list). The log itself is divided into three contiguous regions: (1) *mutable*, (2) *read-only*, and (3) *stable* regions. The mutable and the read-only regions reside in-memory, while the stable one resides on disk. Records in the mutable region can be updated in-place. Records in the read-only and stable regions are immutable, and use read-copy-updates (RCU) to the tail, adding to the tail of the linked list via a compare-and-swap (CAS) at the corresponding hash entry. This design allows write-hot records to be accessed and updated very quickly and in a thread-scalable manner.

As the tail grows, older pages need to be flushed to disk and eventually evicted from main memory. This is achieved in a latch-free manner by tracking several monotonically-increasing addresses: a BEGIN address that tracks the first address in HybridLog, a HEAD address that tracks the first address in main memory, a READ-ONLY address that tracks the first mutable address, and a TAIL address that tracks the tail of the HybridLog address space. Thus, simple comparisons are sufficient to determine operation logic. FASTER uses epoch protection (described next) to maintain memory safety in the presence of multiple threads accessing and updating the store, without requiring fine-grained latches to update these addresses.

### 2.3 The Epoch Framework

FASTER uses an epoch-based framework [7, 25], which enables synchronization across threads in a lazy fashion. Most of the time, threads perform operations independently in a latch-free manner. However, some system-wide events necessitate thread synchronization, e.g., to avoid accessing invalid memory regions or stale data. Examples of such events include flushing records from the read-only region of HybridLog to disk, or truncating the HybridLog. To this end, the system employs a global *epoch counter*,  $E$ , while every thread maintains its own thread-local version,  $E_i$ . During system-wide events, threads coordinate by registering *trigger actions* with the current global epoch,  $E$ . Threads periodically *refresh* their thread-local version, to match the global epoch,  $E$ . When all thread-local epochs,  $E_i$ , are greater than  $E$ , then we say that  $E$  is *safe*, and the registered trigger actions associated with  $E$  are invoked. This mechanism allows trigger actions to be executed *only after* all threads have agreed to some common view of the world.

### 2.4 Log Compaction

For log compaction, the original FASTER employed a *scan*-based approach: the entire log is scanned, and *live* records from the first part of the log (e.g., 20%) are maintained in a temporary hash table

in main memory. Finally, these live records are inserted into the tail, after which the BEGIN address can be moved forward. This design requires a full scan of the log and extra memory for the maintenance of a temporary hash table. More importantly, it increases the contention at the tail of the log, as compacted write-cold records compete with incoming user updates, inevitably leading to performance degradation and higher write amplification.

### 3 F<sup>2</sup> OVERVIEW

F<sup>2</sup> is a concurrent, latch-free key-value store design that aims to deliver high performance for real-world skewed workloads. Skewed workloads typically have a small *hot set* of keys, on which the large majority of user operations are performed. While most existing systems [7, 20, 21] are optimized for skewed workloads where the hot set remains in memory, we further optimize F<sup>2</sup> for memory-constraint environments where the hot set can be larger than the available memory. To achieve this, we propose a *compartmentalized design*, by introducing several new components that operate in a synergistic way. Yet, while these new components can deliver better performance and/or make the system more memory-efficient, they also pose new challenges for guaranteeing correctness under concurrent, latch-free execution.

Figure 2 depicts the overall architecture of F<sup>2</sup>. The key idea is to physically separate hot records from cold ones, across two domains, i.e., *reads* and *writes*. In particular, our design provides individual treatment for each record, depending on its read- and write- *hotness*, by physically placing the record on a different component. First, our architecture incorporates a log-structured record store that keeps *write-hot* keys (i.e., *hot log*), alongside its respective hash index (i.e., *hot-log index*). Note that the hot log spans both memory and disk, while the hot-log index is stored entirely in-memory. Second, it integrates a separate record log for storing *write-cold* keys (i.e., *cold log*), alongside its respective hash index (i.e., *cold-log index*). The cold log resides solely on disk. In contrast to the hot-log index, the cold-log index is based upon a new *two-level index design*, and is stored (partly) on disk. Finally, a *read cache* lies between the hot log index and the hot log, which keeps a cache of disk-resident *read-hot* records in a separate in-memory store. The records kept in the read cache are merely replicas of the original records, which reside in either hot or cold record log. Using this tiered log architecture, we can provide high performance with memory efficiency to all four read/write & hot/cold combinations.

#### 3.1 Components Overview

Next, we present an overview of every F<sup>2</sup> component.

*Hot-Log Index.* The hot log index employs a latch-free hash table design and is stored entirely in-memory. Based upon the design described in Section 2.1, each bucket entry contains a pointer (or *address*) to a record, whose key hashes to this entry. However, this record may now reside in either the hot log or the read-cache. Each such record points to a (previous) record (if any) in the hot log, forming a hash chain. With this hash chain, user operations access records with matching key, stored in the hot log or in read cache.

*Hot Log.* The goal of the hot log is to enable write-hot records to be retrieved and updated promptly, even when many threads

are concurrently operating on the log. Therefore, the hot log is an instance of FASTER’s HybridLog, which is coupled with the aforementioned hot-log index. Note how the hot-log index only needs to index the hot-log records, effectively reducing its memory overhead. Although the organization of the hot HybridLog remains largely the same (e.g., insertions at the tail of the log, in-place updates for mutable records, RCUs for immutable records), we significantly alter its compaction behavior (as we discuss in Section 4).

*Cold-Log Index.* The purpose of the cold-log index is to substantially decrease the amount of memory required to index write-cold records. The cold-log index is based upon a *two-level index* design, and consists of a (small) in-memory structure and a (large) on-disk one. The key idea is to group multiple hash index entries together, to create *hash chunks*. Each hash chunk contains a fixed number of entries (e.g., 32), similar to those found in the hot-log index. Then, we employ an in-memory index to index the hash chunks, whereas we store the actual chunks on-disk. In essence, because we expect cold log-resident records to be accessed infrequently, we propose trading-off memory utilization for more disk I/O. In Section 5, we provide a deep dive on its organization and operation.

*Cold Log.* The cold log enables the physical separation of write-hot and write-cold records. Its design is identical to the hot log (i.e., HybridLog), with the exception that (almost) all records reside on disk (i.e., at the stable region). This means that accessing a record in the cold log typically requires two disk I/O operations: one for retrieving the hash chain from the cold-log index, and one for reading the actual record from the log. Yet, as we discuss below, the addition of the cold log eliminates the contention at the hot log tail.

*Read Cache.* The read-cache component allows immediate access to read-hot records, even if they are originally stored on disk. While write-hot records reside in the in-memory part of the hot log, write-cold records do not. This leads to suboptimal performance for read-hot write-cold records, as one would need to perform one (or more) disk I/O operations, each time this record is requested by the user. To this end, we maintain a separate read-cache component, which avoids redundant disk I/O operations. In the spirit of the hot log, read-hot records that become read-cold, are eventually evicted from the cache. In Section 6, we discuss read-cache in more details.

#### 3.2 User Interface

F<sup>2</sup> supports Reads, Upserts, Deletes, and *atomic* updates in the form of read-modify-writes (RMWs). A Read returns the value for a key (if a record with a matching key exists in the store); otherwise it returns NOT\_FOUND. An Upsert replaces the value for a key *blindly* (if a record exists in the store), or insert a new value. A Delete inserts a tombstone record for a key, deleting it logically. A RMW updates the value of a key based on the existing value, and a given user-defined update logic (defined at compile-time). If no record for this key exists, RMW creates a new record with a initial value.

#### 3.3 Lifecycle of a Record

Figure 3 show the lifecycle of a record that enters F<sup>2</sup>. The user first inserts a key-value pair to the store, by creating a new record at the *tail* of the hot log. Initially, our record is created in the mutable region (in-memory), and any subsequent updates are applied in-place.




Figure 2:  $F^2$  Architecture

As other records are appended to the log, our record eventually moves into the read-only region. If a user issues an update for this key, we then perform an RCU to copy the updated record to the tail of the hot log (i.e., mutable region). When our record is in-memory (read-only or mutable region), the read-cache is not used as read requests can be directly served from the hot log.

When a record that resides in the read-only region has not been updated for a while, it is inevitably flushed to disk (i.e., stable region), as the in-memory regions of the hot log are populated with newer records. Similarly to before, a user update will result in RCU in the mutable region. On the other hand, a user read request leads to the record being copied to the in-memory read-cache, after being read from the disk. This enables future user reads to be handled directly from the read-cache, avoiding any additional disk I/O operations. As long as the user continues to issue reads for our record, it remains in the read-cache (i.e., write-cold, read-hot record). Yet, if no reads occur for some time, our record is eventually evicted from the read-cache. At this point, any subsequent read request results in extra I/O to fetch the record from the disk again.

Assuming no further updates, our record eventually finds its way to the back (i.e., BEGIN) of the hot log. As more records are being inserted, the hot log grows larger in size, which inevitably necessitates moving the most write-cold records from the hot cold to the cold log. This is achieved through a background "hot log-to-cold log" compaction process, or more simply, *hot-cold compaction* (indicated by the green arrow in Figure 2). During this process, *live* records from the beginning of the hot log (i.e., compacted region) are copied to the *tail* of the cold log. Once all live records have been successfully identified and copied, the hot log is subsequently truncated, invalidating all records in the compacted region. Note that during hot-cold compaction, the tail of the hot log remains intact, and is able to fully accommodate other incoming user requests.

Once the hot-cold compaction process finishes, our record is now stored in the cold log. In fact, because the hot set for a skewed workload is typically small, the large majority of records end up in the cold log. Recall that the cold log resides (almost) entirely on disk, as keeping those (write-cold read-cold) records in-memory would not bring any real benefit. User update and read requests are handled similarly to when our record was stored in the stable region of the hot log. In particular, an update request from the user creates a new record to the mutable region of the hot log, while a read request copies our disk-resident record to the in-memory read cache (causing it to become read-hot write-cold). Assuming that no




Figure 3: Lifecycle of a Record in  $F^2$

such requests take place, our record remains cold, and eventually arrives at the back (i.e., BEGIN) of the cold log.

As the cold log is populated with more records, older non-live records need to be garbage-collected. To do so, we employ another background compaction process, namely *cold-cold compaction*. This process copies *live* cold log-resident records from the back (i.e., BEGIN) of the cold log to *its tail* (indicated by the red arrow in Figure 2). Once all live records have been compacted, we truncate the cold log, again invalidating all records in the compacted region. This way, non-live records are removed completely from  $F^2$ .

Notice how both hot-cold and cold-cold compaction copy live records to the cold log. In contrast to FASTER design, the hot log tail now experiences *no* contention from any internal compaction operations. Yet, because we allow both compaction processes to run concurrently, we now observe contention at the tail of the cold log. We discuss how we address this issue in the next section.

## 4 TIERED RECORD LOGS

In this section we describe  $F^2$ 's tiered hybrid log architecture. First, we introduce our new resource-efficient method for performing log compaction. Then, we describe how user operations are performed in this new, more complex design, emphasizing on correctness issues that may arise under concurrent execution. Finally, we highlight such an issue, where Reads are performed concurrently with cold-cold compaction, and explain in detail how it is handled.

### 4.1 Lookup-Based Compaction

As described previously, in  $F^2$ , live records are continuously compacted, using hot-cold and cold-cold compaction background processes. Given the large number of keys that hot and cold logs should handle (e.g., billion of keys for the cold log case), performing log compaction in an efficient manner is of utmost importance. Yet, doing so is non-trivial. Traditional log compaction algorithms identify live records by scanning the entire log, which in this case is prohibitively expensive. Moreover, they require additional resources to temporarily store the soon-to-be-compacted records in-memory, which further increases the memory footprint of the system.

To this end, we propose a new compaction method, *lookup-based compaction*, which addresses the above limitations. In particular, lookup-based compaction keeps only a small percentage of the to-be-compacted records in-memory, and leverages the hash index to identify whether each record is live or not. We also show that it is possible to leverage multiple threads to further speed up the

compaction process, while also enabling other user operations to be executed concurrently, without any correctness issues.

Given a source log and a (potentially different) target log, lookup-based compaction process consists of the following phases:

- (1) *Copying phase*: Starting from the beginning of the source log (oldest records), we sequentially scan a fixed [BEGIN, UNTIL] range. This range may represent a certain percentage (e.g., 10%) of the entire log. For each scanned key, we decide if it is *live* using the `ConditionalInsert` operation; if it is, then the record is copied to the tail of the target log.
- (2) *Truncation phase*: Once we process all keys in this source log region, we *truncate* the source log, by atomically setting the BEGIN address to UNTIL. Then, we invalidate all hash index entries that point to invalid addresses (i.e., `address < BEGIN`) using compare-and-swap (CAS) operations.

We make two important observations. First, during the copying phase, copies of the same live records may exist in both logs (for hot-cold compaction) or in both ends of the cold log (for cold-cold compaction). Second, log truncation takes place *only after* all live records have been copied to the target log. To this end, we argue that *only* the log truncation phase is considered "destructive". These observations will be useful later on, when we discuss correctness under concurrent execution. In the next paragraphs, we discuss how `ConditionalInsert` works, how we ensure correctness, and finally how our implementation is able to scale the compaction process to multiple threads in a latch-free way.

**4.1.1 ConditionalInsert.** The key invariant we must guarantee is that compacted records do *not* overwrite newer versions of the same record. Ensuring this invariant under concurrent latch-free user-operations (e.g., `Upserts`, `RMWs`) can be challenging. To this end, we introduce, `ConditionalInsert`, a new primitive that is used to satisfy the above invariant. Given a record and a `START` address, the `ConditionalInsert` operation appends the record to the target log, *if and only if*, there exist no record(s) with a matching key in the (`START`, `TAIL`] address range of the source log. If a record exists in this range, the operation aborts (i.e., becomes a no-op).

We next explain how we implement the `ConditionalInsert` operation and then study the guarantees it provides. For ease of exposition, we assume that `START` address matches the log address of a soon-to-be-compacted record. First, we perform a lookup at the index of the source log, to find the entry corresponding to our key, and we store a copy of that entry in the operation context. The index entry contains the log address of the most-recent record (of this hash chain) in the source log. Starting from this address, we follow this hash chain backwards, possibly issuing read I/O request(s). If at any point during this backwards search, we encounter a record that matches our key, we promptly abort the operation. Otherwise, we arrive either at the end of the hash chain or at some address outside the search range (i.e., `address < START`), meaning we are ready to copy our record to the tail of the target log.

Consider the case where the source and the target logs are the same, e.g., when doing cold-cold compaction. Appending our record to the cold log tail must now ensure that no other newer records with the same key were inserted in the meantime. Otherwise, it is possible that we accidentally overwrite a newer version with an older one (i.e., lost update anomaly). Hence, we leverage the

previously saved index entry. In particular, we first write the record to the log, and then perform an index update (using CAS), expecting that the index entry remained unchanged. If CAS fails, then newer records were inserted in this hash chain. In this case, we invalidate our written record, and restart our search on the hash chain, but *only* check the newly-introduced records on the hash chain. As before, if we encounter a (newer) record with a matching key, we abort; otherwise we try to update the index entry again. To complete a `ConditionalInsert` operation, we may have to retry several times; before either succeeding at appending the record, or aborting.

Now, consider the opposite case, where the source log differs from the target log, e.g., when doing hot-cold compaction. As before, we follow the hash chain backwards for any key matches, ultimately exploring the entire hot log address range. Now, we are ready to copy our record to the cold log tail. Since the records in the cold log are older *by-design*, they naturally satisfy our invariant and we can just issue an `Upsert` to cold log. The only implication of this is that we might `Upsert` non-live keys (e.g., if newer records entered the hot log in the meantime). While these superfluous writes might lead to slightly more disk operations, correctness is still ensured.

Our invariant is satisfied, even in the presence of concurrent `ConditionalInsert` operations. The main concern here is a possible record re-ordering at the target log (as a result of non-sequential record processing), leading to overwriting of newer records. First, we note that when compaction threads operate on records with different keys, records re-ordering poses no correctness issues. Now consider a scenario, where two threads,  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ , operate on two different records with the same key,  $R_1$  and  $R_2$ . We know that both records will be part of the same hash chain, and thus one record, e.g.,  $R_1$ , will be located in front (i.e., higher log address) of the other, e.g.,  $R_2$ , in the hash chain. This suggests that  $R_1$  is live, while  $R_2$  is not. When the two threads call `ConditionalInsert`, *only*  $T_1$ 's request will succeed. This is because by following the hash chain backwards,  $T_2$  will inevitably encounter  $R_1$  (i.e., same key) and thus abort. On the other hand,  $T_1$  will not encounter  $R_2$  at all, since it is located before  $R_1$  in the log. Generalizing this to many threads operating on multiple records with the same key, it follows that *exactly one* record for each key will be compacted to the target log.

Aside from satisfying our invariant, `ConditionalInsert` further enables our lookup-based compaction to be resource-efficient. Contrary to `FASTER`'s scan-based compaction, `F2`'s compaction does not require loading all records in the compacted region in-memory. Rather, it only loads a small *active* frontier of those records in-memory. For example, when compacting an 1GB log region, we typically need to store just 3 log pages in memory (i.e., 96MB). More importantly, we now do not need to scan the entire log to reason about the liveness of key(s). Rather, by leveraging the hash chains, we now perform only the absolute necessary disk operations. This effectively enables the compaction of large cold logs (e.g., 1B+ keys), which would otherwise be impossible. Finally, as we discuss later on, `ConditionalInsert` also constitutes the main building block for supporting `RMWs` in our new tiered design.

**4.1.2 Leveraging Multiple Threads.** Enabling multiple threads to perform log compaction concurrently, can lead to shorter compaction times. Given that our key invariant is satisfied even when issuing concurrent `ConditionalInsert` operations, here we focus

---

**Algorithm 1: User Read-Modify-Write (RMW) in F<sup>2</sup>**

---

```
1 function Status Rmw(key, input, ctx):
2   start_addr = hot_log.index.FindEntry(key).address;
3   /* Try RMW in hot log - return NOT_FOUND if no record */
4   rmw_status = hot_log.Rmw(key, create_if_not_exists=false);
5   if rmw_status ≠ Status.NOT_FOUND then
6     return rmw_status;
7   /* No records in hot log - try reading from cold log */
8   read_status = cold_log.Read(key, record);
9   if read_status == Status.OK then
10    new_value = UpdateValue(key, input, record.value);
11  else
12    new_value = InitialValue(key, input);
13  /* Previously stored log address is now invalid */
14  if start_addr < hot_log.begin_address then
15    goto RETRY;
16  /* Insert updated value; abort if new records are found */
17  ci_status = hot_log.ConditionalInsert(key, new_value, start_addr);
18  if ci_status == Status.OK then
19    return Status.OK;
20  RETRY:
21  return Rmw(key, input, ctx);
```

---

on how the participating threads can be coordinated in a latch-free way. During log compaction, we always operate on a small part (i.e., active frontier) of the compacted region, which is stored in an in-memory circular buffer. This buffer consists of a fixed number of *frames*, and each one is populated by a log page.

At first, we populate the frames with the first log pages in the compacted region of the source log. Threads start processing records from the first frame, onwards. For each frame, we keep a shared atomic counter that tracks the next record inside the page. Each thread participating in the compaction performs a fetch-add atomic operation to retrieve the next record in the page. For each record, the thread then issues a `ConditionalInsert` request. When the last record for this page has been processed, we close this frame, and we instruct threads to move to the next frame. Using F<sup>2</sup>'s epoch protection, we also register a trigger action for the closed frame, which is invoked when all threads have moved to the next frame. Once this occurs, this action issues an async I/O request to read the next page from the log into the (now safe) frame. We repeat this process, until we process the entire compacted region.

**4.1.3 Configuration.** Lookup-based compaction is performed as a background process, allowing any concurrent user operations to run unrestricted. The user can specify (1) the desired disk budget for hot and cold logs, (2) the trigger percentage (e.g., 80%), and (3) the compaction percentage (e.g., 10%). We use a background thread to continuously monitor the current log disk space utilization. Once a log approaches the disk size threshold (e.g., 80% of the target disk space), a compaction of the oldest records (e.g., 10%) is triggered.

## 4.2 Point Operations

Next, we describe how user operations are performed in our design.

**4.2.1 Upsert and Delete.** Implementing user `Upserts` and `Deletes` is straightforward. We first perform a lookup in hot-log index, then append the new record to hot log tail, and finally CAS the index entry to point to the our newly-appended record. If CAS fails, we

just mark the record as invalid and retry. Note that in `Deletes`, tombstone records are *always* inserted, even if the entry for that key does not exist in the hot-log index. The reason behind this is that (non-tombstone) valid records may still exist in the cold log.

**4.2.2 Read.** Performing user Reads involves more steps. We first issue a Read op in the hot log, since the hot log contains the most recent records. If a record is found there, we promptly return it to the user. If a tombstone record is found, we instead return `NOT_FOUND`. If no record is found in the hot log, then we issue a Read to the cold log. As before, we either return a valid record, or `NOT_FOUND`.

The above algorithm provides correct results on most cases. However, under concurrent cold-cold compaction, it is possible for a Read to return `NOT_FOUND` even if a record exists. We discuss this anomaly and provide a solution, separately in Section 4.3. Later in the paper, we also describe how Reads are modified, in the presence of a read-cache (Section 6.2).

**4.2.3 Read-Modify-Write.** Given an existing value and an (optional) input, read-modify-write (RMW) updates the value of a key based on the logic provided by the user. When issuing the request, the user also provides an *initial* value, in case the key does not exist in the store. The first step in an RMW operation is to locate the most-recent record with a matching key; in our tiered design, this record may reside in either hot or cold log. Unless the record found already resides in the mutable region of the hot log, where it is updated in-place, a new record with the updated (or initial) value is appended to the tail of the hot log.

Algorithm 1 details how user RMWs are performed. First, we issue an RMW request to the hot log (L3). Given that write-hot records are usually stored in the hot log, this makes the common case fast, since we can immediately return upon updating the record (L5). If no record matching our key exists in hot log, we refrain from creating a new record. Rather, we issue a Read request to the cold log (L6), since it is possible a record may exist there. If that is the case, we update its value (L8) using the user-provided logic (i.e., `UpdateValue`); otherwise, we use the initial value (i.e., `InitialValue`), which was previously provided by the user. Finally, we try to insert the updated record to the hot log tail (L13).

Concurrent to our RMW operation, newer records with the same key might have been appended by the user. To ensure that we always use the most-recent record for our key, we leverage the `ConditionalInsert` operation we presented earlier. In particular, at the very start of the user RMW (L2) we fetch and store the address where the hash chain begins in the log (i.e., `start_addr`). We later use that address to determine whether any new records has been inserted in the `(start_addr, TAIL]` range (L13). If that is the case, we abort and retry again the entire user RMW operation. Note that the hot log RMW request (L3) will now most likely succeed, since a record now exists in the hot log (assuming small chance of hash collisions). Otherwise, `ConditionalInsert` successfully inserts the updated record to the tail of hot log.

Note that it is also possible that by the time we return from the cold log (L6), `start_addr` is no longer valid. This can be caused by one (or more) log truncations, as a result of concurrent hot-cold compactions. If this rare event occurs, we retry the entire RMW user operation, as the `(start_addr, TAIL]` range is now undefined.




Figure 4: False-Absence Anomaly Example

### 4.3 False-Absence Anomaly

A cold log Read traverses the entire log, by following the hash chain backwards. However, it is possible to fail locating a record that is indeed present in the log, incorrectly returning NOT\_FOUND.

Consider the scenario depicted in Figure 4, where a Read operation is issued in the cold log (after a failed search in the hot log) for a given key,  $K_1$ . At the same time a concurrent cold-cold compaction is being executed. Assume that only a single record  $R_1$  for key  $K_1$  exists in the cold log, and it is located in at the very beginning of the cold log. The following events transpire in-order. First, thread  $T_1$  that performs the Read operation performs a lookup in the hash chain (i.e.,  $R_2$ ).  $T_1$  then issues a read I/O request to fetch  $R_2$  from disk. Unbeknownst to  $T_1$  at the time,  $R_2$  has a different key  $K_2 \neq K_1$ , i.e., due to a hash collision. While  $R_2$  is being read from disk, thread  $T_2$  performing the compaction, manages to copy all live records to the tail of the cold log. Thus a copy of  $R_1$ ,  $R'_1$  has been written to the tail.  $T_2$  then proceeds and truncates the log, invalidating  $R_1$ . Then,  $R_2$  is finally fetched from disk.  $T_1$  realizes that the log was truncated (e.g., by refreshing its local epoch), and also finds that  $R_2$ 's key  $K_2 \neq K_1$ . Now, it proceeds to follow the hash chain backwards, only to find that the previous address, originally pointing  $R_1$ , is now invalid (due to log truncation). Thus,  $T_1$  returns NOT\_FOUND, as it deduces that no record with key  $K_1$  exists in either hot or cold log. However, this is clearly incorrect, as  $R'_1$  exists in the cold log tail.

The above anomaly occurs because  $T_1$  is not aware of the concurrent cold-cold compaction. One way to prevent this would be by utilizing some elaborate locking scheme, where cold log truncation is performed only when no Reads are currently operating in the cold log. However, such an approach not only would be complex and expensive, as it would require coordination among all threads operating in the cold log, but also be amenable to starvation, potentially delaying log truncation indefinitely, e.g., due to a constant stream of cold-log requests. Another approach would be to temporarily store every live record in the compacted region into a separate in-memory store. However, the additional memory overhead associated with this is non-negligible, as a good chunk of cold log-resident records are also live (i.e., infrequently accessed keys).

Instead we opt for an alternative lightweight solution. We introduce a shared atomic counter `num_truncs` in the cold log, which tracks the number of log truncations that occurred. Now, once a Read is issued in the cold log, we atomically fetch (1) the TAIL address of the cold log, as well as the current value of `num_truncs`. We store these values in the read request context. Then, as before, we follow the hash chain backwards. Now, if we end up finding no record with a matching key, we then fetch the current value of `num_truncs` and compare it with the previously stored value. If they differ (i.e., log truncation occurred), we traverse *only* the newly-introduced part (as indicated by the previously stored TAIL




Figure 5: Two-level Index architecture, and Read op lifecycle.

address) of the hash chain (if any), to check if a record with a matching key was just compacted. Note that while using this scheme some Reads might do this bit of extra work to ensure correctness, the large majority will not, ensuring that the common case is fast.

## 5 COLD-LOG HASH INDEX

The majority of records in our target workload are accessed infrequently, which results in a large buildup of records in the cold log (i.e., through hot-cold compaction). For real-world workloads, this means that the cold log has to manage hundreds of millions, or even billions, of records. Indexing these records may lead to significant memory overheads. For example, indexing one billion cold keys using an in-memory hash index (similar to the hot-log index), requires at least 8 GiB (when assuming  $\sim 8$  bytes per key). Alternative key-value designs [5, 20, 21] may require an even greater memory amount, especially if they keep additional metadata per record.

To this end, we propose a *two-level* hash index design, which is shown in Figure 5. This design employs both main memory, and disk structures to index the records residing in the cold log. The key idea here is to perform in-memory indexing at a more *coarse-grained* level. In particular, we first opt to group multiple hash index entries together, creating a single *hash chunk*. Then, we use an in-memory component to index these chunks (1st level), while the actual chunks are stored on a separate disk structure (2nd level). Essentially, we advocate trading-off memory utilization for more disk I/O, in cases where our environment is memory-constrained and operations on the cold log are infrequent.

### 5.1 Index Organization

We implement our two-level index using an additional log-structured hash chunk store. Hash chunks are indexed in-memory, using a (now much smaller) hash index, while they are being stored (mostly) on disk using a separate HybridLog (i.e., *hash chunk log*). To facilitate concurrent updates on the index chunks, we employ a modest in-memory region (e.g., 96MiB) as part of the hash chunk log. Each hash chunk holds a fixed power-of-two number of entries, leading to all chunks being the same size. Finally, each chunk is also associated with a unique id, which is used to retrieve its position in the hash chunk log (via the in-memory hash chunk index).

This cold-log index design comes with three main benefits. Firstly, it enables us to reuse existing latch-free components, like HybridLog, and ensure correctness under concurrent thread execution. Secondly, by varying the size of the hash chunk, it allows for complete control over its in-memory overhead. For example, increasing (decreasing) the size of the hash chunks, results in fewer (more) hash chunks required to index the same number of keys. This naturally

leads to smaller (larger) in-memory hash index. Thirdly, its log-structured design allows for the use of hash chunks smaller than the disk block size (e.g., less than 4 KiB), while still maintaining low write amplification and efficient use of disk I/O bandwidth.

## 5.2 Index Operations

*Finding an Entry.* Finding a particular cold-log hash entry consists of (1) reading the hash chunk from the hash chunk log, and (2) extracting the respective hash entry. Given a key for a record in the cold log, we first compute its hash value,  $h$ . To find the hash chunk id for this key, we use the `chunk_id` bits of  $h$ . Then, we issue a Read request in the hash chunk log. Typically, this results in one disk read operation, unless the chunk happens to reside in the in-memory region of the hash chunk log. Once the chunk is read, we identify the hash entry for our key, using `chunk_offset` bits of  $h$ . By following the address field of this entry, we gain access to the respective hash chain in the cold log, and thus can read the most-recent record for that key in the cold log.

*Modifying an Entry.* Modifying a particular cold-log hash entry consists of (1) reading the hash chunk from the hash chunk log, (2) applying our update to the specific hash entry, and (3) writing the entire hash chunk to the hash chunk log. Notice how this process naturally fits the functionality of a RMW operation. Thus, similar to before, given a key, we first identify the hash chunk id for this key. Then we issue a RMW at the hash chunk log, which first reads the chunk, applies the update, and finally writes the new chunk in the log. If the hash chunk does not exist, it first creates an empty chunk (i.e., all hash entries are invalid), and then modifies the entry. It is worth noting that all hash chunk updates are *atomic*, as this is guaranteed by the underlying HybridLog design.

However, ensuring atomic updates in the granularity of hash chunks, is not enough for end-to-end correctness. Consider the case where two threads,  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ , operate on two cold log records with different keys (e.g., during cold-cold compaction), which are assigned to the same hash entry in the cold-index (e.g., due to a hash-collision). If both threads try to update the same hash entry simultaneously (e.g., as a result of copying their live record to the cold log tail), two separate RMWs are issued. Yet, in this case, only one update, i.e., the one that is applied *last* by  $T_2$ , will actually persist. This leads to a lost-update anomaly, i.e., for the update that was applied by  $T_1$ , since the now-updated hash chain does not include  $T_1$ 's record. This anomaly occurs because,  $T_2$  was not informed of  $T_1$ 's changes. To alleviate this issue, we implement a higher-level mechanism, which causes RMWs to abort and retry, if the hash entry was unexpectedly modified by some other thread. This mechanism is similar in spirit to CAS semantics: i.e., applies the update only if the current entry matches a previously stored one. Note that retrying RMWs incurs no additional I/O operations, as the recently-modified chunk would most-certainly be in-memory.

## 5.3 Index Configuration

We configure the cold-log hash index, such that we utilize around 1B of main memory per cold key. We set the size of each hash chunk to 256B, resulting in 32 hash index entries being stored in a single chunk (each entry occupies 8B). The number of chunks can be set depending on the number of expected unique cold keys.




Figure 6: Read-Cache Architecture and its Integration to  $F^2$

For example, for 250 million cold keys (memory budget is around 240MiB), one would need a total of  $\sim 8$  million chunks (assuming one entry per cold key). Indexing this many chunks in-memory, requires  $\sim 64$ MiB (assuming one entry per chunk). The remaining memory budget can be used to keep a fraction of the hash chunks in-memory (e.g., increasing the in-memory region of the hash chunk log). Alternatively, one may use part of this budget to increase the size of the in-memory read-cache. In this example, our two-level index leads to memory savings of  $\sim 1.75$ GiB, compared to indexing all keys in-memory like in FASTER. For 1 billion keys, the total savings would be close to 6GiB.

## 6 RECORDS READ-CACHE

The tiered log architecture enables the physical separation of write-hot and write-cold records. Read-hot records are handled using a *read-cache*, an in-memory component for serving read-hot write-cold records efficiently. We next describe its organization and the correct execution of user operations in the presence of concurrency.

### 6.1 Read-Cache Organization

Read cache is tightly integrated with the hot log and serves disk-resident records originally located in either hot or cold log. Its only goal is to provide fast access to the set of read-hot records, by avoiding issuing unnecessary read requests to disk. Thus, a read-hot record that is also kept in-memory (e.g., at the in-memory region of the hot log) is *never* inserted in the read cache, as it can be retrieved equally fast. Note that the read-cache records are merely *replicas* of the original disk-resident records; the latter are never removed from their position in the hot/cold log.

Read cache is an in-memory record log, implemented as a separate HybridLog, and thus only contains a mutable and a read-only region (Figure 6). Records are inserted at the tail of the log (i.e., mutable region), and eventually evicted at the head (we describe the eviction process later). If a record residing in the read-only region of the read-cache is requested again by the user, we update its presence in the read-cache, by copying it to the tail of the log. This gives our record a second-chance, and ensures that the most read-hot records are never evicted. To this end, our read-cache behaves similarly to a Second-Chance FIFO cache [37].

Adding records to the read-cache is achieved by extending the hot hash index chains to span both read-cache and hot log. In particular, the hot log index entries may now directly point to a record address in the read cache, which is typically followed by one (or more) records in the hot log. Note that in this case, *at most one* record in each hash chain is read cache-resident (we plan to address this limitation in the future). An index entry may also directly point to an address in the hot log, bypassing the read-cache altogether.

### 6.2 User Operations with Read-Cache

Our read cache is based on the key invariant that for a given key, it *always stores its most-recent record*. Next, we describe how user



operations are modified to take advantage of the integration of the read cache in our design, and how our invariant is ensured.

**6.2.1 Upsert, RMW, Delete.** When inserting a new record, we have to make sure that we also invalidate any record located in the read cache, in order to satisfy our key invariant. Therefore, for both Upserts and Deletes, we first traverse the hash chain invalidating any potential records in the read cache (by setting a bit in the record header), and then proceed as before (see Section 4.2.1).

**6.2.2 Reads.** We first issue a lookup for the key in the hot hash index, and then follow the respective hash chain backwards, similarly to before. If we encounter a *valid* record with a matching key in the read cache, we promptly return it to the user. Note that if this record resides in the read-only region, we also try to insert it to tail of the read-cache, and then conclude the operation. Otherwise, we continue the search in the hot log. If at any point we encounter a disk-resident record in either hot log or cold log, we first try to insert it to the read cache, and subsequently return it to the user. Alternatively, we return NOT\_FOUND. Note that inserting a record to read-cache may abort, because of other concurrent operations (e.g., Upserts). As before, we identify and handle such scenarios by relying on atomic CAS operations.

### 6.3 Read-Cache Records Eviction

Once the read cache is filled completely, records need to be evicted to make space for other incoming records. Yet, we have to ensure that both during, and after the eviction process, the system always remains in a consistent state.

Eviction is performed on a per-page granularity. For each record in the page, we first determine if it is valid; if it is, we skip the record. Otherwise, it means that the respective hash index entry points to this soon-to-be-evicted record, and thus needs to be modified to point to the hot log instead. To do so, we retrieve the next address in the hash chain, which always points to the hot log (i.e., at most one record per hash chain resides in read cache). Then, we CAS this address to the hash bucket entry. If CAS succeeds, we move to the next record. Otherwise, some other thread altered the hash chain in the meantime, e.g., by inserting a new record in the chain. Therefore, our record has been invalidated, and we again move to the next record. Note that multiple threads can participate in this process safely, as no two evicted records share the same hash chain.

## 7 EVALUATION

We evaluate  $F^2$  in many ways. First, we compare  $F^2$ 's performance, I/O amplification and thread scalability to leading key-value stores. Next, we evaluate its performance when the available memory budget is limited, and when varying the skewness of the workload. We then illustrate how  $F^2$  compares with the original FASTER design. Finally, we experiment how different choices for the cold-log index and read-cache affect  $F^2$ 's behavior.

### 7.1 Experimental Setup

**System.** We conduct all experiments on CloudLab [16], using a single c6525-100g node located at the Utah cluster. This node is equipped with a 24-core AMD 7402P 2.80GHz CPU, 128GiB of RAM, and a Dell 1.6TB NVMe SSD (PCIe v4.0) device [14]. The node runs

Linux v5.4.0 on an ext4 filesystem, and uses a disk block size of 4096 bytes. We also manually pin user threads to hardware cores.

**Workloads.** We use multiple variants of the Yahoo! Cloud Serving Benchmark (YCSB) [10]. In general, we experiment with 250 million unique keys, with 8 byte keys and 108 byte values. We evaluate the system performance using YCSB-A (50% reads, 50% blind updates), YCSB-B (95% reads, 5% blind updates), YCSB-C, (100% reads), and YCSB-F, (50% reads, 50% RMWs). We also briefly experiment with the YCSB-D read latest workload (95% reads, 5% inserts).

To model the skewness of real-world workloads, we use a *Zipfian*-based ( $\theta = 0.99$ ) and multiple *Hotspot*-based key distributions. For the latter, we mostly use a *hot set* containing 10% of all keys, but also experiment with different sizes (e.g., 2.5% – 20% of all keys). For all Hotspot workloads, the hot set is accessed 90% of the times, while the cold set 10%; inside the hot (cold) set, we sample the hot (cold) key uniformly. For each experiment, we load the dataset into the system, warm-up the system by invoking 20M ops, and then run each workload for 100M ops, measuring overall system throughput. We report average throughput in thousands of requests per second.

Unless otherwise noted, we set the available memory to 10% of the dataset set (i.e., 3GiB for our 250M key-value dataset). This is done via the exposed user configuration parameters of each system and further enforced via type 2 Linux cgroup [8].

**Baseline Systems** In general, we compare  $F^2$  against three state-of-the-art systems, SplinterDB [9] (commit 89f09b3), RocksDB v7.4.5 [6], and LeanStore [20] (commit 9f609e7). We tried to compare against Kvell [21], a point-optimized store, but its in-memory index could not fit in our desired memory budget. For such low-memory environments, SplinterDB can outperform KVell [9]. We also compare  $F^2$  with the original FASTER. We configure all systems to use direct I/O for reads and writes, and disable write-ahead logging, compression, and checksums (when supported). Disabling those settings enable us to distinguish the raw system performance from other overheads. For all three baselines, we try to tune their parameters as recommended by their documentations. Specifically for RocksDB, we enable optimizations for point operations, and then set its parameters as suggested by their tuning guide [36].  $F^2$ . We implemented  $F^2$  in C++ as an embedded library, evolving from the original FASTER C++ codebase. We leverage template meta-programming to avoid many runtime overheads, and we employ a large set of tests and scenarios to check the correctness of our implementation, under concurrent thread execution.

Unless otherwise noted, we configure  $F^2$  as follows. The in-place update region of the hot log is set to 90% of the log in-memory region (as in prior work [7]). We use 512MiB memory budget ( $\approx 4M$  hash buckets) for the hot-log index. We assign 512MiB to read-cache. We use just 64MiB for the in-memory region of the cold log. We configure the cold-log index to use 256B hash chunks, which are indexed in-memory using another 64MiB. The remaining budget ( $\approx 1.75GiB$ ) is mostly used for the in-memory region of the hot log. To trigger both hot-cold and cold-cold compactions, we set the disk budget of the hot (cold) record log to 5GiB (35GiB). Note that we use the above  $F^2$  configuration for all workloads to perform a fair comparing against the baselines, even if this configuration might not be the optimal performance-wise for every workload. For example, as we show in Section 7.6.2, trading  $F^2$ 's in-memory region




Figure 7: Throughput of  $F^2$  compared to baseline systems on skewed YCSB workloads, with 8B keys and 108B values, when using 24 threads (higher is better).




Figure 8: I/O Read & Write amplification for two Zipfian YCSB workloads.

of the hot log for larger read-cache, results in superior performance for read-intensive workloads.

## 7.2 Comparison to Baselines

**7.2.1 System Throughput.** We first evaluate the performance of  $F^2$  compared to the baseline systems when using all 24 CPU cores. Figure 7 shows the overall system throughput in thousands of requests per second, across all YCSB workloads for different skewed key distributions (Zipfian, Hotspot, Latest).  $F^2$  reaches on average  $1.78\times$  higher throughput compared to SplinterDB,  $4.61\times$  compared to RocksDB, and  $15.78\times$  compared to LeanStore, across all Zipfian workloads. For update intensive YCSB-A,  $F^2$  speedups originate from its tiered log-structured design. This enables fast ingestion speeds, while maintaining the most-frequently accessed keys in the in-memory part of hot log. For read-intensive workloads, YCSB-B & YCSB-C,  $F^2$  still manages to be around  $1.8\times$  faster than both SplinterDB and RocksDB, partially due to its read-cache. LeanStore, due to its page-level buffer pool, cannot effectively keep the (small) hot record set in-memory, as hot records are not always clustered together inside the same page, resulting in poor performance.

For Hotspot YCSB workloads,  $F^2$  achieves average speedups of  $1.66\times$  over SplinterDB,  $1.88\times$  over RocksDB, and  $12.30\times$  over LeanStore. Hotspot key distribution is shown to be more challenging for all systems, as indicated by the lower number of system throughput. This is due to the occasional operations on cold keys, where all are equally probable to be chosen (i.e., uniformly-distributed). For YCSB-A and YCSB-F,  $F^2$  manages to provide around  $2\times$  speedup (or more) over all baselines, but for read-intensive YCSB-B and YCSB-C, speedups are more modest (close to  $1.4\times$ ). This is attributed to the intermittent, continual access of cold keys, which (almost) always cause two disk I/O ops: one for fetching the hash chunk from the cold-log index, and one for retrieving the actual record from the cold log. Finally, for the YCSB-D read latest workload,  $F^2$  shows speedups similar to YCSB-A.

Overall, we observe that  $F^2$  can provide meaningful speedups across a variety of different workloads and skewed key distributions. We next analyze the I/O amplification of  $F^2$  and baseline systems.

**7.2.2 I/O Amplification.** Figure 8 shows the I/O read & write amplification for the benchmark round of YCSB-A and YCSB-B Zipfian workloads, as measured by `proc/iostat`. We observe that  $F^2$  reads  $2.8\times$  less bytes from disk compared to SplinterDB (or RocksDB) for the read-intensive YCSB-B. This is mainly due to the in-memory region of  $F^2$ 's hot log and its read-cache, which provide immediate access to hot records. We also see that  $F^2$  writes  $1.7\times$  less bytes to disk, compared to the best-performing system, SplinterDB, for




Figure 9: Concurrency Scaling of  $F^2$  compared to baseline systems, for Zipfian YCSB-A and YCSB-B workloads.

the update-intensive workload, YCSB-A. This is attributed to the in-place update region of  $F^2$ 's hot log, which avoids writing stale values to disk for write-hot keys, as well as its log-structured design, which aggregates multiple records (or hash chunks), before writing them to disk in larger (4KiB) blocks. Overall, we see that  $F^2$  makes more effective use of the disk bandwidth, which in turn allows serving more user requests.

**7.2.3 Concurrency Scaling.** We now evaluate the performance of  $F^2$  compared to the baselines, while varying the number of threads. Throughput for YCSB-A and YCSB-B Zipfian workloads is shown in Figure 9. We observe that  $F^2$  scales linearly from 1 to 8 threads, but between 8 – 12 threads the scaling flattens out, due to disk bandwidth saturation. RocksDB's scaling is linear for read-intensive YCSB-B workload, but sub-linear on write-intensive YCSB-A. SplinterDB scales well for both workloads, showing its superior ingestion behavior over RocksDB, but overall achieves lower absolute performance compared to  $F^2$ . Interestingly, we observe that when using 24 threads all systems make nearly full use of the underlying NVMe disk (as measured by `iostat`). Yet, as hinted before by the lower I/O read & write amplification,  $F^2$  manages to make better use of the available memory, which leads to higher throughput.

## 7.3 Memory-Constrained Environments

One important goal of  $F^2$  is achieving high performance even on memory-constrained environments. To this end, we now experiment with varying memory budgets, ranging from 750MiB to 4.5GiB (i.e., 2.5% – 15% of our 250M keys dataset), using YCSB-A and YCSB-B Hotspot 10% workloads. We use 24 threads, and configure the parameters of each system to adhere with the memory limit (we also impose this limit via Linux `cgroups`). In particular, for  $F^2$  we only increase the size of the in-memory region of the hot log, depending on the available budget, while keeping everything else constant (e.g., read-cache). The only exception to this is when operating




Figure 10: Throughput on memory-scarce environments, where the memory budget is 2.5% – 15% of total database size (30GiB), for Hotspot 10% YCSB-A & YCSB-B workloads.




Figure 11: Throughput on Hotspot 10% YCSB-A & YCSB-B workloads, when varying the size of the Hot Set to 1% – 20% of all 250M keys. Both axis in log scale. Higher is better.

on the 750MiB memory budget, where we disable read-cache altogether, to accommodate the hot log index and in-memory hot log region. For SplinterDB/RocksDB (LeanStore) we gracefully increase the size of the in-memory cache (buffer pool).

Figure 10 shows the throughput achieved by all four systems, with an increasing amount of available memory. We observe that  $F^2$  achieves the aforementioned goal. Given a memory budget of 750MiB, or 2.5% of 30GiB,  $F^2$  achieves 65% (85%) of the performance for YCSB-A (YCSB-B) when given 4 $\times$  more memory, while still performing 1.71 $\times$  (1.47 $\times$ ) better than the best system on the same budget. Perhaps surprisingly, we see that for very low memory budgets (i.e., 2.5 – 5%) RocksDB matches or outperforms SplinterDB. For YCSB-A,  $F^2$  scales linearly to higher memory budgets, as it manages to keep a larger portion of the hot set in-memory, while achieving larger performance improvements (e.g., 2.11 $\times$  faster than SplinterDB for 4.5GiB budget). For YCSB-B,  $F^2$  quickly saturates budget the disk bandwidth at 2.25GiB (7.5%), and further budget increase do not result in higher performance improvements. This is due to the fixed size of read-cache. Overall, we observe that  $F^2$  manages to achieve good performance, even in cases where the available memory is very limited.

#### 7.4 Varying the Workload Skewness

$F^2$  targets workloads with highly skewed key distribution. To better understand how  $F^2$  behaves under different skewed distributions, here we experiment with varying the hot set percentage (from 1% – 20%) for various Hotspot YCSB workloads. Similarly to Section 7.2 we use 24 threads, and limit the available memory to 3GiB. Figure 11 shows the throughput achieved by all four systems, when running

YCSB-A and YCSB-B (both axis in log scale). We observe that for small hot sets (e.g., 1 – 2.5%)  $F^2$  performs  $2.8 \times - 4.8 \times$  ( $2.5 \times - 4.4 \times$ ) more requests for YCSB-A (YCSB-B), compared to the best baseline system, SplinterDB. This is due to  $F^2$ 's effective caching of the hot set in-memory, which greatly reduces the disk operations. As we increase the hot set size,  $F^2$ 's performance gracefully degrades, as the hot set spills over to disk. Yet, even for large hot sets (e.g., 15 – 20%),  $F^2$  still manages to achieve  $\approx 1.5 \times$  ( $\approx 1.3 \times$ ) better performance over the best baseline(s), for YCSB-A (YCSB-B). Overall, we notice that  $F^2$  is robust to varying degrees of key access skewness, and can deliver substantial improvements.

#### 7.5 Comparison to FASTER

We now compare  $F^2$  to our original FASTER implementation. We use the same experimental setup and  $F^2$  configuration as in Section 7.2 (memory budget 3GiB, 24 threads). We configure FASTER with a fixed 1GiB hash index (# of tag bits is 5) and 1.75GiB HybridLog in-memory region (90% mutable region). To avoid exceeding the specific memory budget during compaction process, we further retrofit  $F^2$ 's lookup-based compaction algorithm (instead of the original scan-based one). FASTER triggers a background log compaction when the (single) log approaches the same 40GiB disk size.

Figure 12 presents the throughput achieved by both systems for both Zipfian and Hotspot 10% distribution. We also measured their I/O amplification. We observe that  $F^2$  is on average  $4.92 \times$  ( $1.93 \times$ ) faster than FASTER on Zipfian (Hotspot 10%) workloads. FASTER's lower performance on update-intensive YCSB-A and YCSB-F workloads is due to the more frequent compaction of write-cold records to the tail of the log, resulting in eviction of the write-hot ones. This is also reflected in FASTER's much higher read-amplification compared to  $F^2$  (i.e.,  $39.7 \times$  vs  $6.7 \times$ ), even when using the more efficient lookup-based compaction mechanism. For read-intensive YCSB-B and YCSB-C workload,  $F^2$  achieves better performance mainly due to its read-cache, and smaller hash chains (which result in fewer disk I/O read operations). Finally, even with  $F^2$ 's cold-log index writing hash chunks to disk,  $F^2$  writes 30% less bytes to disk compared to FASTER (i.e.,  $1.7 \times$  vs  $1.3 \times$  write-amplification for YCSB-A).

#### 7.6 Detailed evaluation of $F^2$

**7.6.1 Size of Cold-Log Index Hash Chunk.** An important piece of  $F^2$  is the cold-log hash index, which belongs on the critical path of a typical cold key request. Here, we evaluate how the size of the cold-log index hash chunk size affects  $F^2$ 's overall performance and I/O write amplification. Figure 13 shows the throughput (write-amplification) achieved by  $F^2$  when hash chunk size ranges from 64B to 4KiB, for YCSB-A and YCSB-B (x-axis in log scale). We observe that  $F^2$  achieves very high performance when using hash chunks of size 512B (or smaller), with the optimal perf. reached for 128B chunks. However, smaller hash chunks require higher memory utilization (e.g., 128MiB for 128B hash chunks), since a larger number of chunks now have to be indexed in-memory (assuming same number of cold keys). For bigger hash chunks, performance quickly degrades: e.g., for 1KiB (or larger) chunks, YCSB-A reaches only 50 – 85% of optimal performance. Write-amplification also increases linearly with the hash chunk size. This is expected, as  $F^2$  now has to write more bytes (i.e., hash chunk size) to disk every time we update a cold record. This also reduces the available disk




Figure 12: F<sup>2</sup> vs FASTER Performance Comparison on YCSB workloads.




Figure 13: F<sup>2</sup>'s I/O Write Amp and Throughput for Cold-Log Index Hash Chunk Sizes, Hotspot YCSB.




Figure 14: F<sup>2</sup> Throughput for increasing Read-Cache Sizes.

bandwidth for other more useful operations (e.g., fetching actual records from disk), further contributing to the poor performance.

**7.6.2 Size of Read Cache.** Throughout our previous experiments, we had fixed the size of the read-cache. For example, with 3GiB memory budget, we favored a large (i.e., 1.75GiB) in-memory region for the hot log, and used a small read-cache of 512MiB. However, this may be suboptimal for e.g., read-intensive workloads, which could greatly benefit from a larger read-cache. Here, given the same total budget of 2.25GiB for both the in-memory hot log region and read-cache, we experiment with trading off the size of the former for the latter. Figure 14 shows F<sup>2</sup>'s throughput when increasing the budget for read-cache (starting with read-cache *disabled*), for Zipfian YCSB-B and YCSB-C. We observe that compared to the original 512MiB read-cache, F<sup>2</sup> can deliver up to 44% (51%) higher throughput for YCSB-B (YCSB-C), if read-cache is configured properly. Specifically for the read-only YCSB-C, we see that even a small cache (e.g., 256MiB) can provide almost a 4× speedup over not using one. This is because with no updates, most records inside the in-memory hot log region can be read-cold. Interestingly, when using a read-cache size of 1280MiB (or above) throughput experiences a sudden spike. This occurs because the read-cache is now able to keep in-memory an (increasingly larger) subset of read-hot records that actually reside in the cold log. Reading those records would otherwise typically incur two disk I/O operations. Finally, it is worth noting that with properly tuned read-cache, F<sup>2</sup> achieves 2.35× (5.08×) speedups for YCSB-B (YCSB-C), compared to the original FASTER.

## 8 RELATED WORK

**LSM Trees.** RockDB [6] (derived from LevelDB [24]) is a popular, embedded, key-value store optimized for fast storage devices. It is widely deployed in production, can handle TBs of data, supports RMWs via a merge operator, and provides a multitude of customization options for tuning to specific workloads. SplinterDB [9] is modern key-value store, designed for NVMe devices, that is based upon a new data structure, STB<sub>e</sub>-tree, which further adapts the idea of tiering (as seen before in PebblesDB [34] and Cassandra [18]) to reduce write-amplification, while introducing a new flush-then-compact compaction policy. This design outperforms both RocksDB and PebblesDB on memory-constrained environments, when using small key-value pair workloads [9]. F<sup>2</sup> manages to further improve upon SplinterDB on skewed workloads, using a combination of highly-concurrent and memory-efficient components.

**Alternative Designs.** KVell [21] is a persistent key-value store that uses a B+ tree index to map every key to a page offset on disk. While it performs well on large key-value pairs, it does not

on smaller ones. It also suffers from high memory overhead, as it needs to index all keys in-memory. F<sup>2</sup> avoids this overhead by using its two-level indexing structure. LeanStore [20] employs an in-memory buffer manager to enable larger-than-memory workloads. To increase performance under concurrent thread execution, it leverages pointer swizzling, epoch-based page reclamation, and fewer latch operations. While very effective when the hot set fits in-memory, its performance degrades when the memory is scarce or when small key-value pairs are used. SILT [26] is a flash-based key-value store based upon a multi-level storage hierarchy to achieve small in-memory footprint. It combines a log-structured store, a hash table, and a compressed trie structure. However, unlike F<sup>2</sup>, it cannot handle internal operations concurrently with user requests, and it is not optimized with respect to write amplification.

**Hot-Cold Data Management.** We are not the first to provide separate management of hot and cold data [19, 23]. Siberia [17] (part of Hekaton [15]) manages hot data using an in-memory store and cold data using a page-level disk store. However, in contrast to F<sup>2</sup>, (i) it requires prior knowledge of the hot data through offline characterization, (ii) cannot adapt to changing workloads, and (iii) does not keep read-hot records in-memory. Anti-Caching [12] is another approach that keeps hot data at record-level inside a in-memory data store. Yet, it requires storing additional metadata for each evicted record, which proportionally increases the memory overhead. F<sup>2</sup> relies instead on the HybridLog to keep track of hot set in-memory, and does not keep any extra metadata. More recently, Zhou et. al. proposed a 2-TREE architecture [41], in which hot (cold) records are clustered together to create hot (cold) pages using a migration protocol that moves records across hot and cold pages. They show that their approach can greatly improve the memory utilization in the presence of highly-skewed workloads. However, their current design is single-threaded and it does not support hash indices. In contrast, F<sup>2</sup>'s design addresses non-trivial technical challenges to enable safe, latch-free, concurrent thread operation.

## 9 CONCLUSION

F<sup>2</sup> is a new concurrent key-value store design that evolves our original FASTER design to efficiently handle large skewed workloads on constrained memory and large fast storage devices. F<sup>2</sup> separates the management of hot and cold data, across both read and write domains, resulting in fast access for the hot working set and efficient disk behavior for the cold set. On YCSB workloads, F<sup>2</sup> delivers much higher performance compared to SplinterDB, RocksDB, LeanStore, and original FASTER, on memory-constrained environments, while also reducing the overall disk read and write amplification.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Lior Abraham, John Allen, Oleksandr Barykin, Vinayak Borkar, Bhuwan Chopra, Ciprian Gerea, Daniel Merl, Josh Metzler, David Reiss, Subbu Subramanian, Janet L. Wiener, and Okay Zed. 2013. Scuba: Diving into Data at Facebook. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 6, 11 (aug 2013), 1057–1067. <https://doi.org/10.14778/2536222.2536231>
- [2] Amitanand S Aiyer, Mikhail Bautin, Guoqiang Jerry Chen, Pritam Damania, Prakash Khemani, Kannan Muthukkaruppan, Karthik Ranganathan, Nicolas Spiegelberg, Liyin Tang, and Madhuwanti Vaidya. 2012. Storage infrastructure behind Facebook messages: Using HBase at scale. *IEEE Data Eng. Bull.* 35, 2 (2012), 4–13.
- [3] Sattam Alsubaiee, Yasser Altowim, Hotham Altwaijry, Alexander Behm, Vinayak Borkar, Yingyi Bu, Michael Carey, Inci Cetindil, Madhusudan Cheelang, Khurram Faraaz, Eugenia Gabrielova, Raman Grover, Zachary Heilbron, Young-Seok Kim, Chen Li, Guangqiang Li, Ji Mahn Ok, Nicola Onose, Pouria Pirzadeh, Vassilis Tsotras, Rares Vernica, Jian Wen, and Till Westmann. 2014. AsterixDB: A Scalable, Open Source BDMS. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 7, 14 (oct 2014), 1905–1916. <https://doi.org/10.14778/2733085.2733096>
- [4] Berk Atikoglu, Yuehai Xu, Eitan Frachtenberg, Song Jiang, and Mike Paleczny. 2012. Workload Analysis of a Large-Scale Key-Value Store. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGMETRICS/PERFORMANCE Joint International Conference on Measurement and Modeling of Computer Systems* (London, England, UK) (SIGMETRICS '12). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 53–64. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2254756.2254766>
- [5] Benjamin Berg, Daniel S. Berger, Sara McAllister, Isaac Grosf, Sathya Gnanasekar, Jimmy Lu, Michael Uhlar, Jim Carrig, Nathan Beckmann, Mor Harchol-Balter, and Gregory R. Ganger. 2020. The CacheLib Caching Engine: Design and Experiences at Scale. In *14th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 20)*. USENIX Association, 753–768. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi20/presentation/berg>
- [6] Zhichao Cao and Siying Dong. 2020. Characterizing, modeling, and benchmarking RocksDB key-value workloads at Facebook. In *18th USENIX Conference on File and Storage Technologies (FAST'20)*.
- [7] Badrish Chandramouli, Guna Prasaad, Donald Kossmann, Justin Levandoski, James Hunter, and Mike Barnett. 2018. Faster: A concurrent key-value store with in-place updates. In *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Management of Data*. 275–290.
- [8] Control Group v2. 2023. <https://docs.kernel.org/admin-guide/cgroup-v2.html>.
- [9] Alexander Conway, Abhishek Gupta, Vijay Chidambaram, Martin Farach-Colton, Richard Spillane, Amy Tai, and Rob Johnson. 2020. SplinterDB: Closing the Bandwidth Gap for NVMe Key-Value Stores. In *2020 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 20)*. USENIX Association, 49–63. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/atc20/presentation/conway>
- [10] Brian F Cooper, Adam Silberstein, Erwin Tam, Raghu Ramakrishnan, and Russell Sears. 2010. Benchmarking cloud serving systems with YCSB. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM symposium on Cloud computing*. 143–154.
- [11] Biplob Deb Nath, Sudipta Sengupta, and Jin Li. 2011. SkimpyStash: RAM Space Skimpy Key-Value Store on Flash-Based Storage. In *Proceedings of the 2011 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data (Athens, Greece) (SIGMOD '11)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 25–36. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1989323.1989327>
- [12] Justin DeBrabant, Andrew Pavlo, Stephen Tu, Michael Stonebraker, and Stan Zdonik. 2013. Anti-caching: A new approach to database management system architecture. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 6, 14 (2013), 1942–1953.
- [13] Giuseppe DeCandia, Deniz Hastorun, Madan Jampani, Gunavardhan Kakulapati, Avinash Lakshman, Alex Pilchin, Swaminathan Sivasubramanian, Peter Vosshall, and Werner Vogels. 2007. Dynamo: Amazon’s Highly Available Key-Value Store. In *Proceedings of Twenty-First ACM SIGOPS Symposium on Operating Systems Principles* (Stevenson, Washington, USA) (SOSP '07). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 205–220. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1294261.1294281>
- [14] Dell Enterprise Agnostic NVMe Drive. 2023. [https://dl.dell.com/manuals/all-products/esuprt\\_data\\_center\\_infra\\_int/esuprt\\_data\\_center\\_infra\\_storage\\_adapters/dell-poweredge-exp-fsh-nvme-pcie-ssd-users-guide7\\_en-us.pdf](https://dl.dell.com/manuals/all-products/esuprt_data_center_infra_int/esuprt_data_center_infra_storage_adapters/dell-poweredge-exp-fsh-nvme-pcie-ssd-users-guide7_en-us.pdf).
- [15] Cristian Diaconu, Craig Freedman, Erik Ismert, Per-Ake Larson, Pravin Mittal, Ryan Stonecipher, Nitin Verma, and Mike Zwilling. 2013. Hekaton: SQL server’s memory-optimized OLTP engine. In *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*. 1243–1254.
- [16] Dmitry Duplyakin, Robert Ricci, Aleksander Maricq, Gary Wong, Jonathon Duerig, Eric Eide, Leigh Stoller, Mike Hibler, David Johnson, Kirk Webb, Aditya Akella, Kuangching Wang, Glenn Ricart, Larry Landweber, Chip Elliott, Michael Zink, Emmanuel Cecchet, Snigdhaswin Kar, and Prabodh Mishra. 2019. The Design and Operation of Cloudlab. In *Proceedings of the 2019 USENIX Conference on Usenix Annual Technical Conference* (Renton, WA, USA) (USENIX ATC '19). USENIX Association, USA, 1–14.
- [17] Ahmed Eldawy, Justin Levandoski, and Per-Åke Larson. 2014. Trekking through Siberia: Managing Cold Data in a Memory-Optimized Database. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 7, 11 (jul 2014), 931–942. <https://doi.org/10.14778/2732967.2732968>
- [18] Avinash Lakshman and Prashant Malik. 2010. Cassandra: a decentralized structured storage system. *ACM SIGOPS operating systems review* 44, 2 (2010), 35–40.
- [19] Jongsung Lee and Jin-Soo Kim. 2013. An Empirical Study of Hot/Cold Data Separation Policies in Solid State Drives (SSDs). In *Proceedings of the 6th International Systems and Storage Conference* (Haifa, Israel) (SYSTOR '13). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 12, 6 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2485732.2485745>
- [20] Viktor Leis, Michael Haubenschild, Alfons Kemper, and Thomas Neumann. 2018. LeanStore: In-memory data management beyond main memory. In *2018 IEEE 34th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 185–196.
- [21] Baptiste Lepercq, Oana Balmau, Karan Gupta, and Willy Zwaenepoel. 2019. Kvell: the design and implementation of a fast persistent key-value store. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*. 447–461.
- [22] Justin Levandoski, David Lomet, and Sudipta Sengupta. 2013. The Bw-Tree: A B-tree for New Hardware Platforms. In *2013 IEEE 29th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)* (2013 ieee 29th international conference on data engineering (icde) ed.). IEEE. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/the-bw-tree-a-b-tree-for-new-hardware/>
- [23] Justin J. Levandoski, Per-Åke Larson, and Radu Stoica. 2013. Identifying hot and cold data in main-memory databases. In *2013 IEEE 29th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. 26–37. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE.2013.6544811>
- [24] LevelDB. 2023. <https://github.com/google/leveldb>.
- [25] Tianyu Li, Badrish Chandramouli, and Samuel Madden. 2022. Performant Almost-Latch-Free Data Structures Using Epoch Protection. In *Data Management on New Hardware*. 1–10.
- [26] Hyeontaek Lim, Bin Fan, David G. Andersen, and Michael Kaminsky. 2011. SILT: A Memory-Efficient, High-Performance Key-Value Store. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles* (Cascais, Portugal) (SOSP '11). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2043556.2043558>
- [27] Chen Luo and Michael J. Carey. 2019. LSM-Based Storage Techniques: A Survey. *The VLDB Journal* 29, 1 (jul 2019), 393–418. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00778-019-00555-y>
- [28] Lin Ma, Joy Arulraj, Sam Zhao, Andrew Pavlo, Subramanya R. Dullloor, Michael J. Giardino, Jeff Parkhurst, Jason L. Gardner, Kshitij Doshi, and Stanley Zdonik. 2016. Larger-than-Memory Data Management on Modern Storage Hardware for in-Memory OLTP Database Systems. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Workshop on Data Management on New Hardware* (San Francisco, California) (DaMoN '16). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 9, 7 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2933349.2933358>
- [29] Yoshinori Matsunobu. 2017. InnoDB to MyRocks Migration in Main MySQL Database at Facebook. USENIX Association.
- [30] Memcached. 2023. <https://memcached.org/>.
- [31] Changwoo Min, Kangyeon Kim, Hyunjin Cho, Sang-Won Lee, and Young Ik Eom. 2012. SFS: Random Write Considered Harmful in Solid State Drives. In *Proceedings of the 10th USENIX Conference on File and Storage Technologies* (San Jose, CA) (FAST'12). USENIX Association, USA, 12.
- [32] Rajesh Nishtala, Hans Fugal, Steven Grimm, Marc Kwiatkowski, Herman Lee, Harry C Li, Ryan McElroy, Mike Paleczny, Daniel Peek, Paul Saab, et al. 2013. Scaling memcache at facebook. In *Presented as part of the 10th {USENIX} Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI'13)*. 385–398.
- [33] Patrick O’Neil, Edward Cheng, Dieter Gawlick, and Elizabeth O’Neil. 1996. The log-structured merge-tree (LSM-tree). *Acta Informatica* 33 (1996), 351–385.
- [34] Pandian Raju, Rohan Kadekodi, Vijay Chidambaram, and Ittai Abraham. 2017. Pebblesdb: Building key-value stores using fragmented log-structured merge trees. In *Proceedings of the 26th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*. 497–514.
- [35] Redis. 2023. <https://redis.io/>.
- [36] RocksDB Tuning Guide. 2023. <https://github.com/facebook/rocksdb/wiki/RocksDB-Tuning-Guide>.
- [37] Andrew S Tanenbaum and Albert S Woodhull. 1997. *Operating systems: design and implementation*. Vol. 2. Prentice Hall Englewood Cliffs.
- [38] Stephen Tu, Wenting Zheng, Eddie Kohler, Barbara Liskov, and Samuel Madden. 2013. Speedy Transactions in Multicore In-Memory Databases. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles* (Farmington, Pennsylvania) (SOSP '13). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 18–32. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2517349.2522713>
- [39] Juncheng Yang, Yao Yue, and K. V. Rashmi. 2020. A large scale analysis of hundreds of in-memory cache clusters at Twitter. In *14th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 20)*. USENIX Association, 191–208. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi20/presentation/yang>
- [40] Geoffrey X. Yu, Markos Markakis, Andreas Kipf, Per-Åke Larson, Umar Farooq Minhas, and Tim Kraska. 2022. TreeLine: An Update-in-Place Key-Value Store for Modern Storage. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 16, 1 (sep 2022), 99–112. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3561261.3561270>
- [41] Xinjing Zhou, Xiangyao Yu, Goetz Graefe, and Michael Stonebraker. 2023. Two is Better Than One: The Case for 2-Tree for Skewed Data Sets. In *13th Conference*

*on Innovative Data Systems Research, CIDR 2023, Amsterdam, Online Proceedings.*