Cost-based plan selection

Exercise 1.1

(refer to the handouts for the full exercise)

$$\sigma_{a=1 \text{ AND } b=2 \text{ AND } d=3}(R)$$

Give the best physical plan (index scan or table scan, possibly followed by a filter) and the cost of the selection.

Cost-based plan selection

Exercise 1.1

(refer to the handouts for the full exercise)

$$\sigma_{a=1 \text{ AND } b=2 \text{ AND } d=3}(R)$$

Give the best physical plan (index scan or table scan, possibly followed by a filter) and the cost of the selection.

1. Cost of checking all conditions via a table scan + filter: $B(R) = 1000$ block I/Os.
2. Cost of an index-scan for condition $a = 1$, followed by a filter: $B(R)/V(R, a) = 1000/20 = 50$ block I/Os.
3. Cost of an index-scan for condition $b = 2$, followed by a filter: $T(R)/V(R, b) = 5000/1000 = 5$ block I/Os.
4. Cost of an index-scan for condition $d = 3$, followed by a filter: $T(R)/V(R, d) = 5000/500 = 10$ block I/Os.

Hence, we select plan (3).

Cost-based plan selection

Exercise 1.2

(refer to the handouts for the full exercise)

$$\sigma_{a=1 \text{ AND } b=2 \text{ AND } c\geq 3}(R)$$

Give the best physical plan (index scan or table scan, possibly followed by a filter) and the cost of the selection.

1. Cost of checking all conditions via a table scan + filter: $B(R) = 1000$ block I/Os.
2. Cost of an index-scan for condition $a = 1$, followed by a filter: $B(R)/V(R, a) = 1000/20 = 50$ block I/Os.
3. Cost of an index-scan for condition $b = 2$, followed by a filter: $T(R)/V(R, b) = 5000/1000 = 5$ block I/Os.
4. Cost of an index-scan for condition $c \geq 3$, followed by a filter: $T(R)/3 = 5000/3 = 1667$ block I/Os.

Hence, we select plan (3).

Cost-based plan selection

Exercise 1.3

(refer to the handouts for the full exercise)

$$\sigma_{a=1 \text{ AND } b\leq 2 \text{ AND } c\geq 3}(R)$$

Give the best physical plan (index scan or table scan, possibly followed by a filter) and the cost of the selection.

1. Cost of checking all conditions via a table scan + filter: $B(R) = 1000$ block I/Os.
2. Cost of an index-scan for condition $a = 1$, followed by a filter: $B(R)/V(R, a) = 1000/20 = 50$ block I/Os.
3. Cost of an index-scan for condition $b \leq 2$, followed by a filter: $T(R)/3 = 5000/3 = 1667$ block I/Os.
4. Cost of an index-scan for condition $c \geq 3$, followed by a filter: $T(R)/3 = 5000/3 = 1667$ block I/Os.

Hence, we select plan (2).

Cost-based plan selection

Task

(refer to the handouts for the full exercise)

$$\pi_{\texttt{D.dname},\texttt{F.budget}}(\sigma_{\texttt{E.hobby}='\texttt{yodeling}' \text{ AND } \texttt{E.sal} \geq 59000}(E) \bowtie \sigma_{\texttt{D.floor}=1}(D) \bowtie F)$$

Construct a sufficiently optimal physical query plan. Use disk I/Os as your optimization metric.

Cost-based plan selection

Task

$$\pi_{\texttt{D.dname},\texttt{F.budget}}(\sigma_{\texttt{E.hobby}='\texttt{yodeling}' \text{ AND } \texttt{E.sal} \geq 59000}(E) \bowtie \sigma_{\texttt{D.floor}=1}(D) \bowtie F)$$

Solution plan

Note: *We use a greedy approach*

1. Find best plan for each *selection* individually
   1. $\sigma_{\texttt{E.hobby}='\texttt{yodeling}' \text{ AND } \texttt{E.sal} \geq 59000}(E)$
   2. $\sigma_{\texttt{D.floor}=1}(D)$
2. Select the best pairwise join
   1. $\sigma_{\texttt{E.hobby}='\texttt{yodeling}' \text{ AND } \texttt{E.sal} \geq 59000}(E) \bowtie \sigma_{\texttt{D.floor}=1}(D)$
   2. $\sigma_{\texttt{E.hobby}='\texttt{yodeling}' \text{ AND } \texttt{E.sal} \geq 59000}(E) \bowtie F$
   3. $\sigma_{\texttt{D.floor}=1}(D) \bowtie F$
3. Join the previously selected first join with the third, remaining relation

Cost-based plan selection

Solution

Subexpression:

$$\sigma_{\texttt{E.hobby}='\texttt{yodeling}' \text{ AND } \texttt{E.sal} \geq 59000}(E)$$

Possibilities:

1. Use clustered BTree index on `E.sal`, then filter on `E.hobby`
2. Scan the table and filter on both conditions

Cost-based plan selection

Solution

Subexpression:

$$\sigma_{\texttt{E.hobby}='\texttt{yodeling}' \text{ AND } \texttt{E.sal} \geq 59000}(E)$$

First possibility: we use the clustered BTree index on `E.sal` to get the records such that $\texttt{E.sal} \geq 59000$, and a filter is applied to retain those with the correct hobby.

The number of tuples that satisfy the salary requirement is:

$$\frac{60000 - 59000}{60000 - 10000} \text{ selectivity } \times 50000 \text{ employees } = 1000 \text{ tuples}$$

Hence, the index scan has a cost of 18 block I/Os (rounding up):

$$\frac{1000 \text{ tuples}}{\left\lfloor \frac{2048 \text{ bytes/block}}{35 \text{ bytes/tuple}} \right\rfloor} = 18 \text{ blocks}$$

The filtering can be performed on the fly without any supplemental I/O.

Cost-based plan selection

Solution

Subexpression

$$\sigma_{\texttt{E.hobby}='\texttt{yodeling}' \text{ AND } \texttt{E.sal} \geq 59000}(E)$$

Second possibility: we forget about the index, and do the selection by scanning the table and filtering. This has a cost of $B(E)$ I/Os (rounding up):

$$B(E) = \frac{50000 \text{ tuples}}{\left\lfloor \frac{2048 \text{ bytes/block}}{35 \text{ bytes/tuple}} \right\rfloor} = 863 \text{ blocks}$$

Cost-based plan selection

Solution

Subexpression:

$$\sigma_{\texttt{E.hobby}='\texttt{yodeling}'\ \text{AND}\ \texttt{E.sal}\geq 59000}(E)$$

Possibilities:

1. Use clustered BTree index on `E.sal`, then filter on `E.hobby` (18 blocks)
2. Scan the table and filter on both conditions (863 blocks)

Intermediate result:

- The first method is indeed better than the second one.
- The estimated number of tuples in the output of this subexpression is:

$$\frac{60000-59000}{60000-10000} \times \frac{1}{200} \times 50000 \text{ tuples} = 5 \text{ tuples}$$

Cost-based plan selection

Solution

Subexpression

$$\sigma_{\texttt{D.floor}=1}(D)$$

Possibilities:

1. Use the index
2. Scan the table and filter on condition

Cost-based plan selection

Solution

Subexpression

$$\sigma_{\texttt{D.floor}=1}(D)$$

First possibility: use the index. The number of tuples that satisfy the selection condition is:

$$\frac{T(D)}{V(D, \texttt{floor})} = \frac{5000}{2} = 2500$$

Since the index is not clustered, this approach has a cost of 2500 block I/Os.

Second possibility: a table scan followed by a filter. This costs $B(D)$ block I/Os (rounding up).

$$B(D) = \frac{5000 \text{ tuples}}{\left\lfloor \frac{2048 \text{ bytes/block}}{40 \text{ bytes/tuple}} \right\rfloor} = 99 \text{ blocks}$$

The second possibility is indeed better than the first and is therefore preferred.

The estimated number of tuples in the output of this subexpression is 2500.

Cost-based plan selection

Solution

Now, we must determine an ordering for the joins.

1. $\sigma_{\texttt{E.hobby}='\texttt{yodeling}' \text{ AND } \texttt{E.sal} \geq 59000}(E) \bowtie \sigma_{\texttt{D.floor}=1}(D)$
2. $\sigma_{\texttt{E.hobby}='\texttt{yodeling}' \text{ AND } \texttt{E.sal} \geq 59000}(E) \bowtie F$
3. $\sigma_{\texttt{D.floor}=1}(D) \bowtie F$

Cost-based plan selection

Solution

Now, we must determine an ordering for the joins. We consider first all pairs of joins and keep those with the smallest cost.

$$\underbrace{\sigma_{\texttt{E.hobby}='\texttt{yodeling}' \text{ AND } \texttt{E.sal}\geq 59000}(E)}_{e_1} \text{ and } \underbrace{\sigma_{\texttt{D.floor}=1}(D)}_{e_2}$$

Note that there are only 8 buffers remaining, since we need 1 to execute the selection in e_1 and 1 for the selection in e_2.

The output of e_1 contains only 5 tuples, and can therefore be computed in 1 block. Since $1 = B(e_1) \leq M = 8$, we can apply the one-pass join algorithm. Its cost is

$$B(e_1) + B(e_2) = 1 + \frac{2500 \text{ tuples}}{\left\lfloor \frac{2048 \text{ bytes/block}}{40 \text{ bytes/tuple}} \right\rfloor} = 51 \text{ block I/Os}$$

Also, because there is no index on e_1 and e_2, we cannot apply index-based joins. The other join algorithms (nested loop, sort-join, hash-join) are always less efficient than the one-pass algorithm.

Cost-based plan selection

Solution

Second pair of joins:

$$\underbrace{\sigma_{\texttt{E.hobby}='\texttt{yodeling}'\ \text{AND}\ \texttt{E.sal}\geq 59000}(E)}_{e_1} \text{ and } F$$

We have 9 buffers at our disposal, given that we need 1 buffers for the selection in e_1. Just as for the first join pair, we can apply the one-pass join since the output of e_1 fits in 1 block. The actual cost is:

$$B(e_1) + B(F) = 1 + \frac{5000}{\left\lfloor \frac{2048}{15} \right\rfloor} = 38 \text{ I/O's}$$

It is also possible to use an index-join, since we have a clustered BTree on `F.did`. This method has a cost of:

$$B(e_1) + T(e_1) \times \left\lceil \frac{B(F)}{V(F, \texttt{did})} \right\rceil = 1 + 5 = 6 \text{ I/O's}$$

Here, the index-join is therefore preferred.

Cost-based plan selection

Solution

Third join pair:

$$\underbrace{\sigma_{\texttt{D.floor=1}}(D)}_{e_2} \text{ and } F$$

We have 9 buffers at out disposal, given that we need 1 buffer to perform the selection in e_2. It is not possible to use the one-pass join algorithm. The non-optimized version of the sort-merge join costs:

$$\begin{aligned} & 2B(e_2)\left\lceil \log_M B(e_2) \right\rceil + 2B(F)\left\lceil \log_M B(F) \right\rceil + B(e_2) + B(F) \\ = & \ 2 \times 50 \times 2 + 2 \times 37 \times 2 + 50 + 37 \\ = & \ 435 \text{ I/O's} \end{aligned}$$

We cannot use the optimization here, since there is not enough memory to perform the last merge of the merge-sort along with that of the sort-join:

$$10 \text{ necessary buffers} = \left\lceil \frac{B(e_2)}{M} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{B(F)}{M} \right\rceil \not\leq M = 9 \text{ available buffers}$$

Cost-based plan selection

Solution

In fact, we have a clustered B-tree index on F.did. It ensues that F is already sorted on this join attribute. Given that we just have to sort e_2, the cost is:

$$\begin{aligned} & 2B(e_2)\left\lceil \log_M B(e_2) \right\rceil + B(e_2) + B(F) \\ = {} & 2 \times 50 \times 2 + 50 + 37 \\ = {} & 287 \text{ I/Os} \end{aligned}$$

Here, we can perform the last merge of the merge-sort together with that of the sort-join:

$$7 \text{ necessary buffers} = \left\lceil \frac{B(e_2)}{M} \right\rceil + 1 \leq M = 9 \text{ available buffers}$$

The best cost we can achieve for our sort-merge join is therefore:

$$2B(e_2)(\lceil \log_M B(e_2) \rceil - 1) + B(e_2) + B(F) = 187 \text{ I/Os}$$

Cost-based plan selection

Solution

The cost of a hash-join is:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 2B(e_2)\left\lceil \log_{M-1} B(\mathsf{F}) - 1\right\rceil + 2B(F)\left\lceil \log_{M-1} B(F) - 1\right\rceil + B(e_2) + B(F) \\
= {} & 2 \times 50 \times 1 + 2 \times 37 \times 1 + 50 + 37 \\
= {} & 261 \text{ I/O's}
\end{aligned}
$$

It is also possible to use an index-join, using the clustered Btree index on `F.did`. This method has a cost of:

$$B(e_2) + T(e_2) \times \left\lceil \frac{B(F)}{V(F, \texttt{did})} \right\rceil = 50 + 2500 \times \left\lceil \frac{37}{5000} \right\rceil = 2550 \text{ I/O's}$$

(Notice that there is no index available on e_2, hence we cannot perform an index-join with e_2 as the inner relation)

Here, the optimized sort-merge join (using the sorted index) is therefore preferred.

Cost-based plan selection

Solution

The join-pair with the least cost is therefore:

$$\underbrace{\sigma_{\texttt{E.hobby}='\texttt{yodeling}'\text{ AND }\texttt{E.sal}\geq 59000}(E)\text{ and }F}_{e_3}$$

Where an index-join on `F.did` is used. Therefore, only 2 buffers are necessary (why?).

The estimated number of tuples in the output of this join is:

$$\frac{T(e_1)\times T(F)}{\max(V(e_1,\texttt{did}),V(F,\texttt{did}))}=\frac{5\times 5000}{5000}=5$$

Cost-based plan selection

Solution

We still need to find the best way to join e_3 with e_2

$$\underbrace{\sigma_{\texttt{E.hobby}='\texttt{yodeling}' \text{ AND } \texttt{E.sal} \geq 59000}(E) \bowtie F}_{e_3} \text{ and } \underbrace{\sigma_{\texttt{D.floor}=1}(D)}_{e_2}$$

For the computation of e_3 we use 2 buffers for the index-join. Hence, only 8 buffers remain available.

The output of e_3 contains only 5 tuples. The size of a tuple of e_3 is evaluated to $15 + 35$ bytes. Thus, the output of e_3 fits in one block. Given that $1 = B(e_3) \leq M = 8$, a one-pass join is possible. The cost thereof is:

$$B(e_3) + B(e_2) = 1 + \frac{2500}{\left\lfloor \frac{2048}{40} \right\rfloor} = 51$$

There is no index on the intermediate result. An index-join is therefore not to be considered. The other join methods cost always more than the one-pass algorithm.

Hence, the one-pass algorithm is preferred to perform the join between e_3 and e_2.

Cost-based plan selection

Solution

The projection $\pi_{\texttt{D.dname},\texttt{F.budget}}$ can be performed on the fly at the same time as the last join.

Notice that we did not need to materialize any of the intermediate results.