### Implementing & Flattening Nested LATERAL joins in DuckDB



Sam Arch, Mayank Baranwal, Arham Chopra



#### FLATERAL



#### Sam Arch, Mayank Baranwal, Arham Chopra



## 

#### Outline

1) LATERAL joins and why we need them for UDFs

2) Project Goals

3) Live Demo

4) Approach

5) War Stories

6) Future Work & Takeaways

### **User-Defined Functions (UDFs)**

```
CREATE OR REPLACE FUNCTION fib(x INT)
RETURNS INT AS
$$
DECLARE
  fib1 INT := 0;
 fib2 INT := 1;
 fib3 INT := 1;
BEGIN
 FOR i IN 1..x LOOP
   fib3 = fib1 + fib2;
   fib1 = fib2;
   fib2 = fib3;
  END LOOP;
 RETURN fib1;
END;
$$ LANGUAGE plpgsql;
SELECT fib(42);
```



#### Reusability Modularity 🗸 **Readability**

#### **UDFs are Slow**

#### No UDF Fast

#### Up to 10,000x slower



#### UDF Slow

### **UDF Inlining to the Rescue!**

```
CREATE OR REPLACE FUNCTION fib(x INT)
RETURNS INT AS
$$
DECLARE
 fib1 INT := 0;
  fib2 INT := 1;
  fib3 INT := 1;
BEGIN
  FOR i IN 1..x LOOP
    fib3 = fib1 + fib2;
    fib1 = fib2;
    fib2 = fib3;
  END LOOP;
  RETURN fib1;
END;
$$ LANGUAGE plpgsql;
SELECT fib(42);
```

WITH RECURSIVE run
(
(SELECT Tru
FROM LATER
LATEF
LATE
UNION ALI
(SELECT "re
FROM run A
LATEF
(SELE
FROM
) 45
WHERE "rur
)
SELECT "run"."
FROM run AS "ru
WHERE NOT "run'

```
("rec?", "res", "x", "fib1", "fib2", "i") AS
ue, NULL :: int4, "x", "fib1 1", "fib2 1", "i 1"
RAL (SELECT 0 AS "fib1_1") AS "let0"("fib1_1"),
RAL (SELECT 1 AS "fib2 1") AS "let1"("fib2 1"),
RAL (SELECT 1 AS "i 1") AS "let2"("i 1"))
esult".*
AS "run"("rec?", "res", "x", "fib1", "fib2", "i"),
RAL
ECT "ifresult6".*
M LATERAL (SELECT "x" AS "q2_2") AS "let4"("q2_2"),
 LATERAL (SELECT "i" <= "q2 2" AS "pred3 2") AS "let5"("pred3 2"),
 LATERAL
 ((SELECT True, NULL :: int4, "x", "fib1 4", "fib2 4", "i 4"
   FROM LATERAL
        (SELECT "fib1" + "fib2" AS "fib3 4") AS "let7"("fib3 4"),
        LATERAL (SELECT "fib2" AS "fib1 4") AS "let8"("fib1 4"),
        LATERAL (SELECT "fib3 4" AS "fib2 4") AS "let9"("fib2 4"),
        LATERAL (SELECT "i" + 1 AS "i 4") AS "let10"("i 4")
   WHERE NOT "pred3 2" IS DISTINCT FROM True)
    UNION ALL
  (SELECT False,
          "fib1" AS "result".
          "run"."x",
          "run"."fib1".
          "run"."fib2",
          "run"."i"
   WHERE "pred3 2" IS DISTINCT FROM True)
 ) AS "ifresult6"
"result"
n"."rec?")
res" <mark>AS</mark> "res"
ın"
"."rec?"
```

#### LATERAL Joins

```
WITH RECURSIVE run("rec?", "res", "x", "fib1", "fib2", "i") AS
        (SELECT True, NULL :: int4, "x", "fib1_1", "fib2_1", "i_1"
        FROM LATERAL (SELECT 0 AS "fib1 1") AS "let0"("fib1 1"),
             LATERAL (SELECT 1 AS "fib2 1") AS "let1"("fib2 1"),
             LATERAL (SELECT 1 AS "i 1") AS "let2"("i 1"))
         UNION ALL
        (SELECT "result".*
        FROM run AS "run"("rec?", "res", "x", "fib1", "fib2", "i"),
             LATERAL
              (SELECT "ifresult6".*
              FROM LATERAL (SELECT "x" AS "q2 2") AS "let4"("q2 2"),
                   LATERAL (SELECT "i" <= "q2 2" AS "pred3 2") AS "let5"("pred3 2"),
                    LATERAL
                    ((SELECT True, NULL :: int4, "x", "fib1_4", "fib2_4", "i_4"
                     FROM LATERAL
                           (SELECT "fib1" + "fib2" AS "fib3 4") AS "let7"("fib3 4"),
                          LATERAL (SELECT "fib2" AS "fib1_4") AS "let8"("fib1_4"),
                          LATERAL (SELECT "fib3 4" AS "fib2 4") AS "let9"("fib2 4"),
                          LATERAL (SELECT "i" + 1 AS "i 4") AS "let10"("i 4")
                     WHERE NOT "pred3 2" IS DISTINCT FROM True)
                      UNION ALL
                     (SELECT False.
                            "fib1" AS "result",
                            "run"."x",
                             "run"."fib1",
                            "run"."fib2",
                             "run" "i"
                     WHERE "pred3_2" IS DISTINCT FROM True)
                   ) AS "ifresult6"
             ) AS "result"
        WHERE "run". "rec?")
    SELECT "run". "res" AS "res"
    FROM run AS "run"
    WHERE NOT "run"."rec?"
```

#### For each LATERAL: For each row in LHS: **Evaluate** the RHS



## Why DuckDB?

```
WITH RECURSIVE run("rec?", "res", "x", "fib1", "fib2", "i") AS
        (SELECT True, NULL :: int4, "x", "fib1_1", "fib2_1", "i_1"
        FROM LATERAL (SELECT 0 AS "fib1 1") AS "let0"("fib1 1"),
             LATERAL (SELECT 1 AS "fib2 1") AS "let1"("fib2 1"),
             LATERAL (SELECT 1 AS "i 1") AS "let2"("i 1"))
         UNION ALL
        (SELECT "result".*
        FROM run AS "run"("rec?", "res", "x", "fib1", "fib2", "i"),
             LATERAL
              (SELECT "ifresult6".*
              FROM LATERAL (SELECT "x" AS "q2 2") AS "let4"("q2 2"),
                   LATERAL (SELECT "i" <= "q2 2" AS "pred3 2") AS "let5"("pred3 2"),
                   LATERAL
                   ((SELECT True, NULL :: int4, "x", "fib1 4", "fib2 4", "i 4"
                     FROM LATERAL
                          (SELECT "fib1" + "fib2" AS "fib3 4") AS "let7"("fib3 4"),
                          LATERAL (SELECT "fib2" AS "fib1 4") AS "let8"("fib1 4"),
                          LATERAL (SELECT "fib3_4" AS "fib2_4") AS "let9"("fib2_4"),
                          LATERAL (SELECT "i" + 1 AS "i 4") AS "let10"("i 4")
                     WHERE NOT "pred3 2" IS DISTINCT FROM True)
                      UNION ALL
                     (SELECT False,
                             "fib1" AS "result",
                            "run"."x",
                            "run"."fib1",
                             "run"."fib2",
                             "run" "i"
                      WHERE "pred3 2" IS DISTINCT FROM True)
                   ) AS "ifresult6"
             ) AS "result"
        WHERE "run"."rec?")
    SELECT "run"."res" AS "res"
   FROM run AS "run"
    WHERE NOT "run"."rec?"
```

#### HASH LATERAL JOIN JOIN





#### Flattening

#### You need a good query optimizer!

## Project Goals

#### Implement & flatten nested LATERAL joins

- **75%** Fixed depth LATERALs (i.e. depth = 2)
- **100% Arbitrary depth LATERALs**
- 125% Full UDF support (Recursive CTEs + LATERALs)



- **75%** Fixed depth LATERALs (i.e. depth = 2)
- **100% Arbitrary depth LATERALs**
- **125%\*** Full UDF support (Recursive CTEs + LATERALs)

\* T&C Apply (explained later)

#### Live Demo



![](_page_10_Picture_2.jpeg)

## Approach

![](_page_11_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### **Original Codebase**

- Binder: Not able to handle correlations in nested laterals
- Planner: Plans nested laterals in an incorrect way, causing failures
- Assumptions in the code on only one level of laterals

![](_page_11_Figure_6.jpeg)

#### ted laterals way, causing failures laterals

## Approach

#### • Binder:

- Bind laterals recursively
- Track correlations correctly
- Maintain correct depth information

![](_page_12_Figure_5.jpeg)

## Approach

#### • Planner:

- Change planning order: top-down
- Detect correlations correctly
- Push-down correlations through all the relevant nodes
- Rewrite column bindings

![](_page_13_Figure_6.jpeg)

### Validation

#### Tests

**Our Stress Tests (verified against UMBRA)** 

PostgreSQL tests for LATERALs and Subqueries

**DuckDB Tests for LATERALs and Subqueries** 

**DuckDB Regression Tests (for PR)** 

**DuckDB CI Tests (for PR)** 

SQLite Tests for LATERALs (the holy grail)

![](_page_14_Figure_8.jpeg)

### Now for the War Stories

#### A tale of misery, suffering and joy

![](_page_15_Picture_2.jpeg)

## Let's do flattening they said It will be easy they said

## - Mark Raasveldt (maybe not really)

### The Prologue

![](_page_17_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_2.jpeg)

### Reading the Codebase

# Especially with close to NO COMMENTS

![](_page_18_Picture_2.jpeg)

# After weeks of procrastinating and struggling with the code

#### And after multiple failed attempts

### Mark when he tells us "Godspeed"

![](_page_20_Picture_1.jpeg)

## Debugging Binder Code

![](_page_21_Picture_1.jpeg)

## Debugging Binder Code

#### And Logical Planner Code

![](_page_22_Picture_2.jpeg)

## Debugging Binder Code

#### And Logical Planner Code

![](_page_23_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### And Physical Planner Code

### When 3 million tests pass

![](_page_24_Picture_1.jpeg)

### But then 2 tests fail

![](_page_25_Picture_1.jpeg)

### But then 2 tests fail

#### 2 days before the deadline

![](_page_26_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_3.jpeg)

## Revamping the whole logic

![](_page_27_Picture_1.jpeg)

### Then all tests pass

![](_page_28_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_2.jpeg)

### **Future Work**

- Put in a Pull Request to DuckDB (refactoring required)
- Benchmark the UDFs in the ProcBench on DuckDB
- Compare DuckDB and Umbra on the ProcBench
- Convince the world to use UDFs

![](_page_29_Picture_5.jpeg)

... So that Sam can get his PhD :)

![](_page_29_Picture_7.jpeg)

## Takeaways

- The Binder/Rewriter is extremely tricky
  - But when it makes sense, it just works
- Extensive Testing & Rapid Prototyping go very far
- Drawing diagrams & (Constructive?) Arguing = Progress

- Real database development is HARD
- This is why DB companies pay us the big bucks

![](_page_30_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_11.jpeg)

### Questions?

![](_page_31_Picture_1.jpeg)