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Background
Sorting Algorithms
Parallel Sort-Merge Join
Evaluation
**SORT-MERGE JOIN (R\(\bowtie\)S)**

**Phase #1: Sort**

→ Sort the tuples of \(R\) and \(S\) based on the join key(s).

**Phase #2: Merge**

→ Maintain two iterators (one per sorted relation) and compare tuples at each position.
→ The outer relation \(R\) only needs to be scanned once.
SORT-MERGE JOIN (R⋈ S)
PARALLEL SORT-MERGE JOINS

Sorting is the most expensive part.

Use hardware correctly to speed up the join algorithm as much as possible.
→ Utilize as many CPU cores as possible.
→ Be mindful of NUMA boundaries.
→ Use SIMD instructions where applicable.
PARALLEL SORT-MERGE JOIN (R*$S$)

Phase #1: Partitioning (optional)
→ Partition R and assign them to workers / cores.
→ Can use the radix partitioning approach discussed last class.

Phase #2: Sort
→ Sort the tuples of R and S based on the join key.

Phase #3: Merge
→ Scan the sorted relations and compare tuples.
→ The outer relation R only needs to be scanned once.
SORT PHASE

Quicksort is probably what most DBMSs will use. Mergesort is good but requires $O(N)$ additional storage for intermediate results.

We will first discuss a mergesort implementation that takes advantage of NUMA and parallel cores for in-memory data.
CACHE-CONSCIOUS SORTING

Level #1: In-Register Sorting
→ Sort runs that fit into CPU registers.

Level #2: In-Cache Sorting
→ Merge Level #1 output into runs that fit into CPU caches.
→ Repeat until sorted runs are ½ cache size.

Level #3: Out-of-Cache Sorting
→ Used when the runs of Level #2 exceed the size of caches.

SORT VS. HASH REVISITED: FAST JOIN IMPLEMENTATION
ON MODERN MULTI-CORE CPUS
VLDB 2009
CACHE-CONSCIOUS SORTING
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LEVEL #1 – SORTING NETWORKS

Abstract model for sorting keys.
→ Fixed wiring “paths” for lists with the same # of elements.
→ Efficient to execute on modern CPUs because of limited data dependencies and no branches.

**Input**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Output**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```
orig = [9,5,3,6]
wires[0] = min(orig[0], orig[1])
wires[1] = max(orig[0], orig[1])
wires[2] = min(orig[2], orig[3])
wires[3] = max(orig[2], orig[3])

output[0] = min(wires[0], wires[2])
wires[2] = max(wires[0], wires[2])
wires[1] = min(wires[1], wires[3])
output[3] = max(wires[1], wires[3])

output[1] = min(wires[1], wires[2])
output[2] = max(wires[1], wires[2])
```
<64-bit Join Key, 64-bit Tuple Pointer>
4-element run

Sort Across Registers

Instructions:
→ 4 LOAD
LEVEL #1 - SORTING NETWORKS

4-element run

Sort Across Registers

Instructions:
→ 4 LOAD

Instructions:
→ 10 MIN/MAX
**LEVEL #1 - SORTING NETWORKS**

### 4-element run

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sort Across Registers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transpose Registers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructions:**

- → **4 LOAD**
- → **10 MIN/MAX**
- → **8 SHUFFLE**
- → **4 STORE**
LEVEL #2 – BITONIC MERGE NETWORK

Similar technique as a Sorting Network but merges two locally-sorted lists into a globally-sorted list.

Can expand network to merge progressively larger lists up to ½ LLC size.

Intel’s Measurements
→ 2.25–3.5× speed-up over SISD implementation.
LEVEL #2 - BITONIC MERGE NETWORK

Input

Sorted Run
8
11
14
21
12
9
5
1

Reverse Sorted Run

SHUFFLE

Sorted Run
1
1
8
9
11
12
14
21

min/max
min/max
min/max
LEVEL #3 - MULTI-WAY MERGING

Use the Bitonic Merge Networks but split the process up into tasks.
→ Still one worker thread per core.
→ Link together tasks with a cache-sized FIFO queue.

A task blocks when either its input queue is empty, or its output queue is full.
Requires more CPU instructions but brings bandwidth and compute into balance.
LEVEL #3 - MULTI-WAY MERGING

Sorted Runs

Cache-Sized Queues

MERGE

MERGE

MERGE

MERGE

MERGE

MERGE

MERGE

MERGE
IN-PLACE SUPERSCALAR SAMPLESORT

The IPS$^4$o algorithm (2017) recursively partition relation by sampling keys to determine partition boundaries.

→ Copies data into output buffers during the partitioning phases.
→ When a buffer gets full, the DBMS writes it back into portions of its existing input buffers instead of allocating a new buffer.

This is the sorting algorithm that we used in CMU's NoisePage DBMS (RIP).
VECTORIZED QUICKSORT

**Google vqsort** (2022)
→ Use sorting network for less than 256 keys.
→ Based on **Google Highway** library to provide support for different ISAs and SIMD register sizes.
→ Claims to be 1.59x faster than IPS\(^4\)o.

**Intel x86-simd-sort** (2022)
→ Aggressive use of AVX512 instructions.
MERGE PHASE

Iterate through the outer table and inner table in lockstep and compare join keys.
May need to backtrack if there are duplicates.

The DBMS can execute this phase in parallel using multiple workers without synchronization if there are separate output buffers.
SORT-MERGE JOIN VARIANTS

Multi-Way Sort-Merge (M-WAY)

Multi-Pass Sort-Merge (M-PASS)

Massively Parallel Sort-Merge (MPSM)
MULTI-WAY SORT-MERGE

Outer Table
→ Each core sorts in parallel on local data (levels #1/#2).
→ Redistribute sorted runs across cores using range partitioning then perform **multi-way merge** (level #3).

Inner Table
→ Same as outer table.

Merge phase is between matching pairs of chunks of outer/inner tables at each core.
MULTI-WAY SORT-MERGE

Local-NUMA Partitioning  Sort
MULTI-WAY SORT-MERGE

Local-NUMA Partitioning  Sort  Multi-Way Merge
MULTI-WAY SORT-MERGE

Local-NUMA Partitioning  Sort  Multi-Way Merge
MULTI-WAY SORT-MERGE

Local-NUMA Partitioning | Sort | Multi-Way Merge | Same steps as Outer Table

- Local-NUMA Partitioning
- Sort
- Multi-Way Merge
- Same steps as Outer Table

CMU-DB
15-721 (Spring 2023)
MULTI-WAY SORT-MERGE

Local-NUMA Partitioning  Sort  Multi-Way Merge  Local Merge Join  Same steps as Outer Table

CMU-DB
15-721 (Spring 2023)
MULTI-PASS SORT-MERGE

Outer Table
→ Same level #1/#2 sorting as previous Multi-Way Merge.
→ But instead of redistributing data across cores, perform a global **multi-pass naïve merge** on sorted runs.

Inner Table
→ Same as outer table.

Merge phase is between matching pairs of chunks of outer table and inner table.
MULTI-PASS SORT-MERGE

Local-NUMA Partitioning → Sort → Global Merge Join → Sort → Local-NUMA Partitioning
MASSIVELY PARALLEL SORT-MERGE

Outer Table
→ Range-partition outer table and redistribute to cores.
→ Each core sorts then in parallel on their local partitions.

Inner Table
→ Not redistributed like outer table.
→ Each core sorts its local data.

Merge phase is between entire sorted run of outer table and a segment of inner table.
MASSIVELY PARALLEL SORT-MERGE

Cross-NUMA Partitioning → Sort → Cross-Partition Merge Join → Locally Sorted Partitions

Globally Sorted
HYPER's RULES FOR PARALLELIZATION

Rule #1: No random writes to non-local memory
→ Chunk the data, redistribute, and then each core sorts/works on local data.

Rule #2: Only perform sequential reads on non-local memory
→ This allows the hardware prefetcher to hide remote access latency.

Rule #3: No core should ever wait for another
→ Avoid fine-grained latching or sync barriers.

Source: Martina-Cezara Albutiu
EVALUATION

Compare the different join algorithms using a synthetic data set.

→ **Sort-Merge**: M-WAY, M-PASS, MPSM
→ **Hash**: Radix Partitioning

Hardware:
→ 4 Socket Intel Xeon E4640 @ 2.4GHz
→ 8 Cores with 2 Threads Per Core
→ 512 GB of DRAM
COMPARISON OF SORT-MERGE JOINS

Workload: 1.6B ⋈ 128M (8-byte tuples)

Throughput (M Tuples/sec)

Cycles / Output Tuple

Partition  Sort  S-Merge  J-Merge  Throughput

M-WAY  M-PASS  MPSM

Source: Cagri Balkesen
M-WAY JOIN VS. MPSM JOIN

Workload: 1.6B \bowtie 128M (8-byte tuples)

- Multi-Way (M-WAY)
- Massively Parallel (MPSM)

Throughput (M Tuples/sec)

Number of Threads

↑Higher is Better

Source: Cagri Balkesen

Hyper-Threading
SORT-MERGE JOIN VS. HASH JOIN

Workload: Different Table Sizes (8-byte tuples)

Source: Cagri Balkesen
SORT-MERGE JOIN VS. HASH JOIN

Varying the size of the input relations

- Multi-Way Sort-Merge Join
- Radix Hash Join

Throughput (M Tuples/sec) vs. Millions of Tuples

Source: Cagri Balkesen
JOIN COMPARISON ($R \bowtie S$)

4× Intel Xeon CPU E7-4870v2 (Only 32 cores)
$|R|=128M, |S|=1280M$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Throughput (M tuples/sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sort-Merge</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concise Hash</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radix-Part (Chained)</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-Part (Linear)</td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Stefan Schuh
PARTING THOUGHTS

Hash join is (almost) always the superior choice for a join algorithm on modern hardware.
→ Most enterprise OLAP DBMS support both.

We did not consider the impact of queries where the output needs to be sorted.

We will see sort-merge joins again next class…
Worst-Case Optimal Joins (aka multi-way joins)