

Query Processing

Exercises

13.2 Answer:

$$\Pi_{T.branch-name}((\Pi_{branch-name, assets}(\rho_T(branch))) \bowtie_{T.assets > S.assets} (\Pi_{assets}(\sigma_{(branch-city = "Brooklyn")}(\rho_S(branch)))))$$

This expression performs the theta join on the smallest amount of data possible. It does this by restricting the right hand side operand of the join to only those branches in Brooklyn, and also eliminating the unneeded attributes from both the operands.

13.4 Answer: We will refer to the tuples (kangaroo, 17) through (baboon, 12) using tuple numbers t_1 through t_{12} . We refer to the j^{th} run used by the i^{th} pass, as r_{ij} . The initial sorted runs have three blocks each. They are:-

$$\begin{aligned} r_{11} &= \{t_3, t_1, t_2\} \\ r_{12} &= \{t_6, t_5, t_4\} \\ r_{13} &= \{t_9, t_7, t_8\} \\ r_{14} &= \{t_{12}, t_{11}, t_{10}\} \end{aligned}$$

Each pass merges three runs. Therefore the runs after the end of the first pass are:-

$$\begin{aligned} r_{21} &= \{t_3, t_1, t_6, t_9, t_5, t_2, t_7, t_4, t_8\} \\ r_{22} &= \{t_{12}, t_{11}, t_{10}\} \end{aligned}$$

At the end of the second pass, the tuples are completely sorted into one run:-

$$r_{31} = \{t_{12}, t_3, t_{11}, t_{10}, t_1, t_6, t_9, t_5, t_2, t_7, t_4, t_8\}$$

13.5 Answer: r_1 needs 800 blocks, and r_2 needs 1500 blocks. Let us assume M pages of memory. If $M > 800$, the join can easily be done in $1500 + 800$ disk accesses, using even plain nested-loop join. So we consider only the case where $M \leq 800$ pages.

a. Nested-loop join:

Using r_1 as the outer relation we need $20000 * 1500 + 800 = 30,000,800$ disk accesses, if r_2 is the outer relation we need $45000 * 800 + 1500 = 36,001,500$ disk accesses.

b. Block nested-loop join:

If r_1 is the outer relation, we need $\lceil \frac{800}{M-1} \rceil * 1500 + 800$ disk accesses, if r_2 is the outer relation we need $\lceil \frac{1500}{M-1} \rceil * 800 + 1500$ disk accesses.

c. Merge-join:

Assuming that r_1 and r_2 are not initially sorted on the join key, the total sorting cost inclusive of the output is $B_s = 1500(2\lceil \log_{M-1}(1500/M) \rceil + 2) + 800(2\lceil \log_{M-1}(800/M) \rceil + 2)$ disk accesses. Assuming all tuples with the same value for the join attributes fit in memory, the total cost is $B_s + 1500 + 800$ disk accesses.

d. Hash-join:

We assume no overflow occurs. Since r_1 is smaller, we use it as the build relation and r_2 as the probe relation. If $M > 800/M$, i.e. no need for recursive partitioning, then the cost is $3(1500 + 800) = 6900$ disk accesses, else the cost is $2(1500 + 800)\lceil \log_{M-1}(800) - 1 \rceil + 1500 + 800$ disk accesses.

13.7 Answer: If there are multiple tuples in the inner relation with the same value for the join attributes, we may have to access that many blocks of the inner relation for each tuple of the outer relation. That is why it is inefficient. To reduce this cost we can perform a join of the outer relation tuples with just the secondary index leaf entries, postponing the inner relation tuple retrieval. The result file obtained is then sorted on the inner relation addresses, allowing an efficient physical order scan to complete the join.

Hybrid merge-join requires the outer relation to be sorted. The above algorithm does not have this requirement, but for each tuple in the outer relation it needs to perform an index lookup on the inner relation. If the outer relation is much larger than the inner relation, this index lookup cost will be less than the sorting cost, thus this algorithm will be more efficient.

13.9 Answer: We can store the entire smaller relation in memory, read the larger relation block by block and perform nested loop join using the larger one as the outer relation. The number of I/O operations is equal to $b_r + b_s$, and memory requirement is $\min(b_r, b_s) + 2$ pages.

13.10 Answer:

a. Use the index to locate the first tuple whose *branch-city* field has value "Brooklyn". From this tuple, follow the pointer chains till the end, retrieving all the tuples.

- b. For this query, the index serves no purpose. We can scan the file sequentially and select all tuples whose *branch-city* field is anything other than “Brooklyn”.
- c. This query is equivalent to the query

$$\sigma_{(branch-city \geq \text{“Brooklyn”} \wedge assets < 5000)}(branch)$$

Using the *branch-city* index, we can retrieve all tuples with *branch-city* value greater than or equal to “Brooklyn” by following the pointer chains from the first “Brooklyn” tuple. We also apply the additional criteria of $assets < 5000$ on every tuple.

- 13.12 Answer:** Let *outer* be the iterator which returns successive tuples from the pipelined outer relation. Let *inner* be the iterator which returns successive tuples of the inner relation having a given value at the join attributes. The *inner* iterator returns these tuples by performing an index lookup. The functions **IndexedNLJoin::open**, **IndexedNLJoin::close** and **IndexedNLJoin::next** to implement the indexed nested-loop join iterator are given below. The two iterators *outer* and *inner*, the value of the last read outer relation tuple t_r and a flag $done_r$ indicating whether the end of the outer relation scan has been reached are the state information which need to be remembered by **IndexedNLJoin** between calls.

```

IndexedNLJoin::open()
begin
    outer.open();
    inner.open();
    done_r := false;
    if(outer.next()  $\neq$  false)
        move tuple from outer's output buffer to  $t_r$ ;
    else
        done_r := true;
end

```

```

IndexedNLJoin::close()
begin
    outer.close();
    inner.close();
end

```

```

boolean IndexedNLJoin::next()
begin
  while( $\neg done_r$ )
  begin
    if( $inner.next(t_r[JoinAttrs]) \neq false$ )
    begin
      move tuple from inner's output buffer to  $t_s$ ;
      compute  $t_r \bowtie t_s$  and place it in output buffer;
      return true;
    end
    else
      if( $outer.next() \neq false$ )
      begin
        move tuple from outer's output buffer to  $t_r$ ;
        rewind inner to first tuple of  $s$ ;
      end
    else
       $done_r := true$ ;
    end
  end
  return false;
end

```

13.13 Answer: Suppose $r(T \cup S)$ and $s(S)$ be two relations and $r \div s$ has to be computed.

For sorting based algorithm, sort relation s on S . Sort relation r on (T, S) . Now, start scanning r and look at the T attribute values of the first tuple. Scan r till tuples have same value of T . Also scan s simultaneously and check whether every tuple of s also occurs as the S attribute of r , in a fashion similar to merge join. If this is the case, output that value of T and proceed with the next value of T . Relation s may have to be scanned multiple times but r will only be scanned once. Total disk accesses, after sorting both the relations, will be $|r| + N * |s|$, where N is the number of distinct values of T in r .

We assume that for any value of T , all tuples in r with that T value fit in memory, and consider the general case at the end. Partition the relation r on attributes in T such that each partition fits in memory (always possible because of our assumption). Consider partitions one at a time. Build a hash table on the tuples, at the same time collecting all distinct T values in a separate hash table. For each value of T , Now, for each value V_T of T , each value s of S , probe the hash table on (V_T, s) . If any of the values is absent, discard the value V_T , else output the value V_T .

In the case that not all r tuples with one value for T fit in memory, partition r and s on the S attributes such that the condition is satisfied, run the algorithm on each corresponding pair of partitions r_i and s_i . Output the intersection of the T values generated in each partition.