# *Introduction to Query Optimization*

Chapter 13

# *Overview of Query Optimization*

- *Plan*: *Tree of R.A. ops, with choice of alg for each op.*
  - Each operator typically implemented using a `pull' interface: when an operator is `pulled' for the next output tuples, it `pulls' on its inputs and computes them.
- Two main issues:
  - For a given query, what plans are considered?
    - Algorithm to search plan space for cheapest (estimated) plan.
  - How is the cost of a plan estimated?
- Ideally: Want to find best plan. Practically: Avoid worst plans!
- We will study the System R approach.

# *Highlights of System R Optimizer*

- Impact:
  - Most widely usedcurrently; works well for < 10 joins.
- Cost estimation: Approximate art at best.
  - Statistics, maintained in system catalogs, used to estimate cost of operations and result sizes.
  - Considers combination of CPU and I/O costs.
- Plan Space: Too large, must be pruned.
  - Only the space of *left-deep plans* is considered.
    - Left-deep plans allow output of each operator to be *pipelined* into the next operator without storing it in a temporary relation.
  - Cartesian products avoided.

# *Schema for Examples*

Sailors (<u>*sid*: integer</u>, *sname*: string, *rating*: integer, *age*: real)
Reserves (<u>*sid*: integer, *bid*: integer, *day*: dates</u>, *rname*: string)

- Similar to old schema; *rname* added for variations.
- Reserves:
  - Each tuple is 40 bytes long, 100 tuples per page, 1000 pages.
- Sailors:
  - Each tuple is 50 bytes long, 80 tuples per page, 500 pages.

# Motivating Example

```
SELECT S.sname
FROM Reserves R, Sailors S
WHERE R.sid=S.sid AND
   R.bid=100 AND S.rating>5
```

RA Tree:




Plan:




- Cost: 500+500*1000 I/Os
- By no means the worst plan!
- Misses several opportunities: selections could have been `pushed' earlier, no use is made of any available indexes, etc.
- *Goal of optimization:* To find more efficient plans that compute the same answer.

# Alternative Plans 1 (No Indexes)




- ***Main difference:*** *push selects.*
- With 5 buffers, cost of plan:
  - Scan Reserves (1000) + write temp T1 (10 pages, if we have 100 boats, uniform distribution).
  - Scan Sailors (500) + write temp T2 (250 pages, if we have 10 ratings).
  - Sort T1 (2*2*10), sort T2 (2*3*250), merge (10+250)
  - Total: 3560 page I/Os.
- If we used BNL join, join cost = 10+4*250, total cost = 2770.
- If we \`push' projections, T1 has only *sid*, T2 only *sid* and *sname*:
  - T1 fits in 3 pages, cost of BNL drops to under 250 pages, total < 2000.

# *Alternative Plans 2 With Indexes*




- With clustered index on *bid* of Reserves, we get 100,000/100 = 1000 tuples on 1000/100 = 10 pages.
- INL with ***pipelining*** (outer is not materialized).
  - –Projecting out unnecessary fields from outer doesn't help.
- Join column *sid* is a key for Sailors.
  - –At most one matching tuple, unclustered index on *sid* OK.
- Decision not to push *rating>5* before the join is based on availability of *sid* index on Sailors.
- Cost: Selection of Reserves tuples (10 I/Os); for each, must get matching Sailors tuple (1000*1.2); total 1210 I/Os.

# *Cost Estimation*

- For each plan considered, must estimate cost:
  - Must estimate *cost* of each operation in plan tree.
    - Depends on input cardinalities.
    - We've already discussed how to estimate the cost of operations (sequential scan, index scan, joins, etc.)
  - Must estimate *size of result* for each operation in tree!
    - Use information about the input relations.
    - For selections and joins, assume independence of predicates.
- We'll discuss the System R cost estimation approach.
  - Very inexact, but works ok in practice.
  - More sophisticated techniques known now.

# *Statistics and Catalogs*

- Need information about the relations and indexes involved. ***Catalogs*** typically contain at least:
  - \# tuples (NTuples) and # pages (NPages) for each relation.
  - \# distinct key values (NKeys) and NPages for each index.
  - Index height, low/high key values (Low/High) for each tree index.
- Catalogs updated periodically.
  - Updating whenever data changes is too expensive; lots of approximation anyway, so slight inconsistency ok.
- More detailed information (e.g., histograms of the values in some field) are sometimes stored.

# Size Estimation and Reduction Factors

- Consider a query block:

```
SELECT  attribute list
FROM  relation list
WHERE  term1 AND ... AND termk
```

- Maximum # tuples in result is the product of the cardinalities of relations in the FROM clause.
- *Reduction factor (RF)* associated with each *term* reflects the impact of the *term* in reducing result size. *Result cardinality* = Max # tuples * product of all RF's.
  - Implicit assumption that *terms* are independent!
  - Term *col=value* has RF *1/NKeys(I)*, given index I on *col*
  - Term *col1=col2* has RF *1/MAX(NKeys(I1), NKeys(I2))*
  - Term *col>value* has RF *(High(I)-value)/(High(I)-Low(I))*

# *Summary*

- Query optimization is an important task in a relational DBMS.
- Must understand optimization in order to understand the performance impact of a given database design (relations, indexes) on a workload (set of queries).
- Two parts to optimizing a query:
  - Consider a set of alternative plans.
    - Must prune search space; typically, left-deep plans only.
  - Must estimate cost of each plan that is considered.
    - Must estimate size of result and cost for each plan node.
    - *Key issues*: Statistics, indexes, operator implementations.