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Background

- Tree data structures in data systems
  - Access method and storage
  - Buffer-managed
Buffer Pool Utilization Issue: B-tree

- Buffer pool memory utilization issue on **skewed workloads** for B-tree
- A few hot records in a B-tree page with many cold ones
- Records keyed on domains with no spatial locality could spread across the key space
  - e.g., user-id
Buffer Pool Utilization Issue: LSM-tree

- Partially mitigates the memory utilization issue
- Frequently-updated data tend to cluster around the top of tree hierarchy
  - Good buffer pool utilization on skewed reads
- Stationary data get migrated down to the bottom
  - Poor utilization on skewed reads
How to improve the memory utilization of buffer pool for tree structures on skewed workloads?
This Work

● Principles
  ○ Multi-structuring to physically separate hot data from cold data
  ○ Actively migrate data at record-level in both direction

● Applications to B-tree and LSM-tree
1. **2B-tree for Disk-based DBMS**

- Compose two b-trees
  - Exposing single tree interface logically
- Record migration between two trees
- Size the hot tree to be close to buffer pool capacity
- Intuition: vast majority of the accesses go to the hot b-tree => increased utilization

![Diagram of 2B-tree for Disk-based DBMS](image)
Downward Data Migration

- Goal: evict cold records with low overhead
- Trigger: hot tree fills up
- Leverage efficient range scans to approximate a clock replacement
Upward Data Migration

- Goal: Migrate only *warm* records upwards to the hot tree to reduce churns
- Probabilistic approach
  - Migrate a sampled set of accesses to the cold tree
  - Intuition: warm records will be more likely to be sampled
Experimental Setup

- 2B-tree implemented using LeanStore buffer pool/B-tree
- 1GB buffer pool and 5GB data set
  - 20M records, 256-byte each.
  - 16KB page size.
- Hot tree sized to be about 90% of the buffer pool capacity
- Probabilistic sampling rate: 0.5
- Workloads:
  - YCSB hotspot
    - Vary the working set size
  - YCSB zipfian
    - Working set covers all data with zipfian access distribution
Point Operations

YCSB-Hotspot

(a) Read-Only

(b) Update

YCSB-Zipfian

(a) Read-Only

(b) Update
Range Scan Operations

- On-par with single b+tree throughput for range scan.
Summary: 2B+tree Improves upon Point Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Point Read</th>
<th>Point Update</th>
<th>Range Scan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B+tree</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B+tree</td>
<td>★★★</td>
<td>★★★</td>
<td>★★★</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Generalize to a N-Tree using LSM-tree

- A specific N-tree design using LSM-tree
  - Write-optimized
  - Better skew reads

- Augment LSM-tree with upward record migration for reads
  - Actively bring stationary but warm records closer to the top of hierarchy
Upward Migration in LSM-tree

- How to identify stationary and warm records?
- Two heuristics:
  - 1. Upon block cache miss: Likely in the bottom of the hierarchy
  - 2. Apply the probabilistic upward migration to identify warm records
Experimental Setup

- We call our proposal UpLSM-tree, built on RocksDB
- Comparison using 1 GB memory budget
  - UpLSM-tree: 1GB block cache
  - Vanilla LSM-tree: 1GB block cache
  - LSM-tree with in-memory row cache for level files on disk
    - 90% memory allocated to row cache
    - 10% memory allocated to block cache
Point Operations

YCSB-Hotspot

YCSB-Zipfian
Range Scan Operations

- On-par with vanilla LSM-tree
- Much better than LSM-tree with row caching
  - Row cache only helps point read operations
  - Block caching is more versatile
Summary: UpLSM-tree Dominates both Baselines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Point Read</th>
<th>Point Update</th>
<th>Range Scan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSM-tree</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★★★</td>
<td>★★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSM-tree w/ RC</td>
<td>★★★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UpLSM-tree</td>
<td>★★★</td>
<td>★★★</td>
<td>★★★</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Work

- Extend the architecture to non-tree-based structures
  - Hashing
  - Heap file with secondary indexes
Conclusion

- We studied improving memory utilization for tree data structures in data systems
  - Multi-structuring
  - Record-level migration
- Applications
  - 2B+tree for Traditional DBMS
  - A better LSM-tree
- Source Code: https://github.com/zxjcarrot/2-Tree
BACKUP SLIDES
Durability and Recovery of Migration

- No logical data changes
- Migration operation uses lightweight systems transaction
  - does not need to force log records to disk
  - Log persistence piggybacked on user commits
  - Analogy: btree split
2. Optimizing 2-Tree for Main-Memory DBMS

- Hot tree could stay completely in main-memory
  - Spill cold records out to disk
  - Serve larger-than-memory dataset
- A better Anti-Caching implementation
  - Scale to larger data set
  - Efficient range scan
- More details in the paper
Comparison

- Hot tree implemented using an in-memory btree, no buffer pool overhead
- Baseline: Original Anti-Caching implementation
  - LRU-based record eviction
  - Records stored unordered on disk
Point Operations

YCSB-Hotspot

YCSB-Zipfian

(a) Read-Only

(b) Update
Range Scan Operations

- Significantly outperformed Anti-Caching original design