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## Problem: very large data

SELECT AVG(SessionTime)
FROM Sessions
WHERE City = 'New York'

- 100 million tuples for 'New York'
- Problem:
- High cost in execution time and space
- Idea: trade result accuracy for response time and space
- Sampling:
- 10,000 tuples for 'New York '
- return an approximate result (with error bound)
- E.g. appox. avg $234.23 \pm 5.32$


## Problems: approx. techniques

## efficiency v.s. flexibility of the queries

## SELECT AVG(SessionTime)

## FROM Sessions

WHERE City = 'New York'


All future queries are known in advance

Frequencies of group and filter predicates do not change over time

Frequencies of set of columns used for group and filter predicates do not change over time

## Problems: approx. techniques

## efficiency v.s. flexibility of the queries

## SELECT AVG(SessionTime)

## FROM Sessions

WHERE City = 'Urbana'


All future queries are known in advance

Frequencies of group and filter predicates do not change over time

Frequencies of set of columns used for group and filter predicates do not change over time

No future queries are known in advance

## BlinkDB

- "a distributed sampling-based approximate query processing system"
- Efficient
- ~TBs data in seconds
- with meaningful error bounds


## SELECT COUNT(*)

FROM Sessions
WHERE Genre = 'western'
GROUP BY OS
ERROR WITHIN 10\% AT CONFIDENCE 95\%

## SELECT COUNT(*)

FROM Sessions
WHERE Genere = 'western'
GROUP BY OS
WITHIN 5 SECONDS

## BlinkDB

- "a distributed sampling-based approximate query processing system"
- Efficient
- ~TBs data in seconds
- with meaningful error bounds
- More general queries
- Only assumption:
- "query column sets" (QCSs) are stable
- QCSs: columns used for grouping and filtering (ie. in WHERE, GROUP BY, and HAVING)


## BlinkDB Architecture



## Sample creation

- Construct stratified samples

1. higher possibility of missing under-representing groups

## Problem with Uniform Samples

| ID | City | Age | Session_Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | NYC | 20 | 212 |
| 2 | Urbana | 40 | 532 |
| 3 | NYC | 30 | 243 |
| 4 | Urbana | 40 | 291 |
| 5 | NYC | 20 | 453 |
| 6 | NYC | 30 | 293 |

```
SELECT AVG(SessionTime)
FROM Sessions
WHERE City = 'Urbana"'
```

Sampling_rate $=1 / 3$| ID | City | Age | Session_Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | NYC | 30 | 243 |
| 5 | NYC | 20 | 453 |

## Problem with Uniform Samples

1. higher possibility of missing under-representing groups
2. Error of each aggregate is NOT equal

| ID | City | Age | Session_Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | NYC | 20 | 212 |
| 2 | Urbana | 40 | 532 |
| 3 | NYC | 30 | 243 |
| 4 | Urbana | 40 | 291 |
| 5 | NYC | 20 | 453 |
| 6 | NYC | 30 | 293 |

Sampling_rate $=2 / 3$| ID | City | Age | Session_Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | NYC | 20 | 212 |
| 3 | NYC | 30 | 243 |
| 4 | Urbana | 40 | 291 |
| 6 | NYC | 30 | 293 |

## Stratified Samples (on City)

| ID | City | Age | Session_Time | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sampling_rate(NYC) = 1/4 } \\ & \text { Sampling_rate(Urbana) }=1 / 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | NYC | 20 | 212 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Urbana | 40 | 532 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | NYC | 30 | 243 | ID | City | Age | Session_Time |
| 4 | Urbana | 40 | 291 | 3 | NYC | 30 | 243 |
| 5 | NYC | 20 | 453 | 4 | Urbana | 40 | 291 |
| 6 | NYC | 30 | 293 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Assig | $\bigcirc$ | al sampl | ze to each gro | UPS |  |  |

## Stratified Samples (on City)

| ID | City | Age | Session_Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | NYC | 20 | 212 |
| 2 | Urbana | 40 | 532 |
| 3 | NYC | 30 | 243 |
| 4 | Urbana | 40 | 291 |
| 5 | NYC | 20 | 453 |
| 6 | NYC | 30 | 293 |



Sampling_rate(NYC) $=3 / 4$
Sampling_rate(Urbana) $=2 / 2$

| ID | City | Age | Session_Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | NYC | 20 | 212 |
| 3 | NYC | 30 | 243 |
| 4 | Urbana | 40 | 291 |
| 5 | NYC | 20 | 453 |
| 6 | NYC | 30 | 293 |

## Storage cost of stratified samples

- Build several multi-dimensional stratified samples
- increase query accuracy and latency
- n columns $\longrightarrow 2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ possible stratified samples

| ID | City | Age | Session_Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | NYC | 20 | 212 |
| 2 | Urbana | 40 | 532 |
| 3 | NYC | 30 | 243 |
| 4 | Urbana | 40 | 291 |
| 5 | NYC | 20 | 453 |

> [City]
> [Age]
> [Session_Time]
> [City, Age]
> [City, Session_Time]
> [Age, Session_Time]
> [City, Age, Session_Time]

## Storage cost of stratified samples

- Build several multi-dimensional stratified samples
- increase query accuracy and latency
- n columns $\longrightarrow 2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ possible stratified samples
- Solution:
- Find subsets of column sets that maximize the weighted sum of coverage of the QCSs of the queries $q$ _


## Optimization formulation



## System Overview



## Online sample selection

- Given a Query Q with specified time/error constraints
- BlinkDB generate different query plans for the same query $Q$
- How to pick the plan that best satisfies the time/error constraints?


## Strategy

- Select appropriate sample(s)
- execute the query $Q$ on small samples of those appropriate samples(s), in order to gather statistics about
- query's selectivity
- complexity
- underlying distribution of its query
- For each candidate sample
- construct an Error Latency Profile (ELP)
- statistically predict for larger samples


Sample Size (in MB)

## Example

- System has 3 stratified samples
- [date, country]


## SELECT AVG(SessionTime)

## FROM Sessions

WHERE City = Galena'

- [date designated media area for a video
- [date, ended_flag]
- Construct an ELP for each of the samples


Sample Size (in MB)
(a) dt, country


Sample Size (in MB)
(b) dt, dma


Sample Size (in MB)
(c) dt, ended_flag

## Implementation

enable queries with response time and error bounds

| return error bars and confidence interval | BlinkDB Query Interface |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hive Query Engine |  |  |
|  | Uncertainty | Propagation Sa | ple Selection |
|  | Hadoop | Shark <br> (Hive on Spark) | BlinkDB |
|  |  | Spark | etastore |
| create/update the set of random and multidimensional samples | Sample Creation and Maintenance |  |  |
|  | Hadoop Distributed File System (HDFS) |  |  |

## Evaluation Setting

- Conviva Workload
- 17 TB in size
- log of media accessed by Conviva users across 30 days
- A sige big fact table with $\sim 5.5$ billion rows $\& 104$ columns
- raw query log constitutes 19,296 queries
- TPC-H workload
- 1 TB of data
- 22 benchmark queries
- For both of the workloads
- partitioned data across 100 nodes
- $50 \%$ storage budget


## BlinkDB v.s. No Sampling

SELECT AVG(Session_Time) FROM Sessions<br>WHERE date $=$.<br>GROUP BY City



## Response time v.s. Error

- Uniform samples: $50 \%$ of entire data
- Single Column: stratified on 1 column
- Multi-Column: stratifies on <= 3 columns



## Time Guarantees

 ran each of them 10 times on 17 TB data set

## Error Guarantees

 ran each of them 10 times on 17 TB data set

