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Consider the following two tables:

- **Sailors (Sid, Name, Rating, Age)**
- **Reserves (Sid, Bid, Date)**

Each attribute (and pointer whenever applicable) is 20 bytes. Each page is 1000 bytes. There are 10,000 sailors, 40,000 reservations and a buffer of $M = 100$ pages.

**Assume the query:** Find the names of sailors who have reservations

```
SELECT Name
FROM Sailors, Reserves
WHERE Sailors.Sid=Reserves.Sid
```

Since there are 10K sailors and 40K reservations, a sailor has on the average 4 reservations (but it is possible that some sailors have more, while others have none).

Each **Sailors** record is 80 bytes and each **Reserves** record 60 bytes. There are 1000/80=12 sailors per page and 1000/60=16 reservations per page. Therefore, **Sailors** contains 10000/12=834 pages and **Reserves** 40000/16=2500 pages.
• **Sailors as outer:**
  - we read blocks of 98 pages of *Sailors* at a time (there are 9 blocks of sailors). For each block we scan *Reserves* (page-by-page) to find matching tuples. One extra page is allocated for output buffer.
  - Total cost: $834 + 9 \times 2500 = 23,334$ page accesses

• **Reserves as outer:**
  - we read blocks of 98 pages of reserves at a time. For each block we scan *Sailors* to find matching tuples. There are $2500/98=26$ blocks of reserves.
  - Total cost: $2500 + 26 \times 834 = 24,184$ page accesses
• Assume that we have a hash index on Reserves.Sid
• For each sailor, find the corresponding entry in the hash index on Reserves.Sid. We assume that this takes 1.2 page accesses per record of sailors (because of overflow buckets).
• Since each Sailor has on the average 4 reservations, and the hash index is non-clustering (secondary), we expect each Sailors.Sid to have 4 matching records in Reserves. Therefore, we need (1.2+4) page accesses per record.
• Total cost:
  - cost of reading Sailors + #records in sailors*5.2 =
    \[834 + 10,000 \times 5.2 = 52,834\]

**Bad solution**
Good solution

• Notice that since we do not care about the boats that a sailor has reserved, we can do an **index-only scan**
  - we do not need to retrieve any tuples from Reserves – if a Sailors.Sid exists in the index, it means that a sailor has at least one reservation).
  - **Total cost:** $834 + 10,000 \times 1.2 = 12,834$

• **Questions:**
  - What if the above query requested also the Bids?
  - What if there were an additional condition on Sailors, e.g., “WHERE Sailors.Rating=8”. 
• Sort *Sailors* on Sid

At each sorted run we read on 100 sailor pages but we only write 50 because we discard attributes Rating, Age (they are not needed for the join and are not required in the result)

**Cost:** \(834 + 417 \text{ (pass 0)} + 417 + 417 \text{ (pass 1)} = 2085\)
• **Sort Reserves on Sid**

At each sorted run we read on 100 reserves pages but we only write 34 because we discard attributes Bid, Date (they are not needed for the join and are not required in the result) - so we assume that we only need 1/3 of the space.

Cost: $2500 + 850 \ (pass \ 0) + 850 = 4200$

As each sorted page of *Reserves* is generated we can directly find the joining tuples of *Sailors* (in order to avoid writing the result of pass 1 in a temporary file and reading it again for the merge phase). Thus, for merging we only need to scan the sorted *Sailors* file.

• **Total cost:** $2085 + 4200 + 417 = 6702$ page accesses
• Considering the relatively large buffer that we have, we could further improve the performance by sorting the two files concurrently. That is, we perform the pass 0 of Sailors (and create 9 sorted runs). Then pass 0 of Reserves (and create 25 sorted runs).

• Then, we sort the two files at the same time; i.e., we allocate 9 buffer pages for the sorted runs of Sailors and 25 pages for Reserves. Once the first sorted page is created during pass 1 of Sailors, the algorithm will proceed by sorting Reserves and creating the first sorted page. The two pages can be immediately matched without the need to materialize any intermediate file.

• When one of the two pages is exhausted (all its records have been matched) the algorithm proceeds by generating the second sorted page for this file and so on. This method improves the previous one by avoiding the cost of writing and reading the sorted Sailors table in a temporary file.

  - Total cost: 6702 - (2*417) = 5868 page accesses
• **Assumptions:** $b_r$, $b_s$ sizes of files (in pages), $M$ main memory pages available

• **Cost:** $3(b_r + b_s)$

• $k_1 = \lceil \frac{b_r}{M} \rceil$, $k_2 = \lceil \frac{b_s}{M} \rceil$

• In order to be able to sort both files with just two passes it should be:

$$M > k_1 + k_2 \Rightarrow M > \sqrt{b_r + b_s}$$
• Use the smallest relation (\textit{Sailors} – 834 pages) as the build input
• The number of buckets \( n \) that we choose should be such that each partition for \textit{Sailors} fits in memory, e.g., we can use 10 buckets (so that the average bucket size is 83.4 pages)
• We first partition \textit{Sailors} with cost = 834+834
• Then we read and partition \textit{Reserves} with cost = 2500+2500. Note that each bucket of \textit{Reserves} occupies more pages (250) than the available memory, but we don't care (only the buckets of \textit{Sailors} should fit in memory).
• Finally, we read each bucket of \textit{Sailors} and match it against the corresponding bucket of \textit{Reserves}. We output the matching tuples to the user. Cost = 834 + 2500.
• Total Cost: \( 3(2500+834) = 10,002 \) page accesses
Main feature of hybrid hash join:
- Keep the first partition(s) of the build relation in memory

We again use *Sailors* as the build input. Assume we assign 90 memory pages to the first partition/bucket, so that we keep it all in memory. Cost = 834+(834-84) (we do not write the first bucket to memory)

We read *Reserves* page by page. Each record that belongs to bucket 1 is matched directly with the first bucket of *Sailors*. The other tuples go to the corresponding buckets and are written back to the disk. Cost = 2500+(2500-250).

Finally we read buckets 2-10 of *Sailors* and match them to the corresponding buckets of *Reserves*. Cost = (834-84)+(2500-250).

Total cost: 3(2500+834)-2(84+250)=10,002-668=9,334 page accesses
Main idea:
- Remove extra attributes (similar to sort-merge join)

When we partition Sailors, we discard the Rating and Age attributes since they are not needed for the query. The remaining file is 417 pages and each bucket of Sailors consumes 42 pages. Thus, we can keep the first 2 buckets in memory (84 pages). We also need 8 main memory pages for the remaining 8 buckets (plus one more for the input buffer).

Cost of partitioning Sailors: 834+417-84=1167

We read Reserves page by page. Each record that belongs to the first two buckets, is matched directly with the corresponding bucket of Sailors (which is in memory). The other tuples go to the corresponding buckets, after removing the useless attributes (Bid, Date).

After removing Bid, Date, the Reserves file has 1/3 of its original size: 834 pages. Each bucket is on the average 84 pages. We have to write to the disk all buckets, except for the first two (168 pages).

Cost of partitioning Reserves: 2500+834-168=3166

Finally, we read buckets 3-10 of Sailors and match them to the corresponding buckets of Reserves. Cost= (417-84)+(834-168)=999.

Total cost: 1167+3166+999 = 5332 page accesses