2-Way Sort

- Problem
 - You have some large number (e.g., 3072) pages of data to sort
 - You only have a small number (e.g., 3) pages to do it
 - How do you do this?
- Idea 1: Sort/Merge
 - Phase 1:
 - Load 3 pages of data
 - Sort everything
 - Flush out this new **sorted run** of size 3 to disk
 - Repeat until all data touched once
 - Phase 2
 - Pick 2 sorted runs of size 3 and merge them together
 - Requires 2 pages from the 2 sorted runs
 - Requires 1 output page
 - As soon as an input page is empty, read in the next
 - As soon as an output page is full, flush it to disk
 - Repeat until all sorted runs of size 3 are merged into sorted runs of size 6
 - Phases 3 to 11 (or, in general, until done)
 - As phase 2, but keep multiplying the sorted run size by 2
 - Cost Analysis:
 - Phase 1: 3072 x 2 IOs (one read/write per page of data)
 - Phase 2-11: 3072 x 2 IOs (one read/write per page of data)
 - In general:
 - Phase 1 creates runs of size 3

- Phase 2 creates runs of size 3.2^{phase-1}
- ▼ Last phase is when 3•2^{phase-1} >= #pages
 - One sorted run of the full length of the data
 - Equivalently:
 - 2^{phase-1} >= #pages/3
 - phase-1 >= log_2(#pages/3)
 - phases >= 1+log_2(#pages/3)
- ceil(1 + log_2(#pages/3)) phases required
- Total: #pages * 2 * (1+log_2(#pages / N)) IOs
- Idea 2: N-Way Sort/Merge
 - What if we have more than 3 pages (say we have N pages)?
 - Phase 1:
 - Load N pages of data instead
 - Phases 2 and onwards:
 - Simultaneously merge N-1 sorted runs
 - (optionally use some of the space to buffer reads/writes)
 - Cost Analysis
 - Base cost per phase is still #pages x 2 IOs each
 - Now, last phase is at N•(N-1)^{phase-1} > #pages
 - So: ceil(1 + log_{N-1}(#pages / N)) phases required
- Idea 3: Longer Initial Sorted Runs
 - Using only N memory, can we create sorted runs longer than N?
 - Obviously, I wouldn't ask if the answer was no.
 - Idea: Flush data out a little at a time
 - Load N pages of data, sort in-memory
 - Flush the first page out to disk
 - Now you have a free page!

- Read in another page of unsorted data
- Sort the result in memory
- Repeat?
- Problem: What if you get a lower value than something you already flushed out?
 - Keep track of the highest value flushed out to disk in the current sorted run.
 - Don't flush out records below this value
 - Instead, set them aside for the next sorted run
 - Eventually you won't be able to flush any new records out... at this point, you end the current sorted run and start the next one
- Cost Analysis:
 - On average, you have a 50% chance of getting a record lower than your highest flushed value
 - Initial sorted runs will be ~2x as long, saving you 2/N phases
- Bonus
 - What happens if the input is *already* sorted?
 - ... or mostly sorted?
- Aggregation
 - Overview
 - Data is Big Users often want summary statistics
 - How do we compute these summary statistics efficiently?
 - Fold
 - An "iterator-style" operation with 2 parts
 - A Default Value (e.g., 0)
 - A Merge Current Value and Record Value operation (e.g., current + record)

COUNT

- Default: 0
- Merge: current + 1

▼ SUM

- Default: 0
- Merge: current + record
- MAX (resp, MIN)
 - Default: -infinity
 - Merge: Max(current, record)

▼ AVERAGE

- Actually a combination of COUNT and SUM:
- SUM(X) / COUNT(*)
- ▼ Can express as a fold over a tuple of values:
 - Default: < count: 0, sum: 0 >
 - Merge: < current.count + 1, current.sum + record >
- ▼ Need a "finalize" step:
 - Finalize: current.sum / current.count

MEDIAN

- Default: Ø
- Finalize: Find the median
- What gives?
 - Median is a "holistic" aggregate
 - "Algebraic" aggregates have a constant-size intermediate result
 - Holistic aggregates need all of the data (e.g., in sorted order)

- Group-By Aggregation
 - What if you want multiple aggregate values?
 - SELECT A, SUM(B) FROM R
 - Creates one row for each A, with a sum of all of the B values from rows with that A.
 - How do we implement this?
 - Idea 1: In-Memory Hash Table
 - Scan records in any order
 - For each record, check to see if the hash table contains the group by attribute(s) value(s)
 - If not, create a new entry in the hash table with the default group value
 - Incorporate the new record's aggregate value
 - Idea 2: Pre-Sort the Data
 - Problem w/ Idea 1: What if you run out of memory
 - Use the external sort algorithm above by the group-by attributes
 - Benefit: you know that all elements of a single group will be adjacent to one another:
 - If you iterate over the sorted list of elements, as soon as the group by attributes change, you know you're done with that group
 - ... so you only ever need to keep one "current value" in memory at a time
 - Pro: You can start emitting intermediate results before you're done with everything
 - Con: Log(N) full passes over the data
 - Idea 3: Pre-Hash the Data

- Do one pass through the data to create hash buckets that will fit in memory
- Like sorting, but you only need one pass through the data
 - ... unless you guess wrong about the number of buckets to create