BP-tree Overcoming the Point-Range Operation Tradeoff for In-Memory B-trees

VLDB 2023

Prashant Pandey, University of Utah Joint work with: Helen Xu (Georgia Tech), Amanda Li (MIT), Brian Wheatman (JHU), Manoj Marneni (Utah)



Dictionary data structures

- Queries
 - Membership
 - Predecessor/Successor
 - Range queries
- Updates
 - Insertions
 - Deletions



External memory model for dictionaries

- How computations work [AV88]:
 - Data is transferred in blocks between levels
 - The number of block transfers dominate the running time
- Goal: minimize number of block transfers
 - Performance bounds are parameterized by block size B, memory size M, and data size N



B-tree: a classic dictionary data structure

- B/B+-trees [BM72] are ubiquitous:
 - In memory indexing [ZCO+15]
 - Databases [K98]
 - Filesystems [RBM13]





- B/B+-trees [BM72] are ubiquitous:
 - In memory indexing [ZCO+15]
 - Databases [K§
 - Filesystems [F What does B stands for in B-trees?





Cost of operations in B-trees

Insert Search $O(log_B N/M)$ I/Os



B-trees: tradeoff between search and inserts

Insert Search $O(log_B N/M)$ I/Os

B-trees are asymptotically optimal for point operations [BF03]



B-trees: tradeoff between search and inserts

Insert $O(log_B N/M)$ I/Os Search

B-trees are asymptotically optimal for point operations [BF03]





In this talk: tradeoff between point and range operations in in-memory B-trees



Range scan in a B-tree

Range scan

 $O(log_B N/M + K/B)$ I/Os



Range scan in a B-tree

Range scan $O(log_B N/M + K/B)$ I/Os **Dominates for** short ranges



Range scan in a B-tree



B-trees show a tradeoff in point-range operations

Large nodes speed up range scans at the cost of point inserts

B-trees show a tradeoff in point-range operations

Large nodes speed up range scans at the cost of point inserts

B-trees show a tradeoff in point-range operations

Large nodes speed up range scans at the cost of point inserts

Long range scans are critical in applications

Real-time analytics [PTPH12]

Graph processing [DBGS22, PWXB21]

Supporting fast range scans without sacrificing point update/query performance is a long-standing open problem in B-tree design

Our results: BP-tree

Concurrent C++
implementation

Empirical evaluation using YCSB [CST+10] workloads Extended YCSB to include long range scans

TLX B-tree [Bingman18]

Masstree [MKM12]

OpenBW Tree [WPL+18]

Range operations Point operations

1.3X faster 0.95X — 1.2X faster

0.94X — 7.4X faster 30X faster

1.2X — 1.6X faster

2.5X faster

Larger nodes improve range scan performance

Small nodes

Large nodes

Larger nodes cause overhead to maintain order

BP-tree design principles

Affine model for performance

BP-tree design principles

Affine model for performance

Large leaf nodes

BP-tree design principles

Affine model for performance

Large leaf nodes

Lazy ordering in leaf nodes

BP-tree design

BP-tree design

Buffered Partitioned Array: a special data structure for leaves

Insert (22)

Blocks

and at an and the second se

Insert (27)

and an antistic to the second s

Blocks

and an and the second sec

Blocks

3			19	22			27	32		89	93	95				

Performance YCSB workloads

BP tree matches on point operations while being 2X faster for range scans

Takeaways

- I/O models (External memory and Affine) apply to in-memory indexes
- Relaxing ordering constraint in leaf nodes can help overcome traditional tradeoffs
- BP-tree supports fast range scans (OLAP) an optimal point updates/queries (OLTP)

Code: <u>https://github.com/wheatman/concurrent-btrees</u>

- 3.00GHz
- Cache
 - 1.5MiB of L1 cache,
 - 48 MiB of L2 cache,
 - 71.5 MiB of L3 cache across all of the cores
- 189 GB of memory
- all experiments on a single socket with 24 physical cores and 48 hyperthreads
- All times are the median of 5 trials after one warm-up trial

48-core 2-way hyperthreaded Intel® Xeon® Platinum 8275CL CPU @

compared to the best B-tree (BP-tree) configuration for that operation (1.0 is the best possible value).

	B-	tree			BP-tree										
	Inse	rt	Fin	d				Inse	rt	Fin	d				
Node size (bytes)	Thr.	N.P.	Thr.	N.P.	Header size (elts)	Block size (elts)	Total size (bytes)	Thr.	N.P.	Thr.	N.P.				
256	8.72E6	0.47	2.66E7	0.92	4	4	384	1.05E7	0.54	2.96E7	0.94				
512	1.56E7	0.84	2.81E7	0.97	4	8	640	1.42E7	0.73	2.96E7	0.94				
1024	1.86E7	1	2.86E7	0.98	8	8	1280	1.63E7	0.84	3.05E7	0.96				
2048	1.74E7	0.93	2.84E7	0.98	8	16	2304	1.83E7	0.94	3.09E7	0.98				
4096	1.34E7	0.72	2.91E7	1	16	16	4608	1.87E7	0.97	3.16E7	1.00				
8192	8.04E6	0.43	2.60E7	0.89	16	32	8704	1.87E7	0.97	3.12E7	0.99				
16384	4.27E6	0.23	1.59E7	0.55	32	32	17408	1.94E7	1.00	3.02E7	0.96				
32768	2.20E6	0.12	1.50E7	0.52	32	64	33792	1.84E7	0.95	2.97E7	0.94				
65536	1.12E6	0.06	1.40E7	0.48	64	64	67584	1.73E7	0.89	1.73E7	0.55				

Table 1: Throughput (thr., in operations per second) and normalized performance of point operations in the B-tree and BP-tree. Point operation throughput is reported in operations/s. We use N.P. to denote the normalized performance in the B-tree (BP-tree)

Table 2: Throughput (thr., in expected elements per second) of range queries of varying maximum lengths (max_len) in the B-tree and BP-tree. We also report the normalized performance (N.P.) compared to the best-case performance for each operation (up to 1.0).

			B-	-tree								Ε	3P-tree						
	Sho	rt(max	_len = 10	0)	Long (max_len = 100,000) Short (max_len = 100)								Short (max_len = 100) Long (max_len = 100)00)
	Ma	p	Itera	ite	Ма	p	Itera	ite				Ма	p	Itera	ite	Мар		Itera	ıte
Node size (bytes)	Thr.	N.P.	Thr.	N.P.	Thr.	N.P.	Thr.	N.P.	Header size (elts)	Block size (elts)	Total size (bytes)	Thr.	N.P.	Thr.	N.P.	Thr.	N.P.	Thr.	N.P.
256	8.56E8	0.77	9.48E8	0.72	1.88E9	0.25	2.16E9	0.29	4	4	384	4.76E8	0.53	7.15E8	0.59	7.32E8	0.14	1.20E9	0.22
512	9.58E8	0.86	1.05E9	0.80	2.12E9	0.28	2.43E9	0.32	4	8	640	6.86E8	0.76	8.93E8	0.73	1.32E9	0.25	1.71E9	0.32
1024	1.01E9	0.91	1.13E9	0.85	2.69E9	0.36	3.13E9	0.42	8	8	1280	7.91E8	0.88	9.45E8	0.78	1.72E9	0.32	1.85E9	0.35
2048	1.08E9	0.97	1.20E9	0.91	4.23E9	0.56	4.51E9	0.60	8	16	2304	8.98E8	1.00	1.07E9	0.88	2.46E9	0.46	2.54E9	0.47
4096	1.11E9	1.00	1.26E9	0.95	5.18E9	0.69	5.33E9	0.71	16	16	4608	8.99E8	1.00	1.13E9	0.93	3.17E9	0.59	3.22E9	0.60
8192	1.10E9	0.99	1.28E9	0.97	5.97E9	0.80	6.36E9	0.85	16	32	8704	8.86E8	0.99	1.22E9	1.00	4.19E9	0.78	4.25E9	0.79
16384	1.08E9	0.98	1.29E9	0.98	6.60E9	0.88	7.00E9	0.93	32	32	17408	8.14E8	0.91	1.17E9	0.96	4.75E9	0.89	4.75E9	0.89
32768	1.08E9	0.97	1.30E9	0.98	7.18E9	0.96	7.36E9	0.98	32	64	33792	6.73E8	0.75	1.05E9	0.87	5.21E9	0.97	5.16E9	0.96
65536	1.09E9	0.98	1.32E9	1.00	7.50E9	1.00	7.49E9	1.00	64	64	67584	5.74E8	0.64	9.83E8	0.81	5.35E9	1.00	5.35E9	1.00

Table 3: Throughput (in operations/s) of the BP-tree (BPT), B-tree (B⁺T), Masstree (MT), and OpenBw-tree (BWT) on uniform random and zipfian workloads from YCSB.

					Uniform				Zipfian							
Workload	Workload Description		B^+T	B ⁺ T/ BPT	MT	MT/ BPT	BWT	BWT/ BPT	BPT	B^+T	B ⁺ T/ BPT	MT	MT/ BPT	BWT	BWT/ BPT	
А	50% finds, 50% inserts	2.91E7	2.33E7	0.80	3.07E7	1.06	2.47E7	0.85	3.00E7	2.78E7	0.93	3.20E7	1.07	2.56E7	0.85	
В	95% finds, 5% inserts	4.70E7	4.46E7	0.95	4.79E7	1.02	3.98E7	0.85	5.63E7	4.84E7	0.86	5.82E7	1.03	4.74E7	0.84	
С	100% finds	4.99E7	4.81E7	0.96	5.18E7	1.04	4.21E7	0.84	6.01E7	5.99E7	1.00	6.40E7	1.06	5.10E7	0.85	
E	95% short range iterations (max_len = 100), 5% inserts	2.58E7	2.71E7	1.05	3.49E6	0.14	1.54E7	0.60	3.25E7	3.35E7	1.03	3.96E6	0.12	1.70E7	0.52	
Х	100% long range iterations (max_len = 10,000)	8.89E5	6.90E5	0.78	2.74E4	0.03	3.60E5	0.40	1.05E6	7.96E5	0.76	2.76E4	0.03	3.65E5	0.35	
Y	100% long range maps (max_len = 10,000)	9.18E5	6.45E5	0.70	2.74E4	0.03	3.63E5	0.40	1.08E6	7.44E5	0.69	2.76E4	0.03	3.71E5	0.34	