





























Recompute Vs Incremental (Materialized			
View) Maintenance – Informal Example			
CREATE MAT SELECT G, SI	CREATE MATERIALIZED VIEW V AS SELECT G, SUM(A) AS S		
FROM R GROUP BY G	At the end of the transaction, we want V to reflect the new state of R		
(start) INSERT INTO R ();	Option 1: Delete and Recompute V Option 2: Incrementally maintain V		
 INSERT INTO R ();	△R ⁺ : the set of tuples inserted in R (obtained by log or other mechanism)		
 INSERT INTO R ();	UPDATE V SET S = S +		
DELETE FROM V WHERE true; INSERT INTO V	(SELECT SOM(A) FROM ΔR^* WHERE $\Delta R^* . G = V. G$) WHERE V.G IN (SELECT G FROM ΔR^*); INSERT INTO V.		
(SELECT G, SUM(A) AS S FROM R GROUP BY G);	(SELECT G, SUM(A) AS S FROM △R ^{+ 9} WHERE NOT G IN (SELECT G FROM V) GROUP BY G):		



Capturing IVM as computation of $\triangle V^+$, $\triangle V^-$		
 ignore (just for simplicity) update commands think of update as delete – insert combo input is ΔR*, ΔR* compute "tuples to be deleted from the view" ΔV* compute "tuples to be inserted in the view" ΔV* 	$\label{eq:states} \begin{array}{l} \mbox{WiTH} \mbox{RGplus} \mbox{AS} \\ (\mbox{SELECT} \mbox{G}, \mbox{SM}(\mbox{A}) \mbox{AS} \mbox{S} \\ \mbox{FROM} \mbox{AR}^+ \mbox{GROUP} \mbox{BY} \mbox{G}, \\ \mbox{RGplus} \mbox{AR}^- \mbox{GROUP} \mbox{BY} \mbox{G}, \\ \mbox{RGplus} \mbox{AR}^- \mbox{G}, \\ \mbox{RGplus} \mbox{AS} \mbox{S} \\ \mbox{FROM} \mbox{RGplus} \mbox{AS} \mbox{mON} \mbox{AS} \mbox{S} \\ \mbox{FROM} \mbox{RGplus} \mbox{AS} \mbox{mON} \mbox{AS} \mbox{MON} \\ \mbox{FROM} \mbox{RGplus} \mbox{AS} \mbox{mON} \mbox{RG}, \\ \mbox{JOIN} \mbox{RGminus} \mbox{AS} \mbox{mON} \mbox{RG}, \\ \mbox{RGplus} \mbox{AS} \mbox{mON} \mbox{RG}, \\ \mbox{RGplus} \mbox{AS} \mbox{mON} \mbox{RG}, \\ \mbox{RGminus} \mbox{AS} \mbox{RG}, \\ \$	
CREATE MATERIALIZED VIEW V AS SELECT G, SUM(A) AS S FROM R GROUP BY G <i>choose(a,b)</i> returns <i>a</i> if <i>a</i> is NOT NULL,	$\Delta V \cdot AS$ (SELECT * FROM V WHERE G IN (SELECT G FROM RGnet)) $\Delta V \cdot AS$ (SELECT r.G AS G, n0(V.S) + r.S AS S	
returns b if a is NULL n0(a) returns a if a is NOT NULL, 0 other	FROM (V RIGHT OUTER JOIN RGnet AS r ON V G=r G)	















$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{Basic IVM Algorithm:} \\ \hline \text{Compose operator IVM rules} \\ \hline \text{Example (wlog deferred, i.e., R means R^1 and S means S^1)} \\ \bullet \text{ Rule for V= } R \Join S \\ \bullet \ \Delta V^{\star} = ((\Delta R^{\star} \bowtie S) U (R \Join \Delta S^{\star})) - (\Delta R^{\star} \Join \Delta S^{\star}) \\ \bullet \ \Delta V^{\star} = ??? \\ \bullet \text{ Rule for V= } \sigma_c R \\ \bullet \ \Delta V^{\star} = \sigma_c \Delta R^{\star} \\ \bullet \ \Delta V^{\star} = ??? \\ \bullet \text{ Composition of rules leads to solutions for} \\ V = T \bowtie \sigma_{A^{>5}} W \\ \Delta V^{\star} = ... \\ \Delta V^{\star} = ... \\ \Delta V^{\star} = ... \end{array}$

May rewrite initial expression

IVM with Caching

14

15

- May associate intermediate views (caches) with subexpressions
- Bottom-up: From updating caches to reaching the materialized view
- Caches will typically needed indices
- Caches may or may not pay off as they incur cost for maintaining them (and their indices)

Generalizations

- Multiple views
 - self maintenance may involve a view utilizing the other views in its computation
- Genuine updates
 - Not simulated via insertions/deletions
- Insertions, deletions, updates on tables and views expressed as DML statements

Comparisons

Materialized View

- High query performanceQueries not visible
- outside warehouseLocal processing at
- sources unaffectedCan operate when
- sources unavailableExtra information at
- warehouse
- Modify, summarize (store aggregates)
- Add historical information

- Virtual View
- No need for yet another database

16

17

- More up-to-date data
 Depending on specifics of IVM
- Query needs can be unknown
- Only query interface needed at sources
- => Lower Total Cost of Ownership

Performance revisited: What if indices are not enough for decent online performance?

Buy RAM

- Use a column database
 - In analytics queries can give a 10x easily
- Scalable, parallel processing
 Mostly via no SQL
- Precompute
 - Fast answers!
 - Penalty: Cost of maintaining precomputed results
 - Applicability depends on schema and queries
 Star schemas and summation are a good (but not the only) target of precomputation

Precomputation problems

Steps:

- 1. Choose what data to precompute
- 2. Use the precomputed data smartly in your queries
- 3. Update smartly the precomputed data as the database changes (IVM)

Tradeoff:

- Precomputed data accelerate analytics => faster queries
- But need to be updated => cost

Example: Precomputation and its Use Database has huge table Sales (product, store, date, amt Application issues often this slow query and displays the results SELECT product, SUM(amt) AS sumamt FROM Sales GROUP BY product To improve performance we precompute table ProductSales(product, sumamt) and insert in it the precomputed data by INSERT INTO ProductSales (SELECT product, SUM(amt) AS sumamt FROM Sales GROUP BY product) Now the application issues instead this fast query below SELECT * FROM ProductSales

Example (cont'd)

Now we have to keep up to date the ProductSales (product, sumamt) as new sales happen. E.g., if another \$10 of product 23 were just s UPDATE ProductSales SET sumamt = sumamt + 10 WHERE product = 23 (in actual code it will use prepared queries)































Aggregates

- Operators: sum, count, max, min, median, avg
- "Having" clause
- Using dimension hierarchy
 - average by region (within store)
 - maximum by month (within date)



























Should one precompute joins?

- Notice that we have featured foreign keys, not printable values. Why?
- Why (city product) and not (city region product)?
- Minor penalty to find the cities of a particular region
- Probably larger penalty by having a larger table
 - Think space in storage and time to scan it