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Introduction

- Used as storage layers of NoSQL DBs
  - Hbase, Cassandra, LevelDB, RocksDB, AsterixDB

- Writes
  - Buffer, Flush, Merge

- Advantages
  - Write performance
  - Space utilization
  - Tunability
  - Simplifies concurrency control & Recovery
Rum Conjecture
Rum Conjecture

Access Method

Read Optimized
(Point/Tree Indexes)

Update optimized
(Differential)

Memory optimized
(Compressible/Approximate)
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Ideal Solution

- Read overhead
- Update overhead
- Memory overhead
RUM Space

- LSM Trees
- Point indexes
- Rum Adaptive
- Differential data structures
- Compressible & Approximate

Read overhead
Update overhead
Memory overhead
LSM Tree Basics
LSM Tree Basics

- History
- Today’s LSM Trees
- Well-known optimizations
- Concurrency control & recovery
- Cost analysis
### History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-place Update</th>
<th>Out-of-place Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overwrite</td>
<td>Write to new locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves read</td>
<td>Improves write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only one copy of data</td>
<td>Multiple copies of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery complicated</td>
<td>Recovery simplified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space amplification high</td>
<td>Space amplification low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No gc</td>
<td>Need gc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- (k1,v1) (k2,v2) (k3,v3)
- (k4,v4)
- (k1,v1) (k2,v2) (k3,v3)
- (k1,v4)
History

- Sequential out of place update mechanism is not new
- Differential files [1976]
  - Updates applied to diff file
  - Periodic merges with main file
- Postgres log-structured db [1980s]
  - Append writes -> sequential log
    - Achieve fast recovery, time-travel queries
- Log-structured File systems [1991]
History

- Problems
  - Low query perf, since related logs scattered
  - Low space utilization
  - Hard to tune

- LSM-tree [1996]
  - Includes merge in structure itself, to address above issues
  - High write performance
  - Bounded query performance
  - Bounded space utilization
Original Design

- Sequence of components $C_0$ to $C_k$
- Each component B+-tree
- $C_i$ full -> rolling merge -> $C_i$ to $C_{i+1}$
- Known as leveling merge policy
- Size ratio $T_i = C_{i+1} / C_i$
- All $T_i$s same -> optimizes write perf

memory  |  disk

writes

\[ C_0 \rightarrow \text{merge} \rightarrow C_1 \rightarrow \text{merge} \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow \text{merge} \rightarrow C_k \]
Today’s LSM

- Updates are out of place
- Writes - append to memory component
- Insert/update operations adds new entry
- Deletion adds anti-matter entry
- Exploit immutability of disk components (runs) for concurrency & recovery
- Multiple disk components merged into new one, without modifying existing ones. [Different than rolling merge]
- Component can be implemented using any index structure
- Memory Component -> B+tree or skip-list
- Disk Component -> B+tree or SSTable (sorted string table)
SSTable

Index Block

- **Key1**: offset1
- **Key2**: offset2
- **Key3**: offset3
- **Key4**: offset4

Data Block

- **Key1**
- **Key2**
- **Key3**
- **Key4**

value1
value2
value3
value4

https://medium.com/databasss/on-disk-io-part-3-lsm-trees-8b2da218496f
Query

- Search multiple components to perform reconciliation
- Point lookup query
  - Search from newest to oldest component
  - Stop after first match found
- Range query
  - Search all components at same time
  - Feed search results to priority queue
  - Priority queue does reconciliation
- Query Perf ↓ when disk components ↑
- ↓ disk components by gradual merge
Merge

Leveling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Before merge</th>
<th>After merge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 0</td>
<td><img src="2019StorageDeveloperConference_0-100" alt="Level 0" /></td>
<td>Empty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td><img src="2019StorageDeveloperConference_0-100" alt="Level 1" /></td>
<td><img src="2019StorageDeveloperConference_0-100" alt="New component" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td><img src="2019StorageDeveloperConference_0-100" alt="Level 2" /></td>
<td><img src="2019StorageDeveloperConference_0-100" alt="Level 2" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Fills cap & flushes to L1
2. Sort & merge

Tiering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Before merge</th>
<th>After merge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 0</td>
<td><img src="2019StorageDeveloperConference_0-100" alt="Level 0" /></td>
<td>Empty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td><img src="2019StorageDeveloperConference_0-100" alt="Level 1" /></td>
<td><img src="2019StorageDeveloperConference_0-100" alt="New component" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td><img src="2019StorageDeveloperConference_0-100" alt="Level 2" /></td>
<td><img src="2019StorageDeveloperConference_0-100" alt="Level 2" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Fills cap & flushes to L1
2. Sort & merge
Merge

Tiering

\[ \log_T(N) \]

Size ratio(T)

Leveling

1 C per level

C - Component
Merge

Tiering

\[ \text{Size ratio}(T=2) \]

Leveling

Ref: Niv Dayan
Well Known Optimizations - Bloom Filters

- Answer set membership queries
- False negative? Never, False positive? Can
- In practice around 10 bits/key -> 1% false positive rate
- False positive impact? No correctness issue, waste extra IO searching non-existent key
- Point lookup queries benefited
- Not usable for range queries
Well known Optimizations - Partitioning

- Range partition disk components into multiple small partitions
- SSTable used to denote such partition (levelDB)
- Breaks large C merge into smaller ones.
  - Bounds processing time of each merge &
  - Temporary disk space
- Orthogonal to merge policies
Partitioned Leveling Merge Policy

Before merge

Level 0  0-100
Level 1  0-30  34-70  71-99
Level 2  0-15  16-32  35-50  51-70  72-95

After merge

Level 0  0-100
Level 1  34-70  71-99
Level 2  0-15  16-32  35-50  51-70  72-95  51-70
Partitioned Tiering Vertical Grouping

Before merge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 0</th>
<th>0-100</th>
<th>0-100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>0-31</td>
<td>34-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>0-13</td>
<td>16-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After merge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 0</th>
<th>0-100</th>
<th>0-100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>34-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>0-12</td>
<td>17-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-13</td>
<td>16-32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Partitioned Tiering Horizontal Grouping

### Before merge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 0</th>
<th>0-100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>35-70 72-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-65 67-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>0-20 22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-15 19-30 32-50 52-75 80-100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### After merge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 0</th>
<th>0-100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>72-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>0-20 22-30 35-52 53-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-15 19-30 32-50 52-75 80-100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concurrency Control & Recovery

- Writes appended to memory, WAL for durability.
- No-steal buffer mgmt policy
- Recovery
  - Transaction log replay
  - List of active components needs to be recovered
    - For un-partitioned:
      - Find all components with disjoint timestamps.
      - Overlapping timestamps components, comp with largest timestamp chosen & rest deleted, since they would have merged to form this selected component.
    - For partitioned (levelDB, RocksDB)
      - Timestamps approach doesn’t work
      - Maintain separate metadata log, stores all changes like add/delete SSTables.
      - Replay this log during recovery.
Cost Analysis

- Cost of writes/queries measured by counting disk IOs.
- Un-partitioned LSM-tree & worst case analysis.
- Size ratio T, no of levels L, B page size (no of entries each data page can store)
- P -> no of pages for memory component.
- Level i contains at most $T^{i+1} \times B \times P$ entries
- $s$ unique keys accessed by range query

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Merge Policy</th>
<th>Write</th>
<th>Point Lookup (Zero/Non-zero)</th>
<th>Short range query</th>
<th>Long range query</th>
<th>Space amplification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leveling</td>
<td>$O(T \times L / B)$</td>
<td>$O(L \times e^{-M/n}) / O(1)$</td>
<td>$O(L)$</td>
<td>$O(s / B)$</td>
<td>$O((T+1) / T)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiering</td>
<td>$O(L / B)$</td>
<td>$O(T \times L \times e^{-M/N}) / O(1)$</td>
<td>$(T \times L)$</td>
<td>$O(T \times s / B)$</td>
<td>$O(T)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LSM Tree Improvements
Improvements

- Merge Operation
  - Caching
  - Merge Perf
  - Write Stall

- Hardware
  - Large memory
  - Multi-Core
  - SSD/NVM
  - Native Storage

- Secondary Indexing
  - Structure
  - Maintenance
  - Distributed
  - Stats Collection

- Special Workloads
  - Temporal
  - Semi-Sorted
  - Small
  - Append-mostly

- Write Amplification
  - Tiering
  - Merge Skipping
  - Data Skew

- Auto Tuning
  - Parameter
  - Data Placement
  - Bloom Filter
Reducing write amplification - Tiering

- WBTree
- Light Weight Compaction (LWC)-Tree
- PebblesDB
- dCompaction

All share similar high-level design based on partitioned tiering with vertical grouping.

Main difference is how workload balancing of SSTable groups is performed:
  - WBTree - relies on hashing, so gives ups range query support
  - LWCTree – dynamically shrinks key ranges of dense SSTable groups
  - PebblesDB – relies on probabilistically selected guards.
  - dCompaction – no built in support for workload balancing.

Skewed SSTable groups impact perf of these structures needs evaluation

SirfDB -> Partitioned tiering design with horizontal grouping
Reducing write amplification

- **Merge skipping**
  - **Skip-tree**
    - Each entry merges from level 0 down to largest level.
    - Directly push some entries to higher level, by skipping some level-by-level merges
    - This will reduce total write cost.
    - Uses mutable buffers
    - Introduces non-trivial implementation complexity

- **Exploit data skew**
  - **TRAID**
    - Separate hot keys from cold keys, so that cold keys are flushed.
    - Hot keys old versions discarded without flushing
    - Hot keys not flushed, hence copied to transaction log
    - Optimization – use transaction log as disk component, index built on top
    - Range query perf impacted, since values not sorted in log
Optimize merge operations

- Improve merge perf
  - VT-Tree
    - Stitching op, no overlap while merging, resultant SSTable points to this page.
    - Avoids reading/copying it again.
    - Drawbacks
      - Causes fragmentation, since pages no longer continuous on disk.
      - To alleviate this, it stitches only when there are K (stitching threshold) continuous pages.
      - Since keys in stitched pages are not scanned, bloom filters cannot be produced.
      - To address this VT-Tree uses quotient filters.
  - Pipelined merge to utilize CPU & IO parallelism [Zhang]
    - Merge op phases
      - Read, merge-sort, write
      - Read, write IO-heavy, while merge-sort CPU heavy.
Optimize merge operations

- Reducing buffer cache misses
  - Merge ops can interfere with caching behavior of system
  - New component enable, can cause buffer cache misses since new component is not cached yet.
  - If all pages of new component caches during merging, it would evict lots of working pages, again causing buffer cache misses.
  - Log-structured buffer merge Tree.

- Minimize write stalls
  - Due to heavy background operations – flushes, merges
  - bLSM – spring-and-gear merge scheduler // unpartitioned level merge policy
    - Tolerate extra component at each level, so that merges at different levels can proceed in parallel.
    - Limits max write speed at memory component to eliminate large write stalls.
  - Drawbacks
    - Only designed for unpartitioned leveling merge policy
    - Bounds max latency of writing to memory component, queueing latency is ignored.
Hardware Opportunities

- Large memory
  - FloDB
  - Accordion
- Multi-core
  - cLSM
- SSD/NVM
  - FD-Tree similar to LSM, to reduce random writes on SSDs.
  - FD+-Tree improves merge process.
  - WiscKey
  - HashKV
  - SifrDB
  - NoveLSM
- Native Storage
Auto-tuning

- Reduces burden on end user.
- Parameter-tuning
  - Monkey
- Tuning merge policy
  - Dostoevsky
- Native Storage
LSM-based Systems

- LevelDB – open-sourced by google 2011
  - Simple KV interface puts, gets, scans.
  - Embedded storage engine for higher-level applns
  - Partitioned leveling merge policy
- RocksDB – fork of levelDB, by faceboo, 2012
  - Lots of features
  - Major motivation for fb, was good space utilization
  - Size ratio defaults to 10, leveling impl at 90% data at largest level
  - Improvements to partitioned leveling merge
Summary

- RUM conjecture
- Learnt about basics of LSM trees
- Various optimizations taxonomy
- LSM-based practical systems
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