CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY COMPUTER SCIENCE DEPARTMENT 15-445/645 – DATABASE SYSTEMS (FALL 2023) PROF. ANDY PAVLO AND JIGNESH PATEL

Homework #3 (by Anurag Choudhary) Due: Sunday, Oct 08, 2023 @ 11:59pm

IMPORTANT:

- Enter all of your answers into Gradescope by 11:59pm on Sunday, Oct 08, 2023.
- **Plagiarism**: Homework may be discussed with other students, but all homework is to be completed **individually**.

For your information:

- Graded out of 100 points; 3 questions total
- Rough time estimate: $\approx 1 2$ hours (0.5 1 hours for each question)

Revision : 2023/09/29 19:08

| Question | Points | Score |
|--------------------|--------|-------|
| Sorting Algorithms | 36 | |
| Join Algorithms | 43 | |
| Bloom Filters | 21 | |
| Total: | 100 | |

- (a) [6 points] Assume that the DBMS has <u>fifty</u> buffers. How many sorted runs are generated? Note that the final sorted file does not count towards the sorted run count.
 □ 183,673 □ 183,674 □ 183,750 □ 183,751 □ 187,501 □ 187,502
- (b) [6 points] Again, assuming that the DBMS has fifty buffers. How many pages (in general) does each sorted run have after the third pass (i.e. Note: this is Pass #2 if you start counting from Pass #0)?
 □ 49 □ 50 □ 2,450 □ 2,451 □ 2,452 □ 120,050 □ 120,051 □ 120,052
- (c) [6 points] Again, assuming that the DBMS has <u>fifty</u> buffers. How many passes does the DBMS need to perform in order to sort the file?
 □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5
- (d) [6 points] Suppose the DBMS has <u>100</u> buffers. What is the total I/O cost to sort the file? □ 18,000,000 □ 36,000,000 □ 54,000,000 □ 72,000,000 □ 90,000,000
- (e) [6 points] What is the smallest number of buffers B such that the DBMS can sort the target file using only <u>three</u> passes?
 □ 55 □ 56 □ 208 □ 209 □ 3,000 □ 3,001
- (f) **[6 points]** Suppose the DBMS has <u>twenty-three</u> buffers. What is the largest database file (expressed in terms of the number of pages) that can be sorted with external merge sort using <u>four</u> passes?

- - There are B = 750 pages in the buffer
 - Table X spans M = 2,500 pages with 80 tuples per page
 - Table Y spans N = 600 pages with 300 tuples per page
 - Table Z spans O = 1,500 pages with 150 tuples per page
 - The join result of X and Y spans P = 500 pages

For the following questions, assume a simple cost model where pages are read and written one at a time. Also assume that one buffer block is needed for the evolving output block and one input block is needed for the current input block of the inner relation. You may ignore the cost of the writing of the final results.

- (a) [3 points] What is the I/O cost of a simple nested loop join with X as the outer relation and Y as the inner relation?
 □ 50,500 □ 200,600 □ 202,500 □ 1,502,500 □ 120,000,600
 □ 120,002,500 □ 300,002,500
- (b) [3 points] What is the I/O cost of a block nested loop join with Z as the outer relation and Y as the inner relation?
 □ 1,500 □ 2,100 □ 2,700 □ 3,000 □ 3,300 □ 3,600 □ 3,900 □ 5,100
- (c) [3 points] What is the I/O cost of a block nested loop join with Y as the outer relation and Z as the inner relation?
 □ 1,500 □ 2,100 □ 2,700 □ 3,000 □ 3,300 □ 3,600 □ 3,900 □ 5,100
- (d) For a sort-merge join with X as the outer relation and Z as the inner relation:
 - i. [3 points]
 What is the cost of sorting the tuples in X on attribute a?

 □ 2,000
 □ 4,000
 □ 6,000
 □ 8,000
 □ 10,000
 □ 12,000
 - ii. **[3 points]** What is the cost of sorting the tuples in Z on attribute a? \Box 2,000 \Box 4,000 \Box 6,000 \Box 8,000 \Box 10,000 \Box 12,000
 - iii. [3 points] What is the cost of the merge phase in the worst-case scenario?
 □ 1,500 □ 2,000 □ 2,500 □ 4,000 □ 900,000 □ 2,000,000
 □ 3,250,000 □ 3,750,000 □ 4,500,000 □ 5,000,000

iv. [3 points] What is the cost of the merge phase assuming there are no duplicates in the join attribute?
□ 1,500 □ 2,000 □ 2,500 □ 4,000 □ 900,000 □ 2,000,000

 $\Box 3,250,000 \Box 3,750,000 \Box 4,500,000 \Box 5,000,000 \Box 2,000,000$

- v. [3 points] Now consider joining X, Y and then joining the result with Z. What is the cost of the final merge phase assuming there are no duplicates in the join attribute?
 □ 1,000 □ 2,000 □ 3,000 □ 5,000 □ 1,000,000
- (e) Consider a hash join with Y as the outer relation and Z as the inner relation. You may ignore recursive partitioning and partially filled blocks.
 - i. **[3 points]** What is the cost of the probe phase? □ 1,000 □ 2,000 □ 2,100 □ 4,200 □ 6,400 □ 7,200 □ 10,000
 - ii. [3 points] What is the cost of the partition phase? \Box 1,000 \Box 2,000 \Box 2,100 \Box 4,200 \Box 6,400 \Box 7,200 \Box 10,000
- (f) [3 points] Assume that the tables do not fit in main memory and that a large number of distinct values hash to the same bucket using hash function h_1 . Which of the following approaches works the best?

 \Box Create hashtables for the inner and outer relation using h_1 and rehash into an embedded hash table using h_1 for large buckets.

 \Box Use linear probing for collisions and page in and out parts of the hashtable needed at a given time.

 \Box Create hashtables for the inner and outer relation using h_1 and rehash into an embedded hash table using $h_2 != h_1$ for large buckets.

 \Box Create two hashtables half the size of the original one, run the same hash join algorithm on the tables, and then merge the hashtables together.

- (g) For each of the following statements about nested loop joins, pick True or False.
 - i. [2 points] In a simple nested loop join where both tables fit entirely in memory, the choice of which table to use as the inner/outer table significantly affects I/O costs.
 □ True □ False
 - ii. [2 points] In a simple nested loop join where one of the tables fits entirely in memory, it is beneficial to use that table as the inner table.
 □ True □ False
 - iii. [2 points] If neither table fits entirely in memory, I/O costs would be lower if we process both tables on a per-block basis rather than per-tuple basis.
 □ True □ False

iv. **[2 points]** For a block nested loop join, in the worst case, each block in the inner table has to be read once for each tuple in the outer table.

 \Box True \Box False

v. **[2 points]** In an index nested loop join where only one of the tables has an index on the join attribute, the choice of inner/outer tables should be made based on the table sizes.

 \Box True \Box False

| input | h_1 | h_2 |
|------------|-------|-------|
| "Nas" | 1973 | 1994 |
| "Cole" | 1985 | 2014 |
| "Kendrick" | 1987 | 2015 |
| "Rocky" | 1988 | 2013 |
| "JID" | 1990 | 2022 |
| "Denzel" | 1995 | 2018 |

(a) **[4 points]** Suppose the filter has 6 bits initially set to 0:

| bit 0 | bit 1 | bit 2 | bit 3 | bit 4 | bit 5 |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Which bits will be set to 1 after "Cole" and "JID" have been inserted? \Box 0 \Box 1 \Box 2 \Box 3 \Box 4 \Box 5

- (b) [3 points] If "Denzel" is inserted next, which bits will now be set to 1 (including those already set in part (a))?
 □ 0 □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5
- (c) [3 points] What will the filter return if we now lookup "Nas"?
 □ True □ False
- (d) **[3 points]** Suppose the filter has 6 bits set to the following values:

| bit 0 | bit 1 | bit 2 | bit 3 | bit 4 | bit 5 |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

What will the filter return if we lookup "Rocky"? \Box True \Box False

(e) [3 points] What will the filter from part (d) return if we lookup "Kendrick"?
□ True □ False

Homework #3

(f) **[5 points]** Suppose the filter has 6 bits set to the following values:

| bit 0 | bit 1 | bit 2 | bit 3 | bit 4 | bit 5 |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

Which names are guaranteed to have NOT been inserted? □ "Nas" □ "Cole" □ "Kendrick" □ "Rocky" □ "JID" □ "Denzel"