RESTORE: REUSING RESULTS OF MAPREDUCE JOBS

Junjie Hu
Current practice deletes intermediate results of MapReduce jobs.

These results are not useless.

A system that reuses the output of MapReduce jobs / sub-jobs -- ReStore
Example
Restore system architecture
Plan Matcher and Rewriter

- Before a job $J$ is matched, all other jobs $J$ depends on have to be matched and rewritten to use the job stored in the repository.
- A physical plan in the repository is considered matched if it is contained within the input MapReduce job.
Example

- A = load 'page_review' as (user, timestamp, page_info);
- Store A into 'out1';
- A = load 'page_review' as (user, timestamp, page_info);
- B = foreach A generate user, page_info;
- Store B into 'out2';
Match Algorithm

- Use DFS
- ReStore uses the first match (greedy)
- Rules to order the physical plans:
  1) A is preferred to B if all the operators in B have equivalent operators in A (A subsumes B)
  2) Based on the ratio between I/O size, execution time
Two types of reuse

- **Job**
  - pros: 1) easy to reuse 2) already stored
  - cons: 1) not always reusable

- **Sub-jobs** *(how to generate)*
  - pros: 1) more opportunities to be reused
  - cons: discuss later
Discussion

- Why not always reuses jobs?
- The challenge in reusing sub-jobs?
- The disadvantages in reusing sub-jobs?
How to generate sub-jobs

- Inject ‘store’ after each operator
- Use heuristics, inject ‘store’ after ‘good’ candidate
Heuristics for choosing sub-jobs

- **Conservative Heuristic**
  the operator that reduces the input-size.
  E.g.: project, filter.

- **Aggressive Heuristic**
  the operator that reduces input size and outputs of operators are known to be expensive.
  E.g.: join, group, project, filter.
The property of the job should be kept in the ReStore Repository

- Property 1: can reduce the execution time of a workflow that contains this job/sub-job
- Property 2: can be reused in future workflows
- Check these properties based on statistics of MapReduce system
Experiment

- Use PigMix: a set of queries used to test Pig performance. E.g.: L3 join, L11 distinct + union
- Two instances to test: 15GB and 150GB (more details on paper)
- Speedup: improved execution time / original execution time
- Overhead: executing time in addition to injecting store operators / original execution time
Overall: effect of reusing jobs

Speedup: 9.8
L3: Group and aggregate
L11: union two data sets
The effect of reusing sub-jobs outputs for data size 150GB

Speedup: 24.4
Overhead: 1.6
Execution time when reusing sub-jobs chosen by different heuristics

Why aggressive is much worse than no-h?

L7: nested split
Overall: Reusing whole jobs and sub-jobs
Performance on 15GB and 150GB

- Data size: 150GB
  - Speedup: 24.4
  - Overhead: 1.6

- Data size: 15GB
  - Speedup: 3
  - Overhead: 2.4

Win!
Effect of Data Reduction

- As the amount of data eliminated by the Filter of Projector operator increases, overhead decreases and speedup increases.
Conclusion

- Jobs of MapReduce can be reused
- Intermediate results of MapReduce jobs can be useful
- Trade-off between increased workload by injecting extra store operators and decreased workload by reusing results
- The type of command
ONLY AGGRESSIVE ELEPHANTS ARE FAST ELEPHANTS
Hadoop + HDFS

- Each different filter conditions trigger a new MapReduce Job
- “going shopping without a shopping list”
- “Let’s see what I am going to encounter on the way”
What is HAIL...

- Hadoop Aggressive Indexing Library

- HAIL:
  - Keeps existing replicas in different sort orders and with different clustered indexes
  - Faster to find a suitable index
  - Longer runtime for a workload
Why HAIL

☐ Each MapReduce job requires to scan the whole disk
  ☐ slow query time

☐ Trojan index
  ☐ expensive index creation
  ☐ How to use General attributes for other tasks

☐ HDFS keeps replicas which all have the same physical data layouts
HAIL

- Client analyzes input data for each HDFS block
- Converts each HDFS block to binary PAX
- Sort data in parallel in different sorting orders

- Datanode creates clustered index
- MapReduce job exploits the indexes

- Failover: Standard Hadoop scanning
What is PAX?

- Partition Attributes Across
- A data organization model
- Significantly improves cache performance by grouping together all values of each attribute within each page. Because PAX only affects layout inside the pages, it incurs no storage penalty and does not affect I/O behavior.

http://www.pdl.cmu.edu/ftp/Database/pax.pdf
Bob: representative analyst

A large web log has three fields, which may serve as different filter conditions:

- visitDate
- adRevenue
- sourceIP
Upload Process

Reuse as much HDFS existing pipeline as possible
1: parse into rows based on end of line
2: parse each row by the schema specified
3: HDFS gets list of datanodes for block
4: PAX data is cut into packets
5: PAX Block

7: Sorts data, create indexes, form HAIL block

8: DN1, DN2 immediately forward pckt
9: DN3 verify checksums
10: DN3 acknowledge pckt back to DN2
6: assemble block in main memory

PCK – data packet
ACK – acknowledgement number

Figure 1: The HAIL upload pipeline
HDFS Namenode Extension

- It keeps track of different sort orders
- HAIL needs to schedule map tasks close to replicas having suitable indexes
- Central namenode keeps Dir_Block mapping: 
  blockID → Set Of DataNodes.
  and Dir_rep mapping:
  (blockID, datanode) → HAILBlockReplicaInfo.
Indexing Pipeline

- Why clustered indexing?
  - Cheap to create in main memory
  - Cheap to write to disk
  - Cheap to query from disk

- Divides data of attribute `sourceIP` into partitions consisting of 1024 values
- Child pointers to start offset
- Only the first child pointer is explicit
  - all leaves are contiguous on disk
  - can be reached by simply multiplying the leaf size with the leaf ID.

Figure 2: HAIL data column index
SELECT sourceIP
FROM UserVisits WHERE visitDate BETWEEN '1999-01-01' AND '2000-01-01';
Annotates his map function to specify the selection predicate and the projected attributes required by his MapReduce job.

JobClient logically breaks the input into smaller pieces called input splits. An input split defines the input data of a map task.

For each map task, the JobTracker decides on which computing node to schedule the map task, using the split locations.

The map task uses a RecordReader UDF in order to read its input data blocki from the closest datanode.
It is crucial to be non-intrusive to the standard Hadoop execution pipeline so that users run MapReduce jobs exactly as before.

- HailInputFormat
  - a more elaborate splitting policy, called HailSplitting.

- HailRecordReader
  - responsible for retrieving the records that satisfy the selection predicate of MapReduce jobs.
Experiment

- Six different clusters
  - One physical cluster with 10 nodes
  - Three EC2 clusters using different data types each with 10 nodes
  - Two EC2 clusters: one with 50 nodes, the other 100 nodes

- Two datasets:
  - UserVisits table – 20GB data per node
  - Synthetic dataset – 13GB data per node
    - consisting of 19 integer attributes in order to understand the effects of selectivity.
Bob-Q1 (selectivity: $3.1 \times 10^{-2}$)  
SELECT sourceIP FROM UserVisits WHERE visitDate BETWEEN '1999-01-01' AND '2000-01-01';

Bob-Q2 (selectivity: $3.2 \times 10^{-8}$)  
SELECT searchWord, duration, adRevenue FROM UserVisits WHERE sourceIP = '172.101.11.46';

Bob-Q3 (selectivity: $6 \times 10^{-9}$)  
SELECT searchWord, duration, adRevenue FROM UserVisits WHERE sourceIP = '172.101.11.46' AND visitDate = '1992-12-22';

Bob-Q4 (selectivity: $1.7 \times 10^{-2}$)  
SELECT searchWord, duration, adRevenue FROM UserVisits WHERE adRevenue >= 1 AND adRevenue <= 10; Additionally, we use a variation of query Bob-Q4 to see how well HAIL performs on queries with low selectivities:

Bob-Q5 (selectivity: $2.04 \times 10^{-1}$)  
SELECT searchWord, duration, adRevenue FROM UserVisits WHERE adRevenue >= 1 AND adRevenue <= 100;
Experiment Result (1)

HAIL has a negligible upload overhead of \(\sim 2\%\) over standard Hadoop. When HAIL creates one index per replica the overhead still remains very low (at most \(\sim 14\%\)).

HAIL outperforms Hadoop by a factor of 1.6 even when creating three indexes.

marks the time Hadoop takes to upload with the default replication factor of three.

When HAIL creates one index per replica the overhead still remains very low (at most \(\sim 14\%\)).

HAIL significantly outperforms Hadoop for any replication factor.
Experiment Result (2)

- HAIL achieves roughly the same upload times for the Synthetic dataset.
- HAIL improves its upload times for larger clusters for UserVisits dataset.
- More interesting, we observe that HAIL does not suffer from high performance variability.

**Figure 5: Scale-out results**

UV: Upload times for UserVisits when scaling-up
Syn: Upload times for Synthetic when scaling-up [sec]
Experiment Result (3)

Figure 6: Job runtimes, record reader times, and Hadoop MapReduce framework overhead for Bob’s query workload filtering on multiple attributes

Figure 7: Job runtimes, record reader times, and Hadoop MapReduce framework overhead for Synthetic query workload filtering on a single attribute
Fault tolerance

• HAIL preserves the failover property of Hadoop by having almost the same slowdown.

• When HAIL creates the same index on all replicas (HAIL-1Idx), HAIL has a lower slowdown since failed map tasks can still perform an index scan even after failure.

HAIL: create indexes on three different attributes, one for each replica.
HAIL-1Idx: create an index on the same attribute for all three replicas.
Wrap Up

- HAIL can:
  - Improve both upload and query times
  - Keep failover properties of Hadoop
  - works with existing MapReduce jobs incurring only minimal changes to them
Questions to Ponder

- Why does HAIL have different performance on different data types?
- Would it be possible to use HAIL for the data that is already stored in the cluster?
- Is HAIL open source?
- Can HAIL integrate with other systems, such as Pig or Hive? – API
- Why do/don’t the authors use Hadoop++?
- What is it like when using HAIL on other cases?
- How useful it will be for needs of different users/queries?
- ....
HAIL vs. Hadoop++
- HAIL create Trojan indexes per physical replica instead of logical HDFS replica
- HAIL create indexes less expensive

Twitter full text indexing
- Only suitable for highly selective queries

CoHadoop
- Did not improve indexing features of Hadoop++
BUILDING WAVELET HISTOGRAMS ON LARGE DATA IN MAPREDUCE
Introduction

- **Histograms** are important for summarizing data
- **Wavelet histogram** is one of the most widely used
- Straightforward adaption for building wavelet histograms to MapReduce is *inefficient*
- Require new algorithm
How to build wavelet histograms

- Suppose dataset has a key drawn from domain $u = \{1, 2, \ldots, u\}$
- Frequency vector as $v = (v(1), v(2), \ldots, v(u))$ where $v(x)$ is the number of occurrences of key $x$ in the data sets
- Calculate wavelet basis vector $\psi$, same length as $v$. $\psi$ is unrelated to $v$
- Coefficients are $w(i) = \langle v, \psi(i) \rangle$ (dot products), $i = 1, \ldots, u$
- Compute the best $k$-term wavelet representations using centralized algorithm
Baseline solution *(Send-V)*

- m mappers *(node)* and single reducer *(coordinator)*
- **Mapper:** each mapper emits \((x, v_{\text{local}}(x))\) for all \(x\) in the splits and its local frequency
- **Reducer:** aggregate \((x, v(x))\).
  Calculate \(w(i) = \langle v, \psi(i) \rangle\) then select best k-terms.
Alternative baseline (Send-Coefficient)

- Due to the Distributive Law, we can calculate each local coefficient on mapper, and let reducer aggregate those results.

\[
\omega_i = \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^{m} v_j, \psi_i \right\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \langle v_j, \psi_i \rangle,
\]
Discussion?

- Drawback?
- Any improvement? (note that coefficient could be negative)
- How many intermediate files? Suppose the splits number is m, domain size is u.
Hadoop Wavelet top-k(*H-WTopk*)

- For an item(key) $x$, $r(x)$ denotes its aggregated score(coefficient) and $r_j(x)$ is its score at node $j$.

- An lower bound $\tau(x)$ of item $x$ score’s magnitude. 
  $$\tau(x) \leq |r(x)|$$

- A global threshold $\tau$, kth largest $\tau(x)$.

- If an item’s local score is always below $\tau/m$, then it can be discarded.
Three rounds for H-WTopk: Round 1

- Each node emits $k$ highest and lowest score. If coordinator receives $x^*$ score from a node, update its upper bound $\tau^+(x)$ and lower bound $\tau^-(x)$ with addition of $r_{\text{local}}(x)$. Otherwise, add the $k$th highest score of this node sends to $\tau^+(x)$, and the $k$th lowest to $\tau^-(x)$.

- Set $\tau(x) = 0$ if $\tau^+(x)$ and $\tau^-(x)$ have different signs. Otherwise, $\tau(x) = \min(|\tau^+(x)|, |\tau^-(x)|)$

- Pick the $k$-th largest $\tau(x)$, denotes as $T_1$. It’s a threshold for the magnitude of the top-$k$ items.
Three rounds for H-WTopk: Round 2

- For each node \( j \), emits item \( x \) if \(| r_j(x) | > T_1/m \).
- Define \( R \) as the set of items coordinator received. Refine \( \tau^+(x) \) and \( \tau^-(x) \) for every \( x \) from \( R \). If a node has not been received from a node, use \( T_1/m \) and \(-T_1/m\) to update upper/lower bound.
- Calculate a better threshold \( T_2 \). For any \( x \) from \( R \), compute \( \tau(x) = \max(|\tau^+(x)|,|\tau^-(x)|) \). Delete \( x \) from \( R \) if \( \tau(x) < T_2 \).
Three rounds for H-WTopk: Round 3

- Ask each node for the scores of all items in $R$.
- Compute the aggregated scores exactly for those items, from which we pick $k$ items of largest magnitude.
H-WTop

- Use lower/upper bound to estimate the score of the item, and calculate a threshold to prune items.
- Cost on communication is better than baseline solution.
- Need 3 rounds.
- Drawback?
Drawback for H-WTopk

- Three rounds of MapReduce jobs incurs a lot of overhead
- On node $j$, every split needs to be fully scanned to compute local frequency vector $v_j$ and compute local wavelet coefficient $w_{i,j}$, $i = 1, ..., u$
- Any solution?
Sampling

- Assume \( n \) is the number of records in the dataset, if we want to approximate each frequency \( \nu(x) \) with a standard deviation of \( \varepsilon n \), a sample of size \( \Theta(1/\varepsilon^2) \) is required. A sample probability \( p = 1/(\varepsilon^2 n) \).

- If \( n \) is very large, we need a very small \( \varepsilon \) to keep accuracy. For \( \varepsilon = 10^{-6} \), even with one-byte key, still needs to emit 1TB data.

- Cost of communication is \( \mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon^2) \)
Two-level sampling (TwoLevel-S)

- For each split \( j \), extract a sample from input. Calculate \((x, s_j(x))\) from sample. \( s_j(x) \) is the counts of \( x \).

- Perform a second-level sample, for any item \( x \) with \( s_j(x) \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon \sqrt{m}} \), emit the \((x, s_j(x))\), otherwise, sample it with a probability proportional to \( s_j(x) \), i.e. \((\varepsilon \sqrt{m} \times s_j(x))\), and emit the pair \((x, \text{NULL})\).
TwoLevel-S

- Communication cost reduced to $O(\sqrt{m/\epsilon})$.
- It provides an unbiased estimation of coefficient $w$. (see proof in paper)
- Both H-WTopk and TwoLevel-S work well in practice (see experiment results in paper)
Provide two approaches to calculate coefficients used in wavelet histograms: one \textit{exact computation} approach and one \textit{approximate computation} approach.

Design algorithms for MapReduce jobs, one should consider the cost of communication (i.e., number of intermediate results). It’s one of the factors that influences the efficiency of algorithm. (For one who has taken cs425 last semester and worked on mp4 may have a good understanding for this)
Thanks for watching.