1 Introduction

We may define procedures for generating synthetic databases, for the purpose of testing database management systems. In this report, we will examine two such procedures and gauge the usefulness of the resulting datasets. The rest of this report is organized as follows. In Section 2, we analyze the type II non-symmetric dataset and show how to pick its parameters correctly. In Section 3 we define and analyze a variation, the type III non-symmetric dataset. In Section 4 we define a metric for how useful a dataset is for testing view selection algorithms. Finally, in Section 5 we present some experiment results and observations about Type II and Type III non-symmetric datasets.

2 Type II non-symmetric synthetic dataset

2.1 Definition

In [2] Chirkova, Fathi, and Huang defined the Type II non-symmetric synthetic dataset. They gave the following algorithm for generation. $D$ is a Type I symmetric dataset having $K$ attributes $a_1, ..., a_K$. Each attribute $a_i$ has $m_i$ possible values. $S_L$ is the desired size of the Type II dataset. $p_1, ..., p_K$ is a set of input probabilities used as shown below. (See the original paper for more details and examples.)
Step 1. Input $S_L$ and $D(K; m_1, ..., m_K)$. Choose $p_1, ..., p_K$ such that $S_L \geq \prod_{i=1}^{K} m_i p_i^{m_i}$. Set $k = 1$.

Step 2. Mark each row in the current table as 'selected' with probability $1 - p_k$. (If a row is marked, it will be eliminated.)

Step 3. For every row that is marked, also mark any rows which differ only in attribute $a_k$.

Step 4. Eliminate all the marked rows in the table. If $k = K$, output the table as $D'$, otherwise $k = k + 1$ and go to step 2.

After generating some datasets with this algorithm, we find the bound given above on the final size of the dataset, $S_L$. is extremely loose, to the extent that the probabilities $p_1, ..., p_K$ must be chosen by trial and error in order to obtain a dataset of the desired size. This works for small datasets, but would be impractical when generating a large dataset, which could take hours for each attempt. Thus it is desirable to have a closer estimate of the final size of a dataset, as well as a way to generate values of $p_i$ which produce a dataset of the desired size.

2.2 Expected size of dataset

Let $g_k$ denote a group of rows which share all attributes in common except for $a_k$. Then during the $k$th iteration of row removal, the existing rows in any $g_k$ either all survive or are all removed. Thus, the removal or survival of these rows are completely dependent events. The removals of rows which are not in the same $g_k$ are not directly dependent events, although they may be indirectly dependent. However, we will generally treat them as independent events to simplify the analysis below.

Claim 1. Let $q_k$ be the probability that a row survives the $k$th iteration of row removal. Then let $Q_k$ be the cumulative probability that a row survives all iterations up to and including the $k$th iteration, so that $Q_0 = 1$ and $Q_k = \prod_{i=1}^{k} q_k$. Then for $k > 0$,

$$q_k = p_k((1 - Q_{k-1}) + Q_{k-1}p_k)^{m_k-1}. \quad (1)$$

Proof. Consider the first round of elimination. Each row starts in a group of $m_1$ rows which are identical except for $a_1$. The odds of a row surviving are the odds of all $m_1$ rows in its group remaining unmarked (each with probability $p_1$). This agrees with the above definition of $q_1 = p_1((1 - 1) + p_1)^{m_1-1} = p_1^{m_1}$.

Now consider the $k$th round of elimination. For a row to survive, it must first itself remain unmarked (probability $p_k$). Additionally, each of the $m_k - 1$ rows in the row’s group must either remain unmarked or have been removed in a previous round. Treat the previous
survival or removal of each row within the group as independent events with probability $Q_{k-1}$ or $1 - Q_{k-1}$, respectively. This yields the above expression for $q_k$. ■

We have then that $q_k$ is the expected fraction of rows which survive iteration $k$. The expected number of remaining rows in the final table is

$$S = S_0 \prod_{i=1}^{K} q_i = S_0 Q_K = \prod_{i=1}^{K} m_i q_i$$

(2)

where $S_0$ is the size of the initial, full table. Our experiments confirm this to be an accurate prediction, despite the aforementioned simplifications about independence. We can easily choose $q_1, ..., q_K$ to satisfy this equation. However, we still need to know the input values of $p_1, ..., p_k$ which produce them. This form is not, in general, analytically solvable for $p_k$, motivating the following approximation.

**Lemma 1** For $0 < x \leq 1$ and $0 \leq y \leq 1$

$$1 - y + xy \geq x^y.$$

**Proof.** Expand $x^y$ into its Taylor series about $x = 1$. Taking the first two terms, we observe the remaining terms are all negative.

$$x^y = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} (y - i) \right) \frac{1}{n!} (x - 1)^n$$

$$x^y = 1 + y(x - 1) + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} y(x - 1) \left( \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (y - i)(x - 1) \right) \frac{1}{n!} \leq 1 + y(x - 1)$$

$$x^y \leq 1 - y + xy$$

■

From the above lemma we can see,

$$q_k = p_k (1 - Q_{k-1} + Q_{k-1} p_k)^{m_k - 1} \geq p_k (p_k^{Q_{k-1}})^{m_k - 1} = p_k^{1 + Q_{k-1}(m_k - 1)}.$$  (3)

In practice this bound appears to be very tight for most cases, and can itself be used as a good approximation. Solving for $p_k$, we get a close approximation,

$$p_k \approx q_k \frac{1}{1 + Q_{k-1}(m_k - 1)}.$$  (4)

Thus, we modify the procedure as follows:
Step 1. Input $S_L$ and $D(K; m_1, ..., m_K)$. Choose $q_1, ..., q_K$ such that $S_L = \prod_{i=1}^{K} m_i q_i$. Set $k = 1$.

Step 2. Set $p_k = \frac{1}{Q_k - 1}$. Then mark each row in the current table as 'selected' with probability $1 - p_k$. (If a row is marked, it will be eliminated.)

Step 3. For every row that is marked, also mark any rows which differ only in attribute $a_k$.

Step 4. Eliminate all the marked rows in the table. If $k = K$, output the table as $D'$, otherwise $k = k + 1$ and go to step 2.

2.3 Memory requirement

To accelerate the procedure, we performed it on a simulated database in memory. A straightforward implementation of the elimination procedure required that we initially start with all possible rows in memory. This made the space complexity $O(S_0)$. Our strategy to minimize memory usage was to use a bitmap, where each bit address mapped to a potential row in the table, and the bit value stored whether the row was present or not. This scheme only required one bit per row. However, this could still quickly become an unfeasible amount of memory. For example, if we attempted to generate a table with similar size and attributes as the 7-attribute TCP-H dataset considered in Section 5, there would be over $6 \times 10^{16}$ potential rows. This would have required over 7 petabytes of memory, even though the final table would only have around 300,000 rows.

However, if we examine the procedure closely we find that we need not start with all rows in memory. The key observation is that, during the $i$th iteration, rows which differ in any of $a_{i+1}, ..., a_K$ are completely independent of each other. If we sort the rows into groups which have the same values of $a_{i+1}, .., a_K$, we can perform iteration $i$ on one group at a time, without regard to any rows outside that group. Figure 1 shows the minimal independent groups of a dataset at each iteration, organized as a tree of dependencies.

From this relationship we can see that the iterations do not need to be run strictly in order; we just need all previous iterations to have been run on the children of a group. Thus we can use a postorder traversal of the tree to perform the row removals. For example, we could run iterations 1 and 2 on the left half of the above rows before iteration 1 was run on the right half. But in order to run iteration 3, we must first run iterations 1 and 2 on the right half.

We take advantage of this with the following procedure: Allocate one hash table for each of the $K$ iterations. Visit each node of the tree, using a postorder traversal. For each node:

1. Clear the corresponding table for this iteration.
Figure 1: Each group is independent of other groups in the same level.

2. If it is a leaf (Iteration 1), populate the table with all potential rows.
3. Run the corresponding removal iteration on the table.
4. Add the remaining rows into the next iteration’s table. If this is the root (last iteration), then the table is the final table.

The memory required is the sum of the size of each of the $K$ hash tables. At the start of iteration $i$, we have $\prod_{j=1}^{i} m_j$ potential rows in a group, with a expected survival rate of $\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} q_j$ up to that point. Let the size of the hash tables be some constant $C$ times the expected number of initial rows in each table. Then the memory $M$ required is

$$M = \sum_{i=1}^{K} \frac{C}{q_i} \prod_{j=1}^{i} q_j m_j$$

The 7-attribute TCP-H-like dataset would require around 2 gigabytes of memory, with appropriate choice of probabilities. Consider the case that $m_1 = \ldots = m_K = m$ and $q_1 = \ldots = q_K = q$. Then

$$M = \sum_{i=1}^{K} \frac{C}{q} (qm)^i = \frac{C}{q} \frac{(qm)^{K+1} - 1}{qm - 1}$$

$$M \in O \left( \frac{(qm)^K}{q} \right) = O \left( \frac{\tilde{S}}{q} \right)$$

where $\tilde{S}$ is the expected size of the final dataset. This is a much more feasible memory requirement. Additionally, using hash tables would preserve the constant-time access of the bitmap, so the time complexity should be similar or better, since we can avoid traversing a huge, sparse bitmap. Also, this method has inherent parallelism which could be exploited for multithreading.
2.4 Further Analysis

Claim 2 Let $V_i$ be the view consisting of all attributes except $a_i$. Then the expected size of $V_i$ is given by

$$|V_i| = \left(1 - Q_{i-1} + Q_{i-1}p_i\right)^{m_i} - \left(1 - Q_{i-1} + Q_{i-1}p_i\left(1 - \frac{Q_i}{Q_{i-1}}\right)^m\right) \prod_{j \neq i} m_j \quad (5)$$

Proof. Again, let $g_k$ denote a group of rows which share all attributes in common except for $a_k$. Then each entry in the view $V_k$ corresponds to a nonempty group in the final table. Thus we can say the expected size of the view $V_k$ is

$$|V_k| = |V_k|_{\text{max}} \cdot P(|g_k| > 0). \quad (6)$$

The maximum view size is just the product of the number of possible values of each attribute in the view (in this case, all except $a_i$), so that $|V_k| = \prod_{j \neq k} m_j$. We derive the probability of a nonempty group as follows.

Consider the variation that during the $i$th iteration, we skip Step 3, and only remove the rows directly marked, instead of the entire group. Let $\chi_i(g_i)$ be the number of rows that have been marked and removed from a particular group during the $i$th iteration, and let $g_i'$ be the group of remaining rows. This makes the survival of the rows in $g_i'$ independent from one another during iteration $i$. Assume as before that their survivals during the other iterations are also independent events. Now define the generating function

$$\Theta_i(x, y) \equiv \sum_{j,k} P( |g_i| = k \cap \chi_i(g_i) = j ) x^k y^j. \quad (7)$$

This means, for example, that the coefficient of $x^3y^2$ in $\Theta_i(x, y)$ is the probability that for any given group $g_i$, two rows have been marked and removed during the $i$th iteration, and if we leave the rest of the group intact - six rows remain in the group.

For the purposes of construction, let $\Theta_i^n(x, y)$ be the value of the generating function after the $n$th iteration. Consider the group after the $(i - 1)$th iteration. At this point each row has survived with chance $Q_{i-1}$ or been removed with chance $1 - Q_{i-1}$. (There is no $y$ because we have not gone through the $i$th iteration yet.) Thus,

$$\Theta_i^{i-1}(x, y) = (1 - Q_{i-1} + Q_{i-1}x)^{m_i}. \quad (8)$$

For the next iteration, a row survives with probability $p_i$, or is marked and removed with probability $1 - p_i$. This only occurs if the row has survived to this point, so we substitute the corresponding expression for $x$:

$$\Theta_i^i(x, y) = \left(1 - Q_{i-1} + Q_{i-1}((1 - p_i)y + p_ix)\right)^{m_i}. \quad (9)$$
Each row which has survived this far either survives the remaining iterations with probability $\prod_{k=i+1}^{K} q_k = \frac{Q_k}{q_i}$, or does not survive with probability $1 - \frac{Q_k}{q_i}$. Again, substituting the corresponding expression for $x$ we obtain the final generating function:

$$\Theta_i^k(x, y) = \Theta_i(x, y) = \left(1 - Q_{i-1} + Q_{i-1}((1 - p_i)y + p_i(1 - \frac{Q_K}{Q_i} + \frac{Q_K}{Q_i}x))^{m_i} \right) . \quad (8)$$

Now, to relate $g'_i$ to $g_i$, we consider any groups with marked rows as being empty, since they should have been removed. Thus the probability of a nonempty group $g_i$ is the sum of the coefficients of all terms with an $x$-component (nonempty) but no $y$-component (none marked).

$$P(|g_i| > 0) = \sum_{k>0} P(|g_i| = k)$$
$$= \sum_{k>0} P\left( |g'_i| = k \cap \chi_i(g_i) = 0 \right)$$
$$= \left( \sum_{k>0} P\left( |g'_i| = k \cap \chi_i(g_i) = 0 \right) \right) - P\left( |g'_i| = 0 \cap \chi_i(g_i) = 0 \right)$$
$$= \Theta_i(1, 0) - \Theta_i(0, 0)$$

Evaluating the above expression with (8) and substituting into (6) yields the premise. ■

3 Type III non-symmetric synthetic dataset

3.1 Definition

The main motivation for the elimination procedure for the Type II dataset is to produce a change in the dataset’s view sizes. However, after conducting this elimination, we observe that it only has a significant impact on views with many attributes. The views with less attributes are left untouched or barely modified in size.

To address this we define a second row elimination method by modifying the previous method. Again, start with the type I non-symmetric synthetic dataset $D(K; m_1, ..., m_K)$. We then conduct a round of row elimination for each of the $\binom{K}{2}$ unordered pairs of distinct attributes $(a_i, a_j)$. For each round, we first remove each row with some probability $p$. For each row removed, we then also remove any other rows which have the same values for both $a_i$ and $a_j$. This will ensure a change in the the size of views with only two attributes, in addition to a change in the size of the larger views.
3.2 Expected size of dataset

Both the Type II and III procedures involve a number of removal iterations, in each which rows are removed according to certain groups. Thus our results about the expected size of the dataset are analogous to those for the Type II dataset.

Claim 3  Let \( q_k \) be the probability that a row survives the \( k \)th iteration of row removal. Then let \( Q_k \) be the cumulative probability that a row survives all iterations up to and including the \( k \)th iteration, so that \( Q_0 = 1 \) and \( Q_k = \prod_{i=1}^{k} q_k \). Also let the initial size of the \( K \)-attribute dataset be \( S_0 \). If \( a_i \) and \( a_j \) are the pair of attributes selected for iteration \( k > 0 \),

\[
q_k = p_k(1 - Q_{k-1} + Q_{k-1}p_k) \left( \frac{S_0}{m_i m_j} - 1 \right).
\]  (9)

**Proof.** The size of the groups during the \( k \)th iteration is \( \frac{S_0}{m_i m_j} \). The result then follows from the same reasoning as in Claim 1. \( \square \)

In the same way as before, we use an approximation to solve for \( p \) in the above equation.

\[
p_k \approx q_k
\]  (10)

We thus define the following procedure for generating a Type III dataset:

**Step 1.** Input \( S_L \) and \( D(K; m_1, \ldots, m_K) \). Choose an ordering of all ordered pairs of unique attributes \((a_i, a_j)\) such that \( 1 \leq i < j \leq K \). Choose corresponding \( q_1, \ldots, q_{K(\frac{K}{2})} \) such that \( S_L = \prod_{k=1}^{K} m_i \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{K(\frac{K}{2})} q_k \). Set \( h = 1 \).

**Step 2.** If \((a_i, a_j)\) is the \( h \)th pair, set

\[
p_h = q_h
\]

where \( Q_n = \prod_{k=1}^{n} q_k \) and \( Q_0 = 1 \). Mark each row in the current table as ‘selected’ with probability \( 1 - p_h \). (If a row is marked, it will be eliminated.)

**Step 3.** For each row that is marked, also mark any other rows which share the same value of both \( a_i \) and \( a_j \).

**Step 4.** Eliminate all the marked rows in the table. If \( h = \binom{K}{2} \), output the table as \( D' \), otherwise \( h = h + 1 \) and go to step 2.

Note that, unfortunately, the memory-efficient implementation described for Type II does not work for the Type III procedure.
4 A metric for usefulness

Our goal in making these definitions is to obtain datasets which are useful in testing algorithms for the view selection problem. The view selection problem, in brief, consists of finding the most efficient set of views to materialize for answering a given set of queries, given a size constraint on the set of views. [1]

For example, with unlimited space, a set of queries could be answered by simply storing the views which most directly correspond to each query. Given space constraints, however, one must consider storing larger views which can answer more than one query.

This problem may vary in difficulty depending on the dataset. If a view is very close in size to its descendents, then it will almost always be selected instead of its descendents. On the other hand, if a view is very large compared to its descendents, it will never be selected. Either case is trivial and uninteresting. For a dataset to be useful in testing view selection algorithms, it must contain a significant number of views whose size is somewhere in the middle. We use the following metric to quantify the "usefulness" of a view.

Let $C(V)$ be the set of direct descendents, or children, of view $V$ (views obtained from $V$ by considering one less attribute). Then we define $\tau(V)$ as the ratio of the view’s size to the total size of all its direct children:

$$\tau(V) \equiv \frac{|V|}{\sum_{c \in C(V)} |c|}.$$ 

Observe that if a view $V$ can be used to answer a set of queries, $C(V)$ can also be used to answer the same queries. Thus, in order for a view to be useful, it must be smaller than the total size of its direct children. This yields an upper requirement for $\tau(V)$:

$$|V| < \sum_{c \in C(V)} |c|$$

$$\frac{|V|}{\sum_{c \in C(V)} |c|} = \tau(V) < 1.$$ 

On the other hand, we want the direct children of $V$ to be significantly smaller than $|V|$. Let $n(V)$ be the number of attributes in view $|V|$. Then for some constant $b \geq 1$, we require that the view’s average child-to-parent size ratio be less than $1/b$:

$$\frac{1}{n(V)} \sum_{c \in C(V)} \frac{|c|}{|V|} < \frac{1}{b}$$

$$\frac{|V|}{\sum_{c \in C(V)} |c|} = \tau(V) > \frac{b}{n(V)}.$$ 

Let $W(D)$ be the set of all possible views with two or more attributes over dataset $D$. We measure the usefulness of the entire dataset by the fraction of views in $W(D)$ which satisfy
the above bounds:

\[
\omega(D, b) = \frac{1}{|W(D)|} \left| \left\{ V \in W(D) \mid n(V) < \frac{b}{\tau(V) - 1} \right\} \right| .
\]

5 Experimental results

We used the metric defined in the previous section to gauge the usefulness of Type II and III datasets generated using various parameters. The value used for \( b \) is somewhat arbitrary, but we used \( b = 2 \) in all the following results to obtain a consistent comparison. \( S/S_0 \) is the ratio of the dataset size to the original dataset’s size. It is the fraction of rows which remain after elimination.

After running tests we notice several trends. For a given final size, the metric can be increased by starting with a larger original dataset, and removing more rows (Table 2). Another large factor in the number of useful views is the presence (or absence) of small-valued attributes, such as attributes containing only 2 or 3 possible values (Table 3). Such attributes tend to greatly increase the number of useful views.

Type III produces a dataset with more ‘useful’ views for testing. However, it also takes more time to generate, and a memory-efficient method is not yet clear. Thus, for larger datasets, Type II may be preferred. Also, although we have a good estimate of the expected size, it has a very high variance, which can make it difficult to obtain a dataset of a particular

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th># Values per Attribute</th>
<th>Rows</th>
<th>( S/S_0 )</th>
<th>( \omega(D, 2) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>10 10 10 8 5 5 4 3 2</td>
<td>109977</td>
<td>.0023</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15</td>
<td>536934</td>
<td>.0112</td>
<td>.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>50 20 10 8 5 5 4 3 2</td>
<td>59624</td>
<td>.0012</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>50 20 10 8 5 5 4 3 2</td>
<td>244550</td>
<td>.0051</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: 9-attribute datasets of various sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th># Values per Attribute</th>
<th>Rows</th>
<th>( S/S_0 )</th>
<th>( \omega(D, 2) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7</td>
<td>301850</td>
<td>.3665</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10</td>
<td>300730</td>
<td>.0301</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15</td>
<td>304233</td>
<td>.0018</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7</td>
<td>296957</td>
<td>.3606</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10</td>
<td>306216</td>
<td>.0306</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15</td>
<td>279474</td>
<td>.0016</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Starting with different sized datasets.
size. Overall, both types can produce a better dataset than the TCPH dataset we used for comparison, and both appear useful for testing database management systems.

References
