Quancurrent: A Concurrent Quantiles Sketch

Shaked Elias-Zada Arik Rinberg Technion Technion

g Idit Keidar Technion

Sketches are a family of streaming algorithms widely used in the world of big data to perform fast, real-time analytics. A popular sketch type is Quantiles, which estimates the data distribution of a large input stream. We present Quancurrent, a highly scalable concurrent Quantiles sketch. Quancurrent's throughput increases linearly with the number of available threads, and with 32 threads, it reaches an update speedup of 12x and a query speedup of 30x over a sequential sketch. Quancurrent allows queries to occur concurrently with updates and achieves an order of magnitude better query freshness than existing scalable solutions.

1 Introduction

Data sketches, or *sketches* for short, are indispensable tools for performing analytics on high-rate, high-volume data. Specifically, understanding the data distribution is a fundamental task in data management and analysis, used in applications such as exploratory data analysis [22], operations monitoring [4], and more.

The Quantiles sketch family captures this task [17, 6, 12, 10]. The sketch represents the quantiles distribution in a stream of elements, such that for any $0 \le \phi \le 1$, a query for quantile ϕ returns an estimate of the $\lfloor n\phi \rfloor^{\text{th}}$ largest element in a stream of size n. For example, quantile $\phi = 0.5$ is the median. Due to the importance of quantiles approximation, Quantiles sketches are a part of many analytics platforms, e.g., Druid [11], Hillview [9], Presto [18], and Spark [20].

Sketches are designed for *stream* settings, in which each element is processed once. Like other sketches, Quantiles sketch is of sublinear-size and its estimates are *probably approximately correct (PAC)*, providing an approximation within some error ϵn with a failure probability bounded by some parameter δ .

The classic literature on sketches has focused on inducing a small error while using a small memory footprint, in the context of sequential processing: the sketch is built by a single thread, and queries are served only after sketch construction is complete. Only recently, we begin to see works leveraging parallel architectures to achieve a higher ingestion throughput while also enabling queries concurrently with updates [19, 21]. Of these, the only solution suitable for quantiles that we are aware of is the Fast Concurrent Data Sketches (FCDS) framework proposed by Rinberg et al. [19]. However, the scalability of FCDS-based quantiles sketches is limited unless query freshness is heavily compromised (as we show below). Our goal is to provide a scalable concurrent Quantiles sketch that retains a small error bound with reasonable query freshness.

In Section 2, we define the problem and overview a popular sequential solution proposed by Agarwal et. al [6] which is used by Apache DataSketches [1], on which our concurrent sketch is based. In Section 3, we present Quancurrent, our highly scalable concurrent Quantiles sketch. Like FCDS, Quancurrent relies on local buffering of stream elements, which are then propagated in bulk to a shared sketch. But Quancurrent improves on FCDS by eliminating the latter's sequential propagation bottleneck, which mostly stems from the need to sort large buffers.

In Quancurrent, sorting occurs at three levels – a small thread-local buffer, an intermediate NUMA-node-local buffer called *Gather&Sort*, and the shared sketch. Moreover, the shared sketch itself is organized in multiple levels, which may be propagated (and sorted) concurrently by multiple threads.

To allow queries to scale as well, Quancurrent serves them from a cached snapshot of the shared sketch. This architecture is illustrated in Figure 1. The query freshness depends on the sizes of local and NUMA-local buffers as well as the frequency of caching queries. We show that using this architecture, high throughput can be achieved with much smaller buffers (hence much better freshness) than in FCDS.

To lower synchronization overhead, we allow buffered elements to be sporadically overwritten by others without being propagated, and others to be duplicated, i.e., propagated more than once. These occurrences, which we call *holes*, alter the stream ingested by the data structure. Yet, in Section 4 we showed that for a sufficiently large local buffer, the expected number of holes is less than 1 and, because they are random, they do not change the sampled distribution. Figure 2 presents quantiles estimated by Quancurrent on a stream of normally distributed random values compared to an exact, brute-force computation of the quantiles, and shows that the estimation remains accurate.

In Section 5 we empirically evaluate Quancurrent. We show an update speedup of 12x and a query speedup of 30x over the sequential sketch, both with linear speedup. We compare Quancurrent to FCDS, which is the state-of-the-art in concurrent sketches, and show that for FCDS to achieve similar performance it requires an order of magnitude larger buffers that Quancurrent, reducing query freshness tenfold.

In the supplementary material we formally define the system model and present



Figure 1: Quancurrent's data structures.



Figure 2: Quancurrent quantiles vs. exact CDF, k = 1024, normal distribution, 32 update threads, 10M elements.

formal correctness proofs.

2 Background

2.1 **Problem Definition**

Given a stream $A = x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$ with n elements, the rank of some x (not necessarily in A) is the number of elements smaller than x in A, denoted R(A, x). For any $0 \le \phi \le 1$, the ϕ quantile of A is an element x such that $R(A, x) = \lfloor \phi n \rfloor$.

A Quantiles sketch's API is as follows:

- **update**(*x*) process stream element *x*;
- **query**(ϕ) return an approximation of the ϕ quantile in the stream processed so far.

A PAC Quantiles sketch with parameters ϵ, δ returns element x for query(ϕ) after n updates such that $R(A, x) \in [(\phi - \epsilon)n, (\phi + \epsilon)n]$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

In an *r*-relaxed sketch for some $r \ge 0$ every query returns an estimate of the ϕ quantile in a subset of the stream processed so far including all but at most r stream elements [16, 19].

2.2 Sequential Implementation

The Quantiles sketch proposed by Agarwal et al. [6] consists of a hierarchy of arrays, where each array summarizes a subset of the overall stream. The sketch

is instantiated with a parameter k, which is a function of (ϵ, δ) . The first array, denoted level 0, consists of at most 2k elements, and every subsequent array, in levels $1, 2, \ldots$, consists of either 0 or k elements at any given time.

Stream elements are processed in order of arrival, first entering level 0, until it consists of 2k elements. Once this level is full, the sketch samples the array by sorting it and then selecting either the odd indices or the even ones with equal probability. The k sampled elements are then propagated to the next level, and the rest are discarded. If the next level is full, i.e., consists of k elements, then the sketch samples the union of both arrays by performing a merge sort, and once again retaining either the odd or even indices with equal probability. This propagation is repeated until an empty level is reached. Every level that is sampled during the propagation is emptied. Figure 3 depicts the processing of 4k elements.



Figure 3: Quantiles sketch structure and propagation.

Each element is associated with a *weight*, which is the number of coin flips it has "survived". An element in an array on level *i* has a weight of 2^i , as it was sampled *i* times. Thus, an element with a weight of 2^i represents 2^i elements in the processed stream. For approximating the ϕ quantile, we construct a list of tuples, denoted *samples*, containing all elements in the sketch and their associated weights. The list is then sorted by the elements' values. Denote by $W(x_i)$ the sum of weights up to element x_i in the sorted list. The estimation of the ϕ quantile is an element x_i , such that $W(x_i) \leq |\phi n|$ and $W(x_{i+1}) > |\phi n|$.

3 Quancurrent

We present Quancurrent, an r-relaxed concurrent Quantiles sketch where r depends on system parameters as discussed below. The algorithm uses N update threads to ingest stream elements and allows an unbounded number of query

threads. Queries are processed at any time during the sketch's construction. We consider a shared memory model that provides synchronization variables (atomics) and atomic operations to guarantee sequential consistency as in C++ [8]. Everything that happened-before a write in one thread becomes visible to a thread that reads the written value. Also, there is a single total order in which all threads observe all modification in the same order. We use the following sequentially consistent atomic operations (which force a full fence): *fetch-and-add* (*F&A*) [3] and *compare-and-swap* (*CAS*) [2].

In addition, we use a software-implemented higher-level primitive, doublecompare-double-swap (DCAS) which atomically updates two memory addresses as follows: DCAS($addr_1: old_1 \rightarrow new_1, addr_2: old_2 \rightarrow new_2$) is given two memory addresses $addr_1, addr_2$, two corresponding expected values old_1, old_2 , and two new values new_1, new_2 as arguments. It atomically sets $addr_1$ to new_1 and $addr_2$ to new_2 only if both addresses match their expected values, i.e., the value at $addr_1$ equals old_1 and the value at $addr_2$ equals old_2 . DCAS also provides wait-free DCAS_READ primitive, which can read fields that are concurrently modified by a DCAS. DCAS can be efficiently implemented using single-word CAS [15, 14].

In Section 3.1, we present the data structures used by Quancurrent. Section 3.2 presents the update operation, and Section 3.3 presents the query. The formal correctness proof is deferred to the supplementary material.

3.1 Data Structures

Quancurrent's data structures are described in Algorithm 1 and depicted in Figure 4. Similarly to the sequential Quantiles sketch, Quancurrent is organized as a hierarchy of arrays called *levels*. Each level can be *empty*, *full*, or in *propagation*. The variable *tritmap* maintains the states of all levels. Tritmap is an unsigned integer, interpreted as an array of trits (trinary digits). The trit tritmap[i]describes level *i*'s state: if tritmap[i] is 0, level *i* contains 0 or 2k ignored elements and is considered to be empty. If tritmap[i] is 1, level *i* contains *k* elements and is deemed full, and if it is 2, level *i* contains 2k elements and is associated with the propagation state. Each thread has a local buffer of size *b*, *localBuf*[*b*]. Before ingested into the sketch's levels, stream elements are buffered in threads local buffers and then moved to a processing unit called *Gather&Sort*. The *Gather&Sort* object has two 2k-sized shared buffers, G&SBuffer[2], each with its own *index* specifying the current location, as depicted in Figure 4a.

The query mechanism of Quancurrent includes taking an atomic snapshot of the levels. Query threads cache the snapshot and the tritmap that represents it in local variables, *snapshot* and *myTrit*, respectively. As the snapshot reflects only the sketch's levels and not G&SBuffers or the thread's local buffers, Quancurrent

is (4kS + (N - S)b)-relaxed Quantiles sketch where S is the number of NUMA nodes.

Algorithm 1: Quancurrent data structures

1	Parameters and constants:	
2	MAX_LEVEL	
3	k	⊳ sketch level size
4	b	⊳ local buffer size
5	S	⊳ #NUMA nodes
6	Shared objects:	
7	$tritmap \leftarrow 0$	
8	$levels[MAX_LEVEL]$	
9	NUMA-local objects:	
		\triangleright shared among threads on the same node
10	G&SBuffer[2][2k]	
11	$index[2] \leftarrow \{0,0\}$	
12	Thread local objects:	
13	localBuf[b]	
14	myTrit	⊳ used by query
15	snapshot	⊳ used by query

3.2 Update

The ingestion of stream elements occurs in three stages: (1) gather and sort, (2) batch update, and (3) propagate level. In stage (1), stream elements are buffered and sorted into batches of 2k through a Gather&Sort object. Each NUMA node has its designated Gather&Sort object, which is accessed by NUMA-local threads. Stage (2) executes a batch update of 2k elements from the Gather&Sort object to levels[0]. Finally, in stage (3), levels[0] is propagated up the levels of the hierarchy.

In the first stage, threads first process stream elements into a thread-local buffer of size b. Once the buffer is full, it is sorted and the thread reserves b slots on a shared buffer in its node's Gather&Sort unit. It then begins to move the local buffer's content to the shared buffer. The shared Gather&Sort buffer contains 2k elements, and its propagation (during Stage 2) is not synchronized with the insertion of elements. Thus, some reserved slots might still contain old values, (which have already been propagated), instead of new ones. As the batch is a sample of the original stream, we can accept the possible loss of information in order to

improve performances. Below, we show that the sampling bias this introduces is negligible.

The pseudo-code for the first stage is presented in Algorithm 2. To insert its elements to the shared buffer, a thread tries to reserve b places in one of the shared buffers using F&A (Line 22). If the index does not overflow, the thread copies its local buffer to the reserved slots (Line 24). We refer to the thread that fills the last b locations in a G&SBuffer as the *owner* of the current batch. The batch owner creates a local sorted copy of the shared buffer and begins its propagation (Lines 26-27).

Note that the local buffer is not atomically moved into the shared buffer (Line 24 is a loop). Thus, the owner might begin a propagation before another thread has finished moving its elements to the shared buffer. In this case, the old elements already contained within the G&SBuffer are taken instead. Furthermore, upon moving its elements later, the writer thread might overwrite more recent elements. In other words, during this stage, stream elements may be duplicated and new elements may be dropped. We call both of these occurrences *holes*, and analyze their implications in Section 4.1.

Alg	gorithm 2: Stage 1: gather and sort	
16 P	Procedure update(x):	
17	add x to $localBuf$	⊳ thread-local
18	if ¬ <i>localBuf</i> .full() then return	
19	sort <i>localBuf</i>	
20	$i \leftarrow 0$	
21	do	▷ insert to Gather&Sort unit
22	$idx \leftarrow index[i].F&A(b)$	
23	if $idx < 2k$ then	⊳ space available
24	move $localBuf$ to $G\&SBuff$	$er[i][idx,\ldots,idx+b]$
25	if $idx + b = 2k$ then	⊳ owner, filled buffer
26	$myCopy \leftarrow \text{sorted copy}$	of $G\&SBuffer[i]$
27	batchUpdate(<i>i</i> , <i>myCopy</i>)	
28	return	
29	$i \leftarrow \neg i$	
30	while true	
31 e	nd	

In the second stage, the owner inserts its local sorted copy of the shared buffer into level 0 using a DCAS. The batch of 2k elements is only inserted when level 0 is empty, reflected by the first digit of the tritmap being 0. We use DCAS to



(a) Gather&Sort object.



(b) Batch update into levels[0].

Figure 4: Quancurrent's data structures.

atomically update both *levels*[0] to point to the new sorted batch and *tritmap* to indicate an ongoing batch update (reflected by setting tritmap[0] to 2). The DCAS might fail if other owner threads are trying to insert their batches or propagate them. The owner keeps trying to insert its batch into the sketch's first level until a DCAS succeeds, and then resets the index of the G&SBuffer to allow other threads to ingest new stream elements. The pseudo-code for the second stage is presented in Algorithm 3, and an example is depicted in Figure 4b.

Algorithm 3: Stage 2: batch update32Procedure batchUpdate($i, base_copy$):33while $\neg DCAS(levels[0]: \bot \rightarrow base_copy, tritmap[0]: 0 \rightarrow 2)$ do { }34 $index[i] \leftarrow 0$ 35propagate(0)36end

In the beginning of the third stage, level 0 points to a new sorted copy of a G&SBuffer array and tritmap[0]=2. During this stage, the owner thread propagates the newly inserted elements up the levels hierarchy iteratively, level by level from level 0 until an empty level is reached. The pseudo-code for the propagation stage is presented in Algorithm 4. On each call to *propagate*, level *l* is propagated to level l+1, assuming that level l contains 2k sorted elements and tritmap[l] = 2. If tritmap[l+1] = 2, the owner thread is blocked by another propagation from l+1 to l+2 and it waits until tritmap[l+1] is either a 0 or 1. The owner thread samples k elements from level l and retains the odd or even elements with equal probability (Line 39). If tritmap[l+1] is 1, then level l+1 contains k elements. The sampled elements are merged with level l+1 elements into a new 2k-sized sorted array (Line 41). We then (in Line 42) continuously try, using DCAS, to update *levels*[l+1] to point to the merged array and atomically update *tritmap* such that $tritmap[l] \leftarrow 0$, reflecting level l is available, and $tritmap[l+1] \leftarrow 2$, reflecting that level l+1 contains 2k elements. After a successful DCAS, we clear level l (set it to \perp) and proceed to propagate the next level (Line 44). If tritmap[l+1] is 0, then level l + 1 is empty. We use DCAS (Line 45) to update levels[l + 1] to point to the sampled elements and atomically update *tritmap* so that tritmap[l] becomes 0, and *tritmap*[l+1] becomes 1 (containing k elements). After a successful DCAS, we clear level *l* (set it to \perp) and end the current propagation.

Propagations of different batches may occur concurrently, i.e., level propagation of levels l and l' can be performed in parallel. Figure 5 depicts an example of concurrent propagation of two batches.

Algorithm 4: Stage 3: Propagation of level *l*

37	<pre>Procedure propagate(l):</pre>
38	if $l \ge MAX_LEVEL$ then return
	▷ choose odd or even indexed elements randomly
39	$newLevel \leftarrow sampleOddOrEven(levels[l])$
40	if $tritmap[l+1] = 1$ then \triangleright next level is full
41	$newLevel \leftarrow merge(newLevel, levels[l+1])$
42	while $\neg DCAS(levels[l+1]: levels[l+1] \rightarrow newLevel, tritmap[l,$
	$l+1$: $[2,1] \rightarrow [0,2]$) do { }
43	$levels[l] \leftarrow \bot$ \triangleright clear level
44	return propagate(<i>l</i> +1)
	ightarrow tritmap[l+1] is 0 or 2
45	while $\neg DCAS(levels[l+1]: \bot \rightarrow newLevel, tritmap[l, l+1]:$
	$[2,0] \rightarrow [0,1]$) do { }
46	$levels[l] \leftarrow \bot$ \triangleright clear level
47	end

3.3 Query

Queries are performed by an unbounded number of query threads. A query returns an approximation based on a subset of the stream processed so far including all elements whose propagation into the levels array begun before the query was invoked. The query is served from an atomic snapshot of the levels array. The pseudo-code is presented in Algorithm 5. Instead of collecting a new snapshot for each query, we cache the snapshot so that queries may be serviced from this cache, as long as the snapshot isn't too stale. The snapshot and the tritmap value that represents it are cached in local variables, *snapshot* and *myTrit*, respectively. Query freshness is controlled by the parameter ρ , which bounds the ratio between the current stream size and the cached stream size. As long as this threshold is not exceeded, the cached snapshot may be returned (Lines 50-51). Otherwise, a new snapshot is taken and cached.

The snapshot is obtained by first reading the tritmap, then reading the levels from 0 to MAX_LEVEL , and then reading the tritmap again. If both reads of the tritmap represent the same stream size then they represent the same stream. We can use the levels read to reconstruct some state that represents this stream. The process is repeated until two such tritmap values are read. For example, focusing on the last two phases of the propagation in Figure 5, lets assume a query thread T_q reads tm1 = 00202, then reads the levels from levels[0] to levels[4] as depicted



Figure 5: Quancurrent propagation.

(a) The owner of batch i, owner(i), inserts batch i to level 0 and atomically updates tritmap[0] to 2. (b) owner(i) merges level 0 with level 1 and changes tritmap[1, 0] from [1, 2] to [2, 0]. (c) owner(i) clears level 0. (d) owner(i + 1) inserts its batch to level 0 and atomically updates tritmap[0] to 2. (e) owner(i) merges level 1 with level 2, and sets tritmap[2, 1] to [2, 0]. Batch i + 1 is still blocked because level 1 has not been cleared yet. (f) owner(i) clears level 1. (g) Now owner(i + 1) successfully merges level 0 with the empty level 1, and sets tritmap[1, 0] to [1, 0].

in Figure 5 (between the dashed lines), and then read $tm^2 = 00210$. The two tritmap reads represent the same stream of size 10k, thus a snapshot representing the same stream can be constructed from the levels read. The pseudo-code for calculating the stream size is presented in Algorithm 6. Each level is read atomically as the levels arrays are immutable and replaced by pointer swings. The snapshot is a subset of the levels summarizing the stream. To construct the snapshot, the collected levels are iterated over, in reversed order, from MAX_LEVEL to 0, and level *i* is added to the snapshot only if the total collected stream size (including level *i*) is less than or equal to the stream size represented by the tritmap (Line 61). Back to our last example, the size of each level collected by T_q is 2k, k, 2k, 0, 0 (in descending order). As explained, to construct the snapshot, we go over the collected levels from snapLevels[4] to snapLevels[0]. By reading snapLevels[1], the total stream size represented by snapshot is $0+0+4\cdot 2k+2\cdot k=10k$. As the stream size represented by tm1 and tm2 is 10k, the construction of the snapshot is done and all elements of the processed stream are represented exactly once. The tritmap myTrit maintains the total size of the collected stream and each trit describes the state of a collected level. If level i was collected to the snapshot, the value of myTrit[i] is the size of level i divided by k (Line 63).

As levels propagate from lowest to highest, reading the levels in the same direction ensures that no element would be missed but may cause elements to be represented more than once. Building the snapshot bottom-up ensures that each element will be accounted once. In other words, reading the levels from lowest to highest and building the snapshot highest to lowest ensures that an atomic snapshot is collected, as proven in the Supplementary material.

Algorithm 5: Query

48	Procedure Query(ϕ):
49	$tm1 \leftarrow tritmap$
50	if $\frac{tm1.streamSize()}{myTrit.streamSize()} \le \rho$ then
51	return snapshot.query(ϕ)
52	do
53	$tm1 \leftarrow tritmap$
54	$snapLevels \leftarrow read \ levels \ 0 \ to \ MAX_LEVEL$
55	$tm2 \leftarrow tritmap$
56	while $tm1$.streamSize() $\neq tm2$.streamSize()
57	$myTrit \leftarrow 0$
58	$snapshot \leftarrow empty \ snapshot$
59	for $i \leftarrow MAX_LEVEL$ to 0 do
60	weight $\leftarrow 2^i$
61	if snapLevels[i].size()·weight+
	$myTrit.streamSize() \leq tm1.streamSize()$ then
62	add $snapLevels[i]$ to $snapshot$
63	$myTrit[i] \leftarrow snapLevels[i].size()/k$
64	if <i>myTrit</i> .streamSize()= <i>tm1</i> .streamSize() then break
65	end
66	return snapshot.query(ϕ)
67	end

4 Analysis

In Section 4.1 we analyze the expected number of holes, and in Section 4.2 we analyze Quancurrent's error.

4.1 Holes Analysis

Because the update operation moves elements from the thread's local buffer to a shared buffer non-atomically, holes may occur when the owner thread reads older elements that were written to the shared buffer in a previous window. The missed

Algorithm 6: Tritmap

68 Procedure streamSize(): $\mathit{curr_stream} \gets 0$ 69 for $i \leftarrow 0$ to MAX_LEVEL do 70 weight $\leftarrow 2^i$ 71 if tritmap[i] = 1 then 72 $curr_stream \leftarrow curr_stream + weight \cdot k$ 73 else if tritmap[i] = 2 then 74 $curr_stream \leftarrow curr_stream + weight \cdot 2k$ 75 end 76 77 return curr_stream 78 end

(delayed) writes may later overwrote newer writes. Together, for each hole, an old value is duplicated and a new value is dropped.

We analyze the expected number of holes under the assumption of a *uniform stochastic scheduler* [7], which schedules each thread with a uniform probability in every step. That is, at each point in the execution, the probability for each thread to take the next step is $\frac{1}{N}$.

Denote by H the total number of holes in some batch of 2k elements. G&SBuffer's array is divided into $\frac{2k}{b}$ regions, each consisting of b slots populated by the same thread. Denote by $H_1, \ldots, H_{\frac{2k}{b}}$ the number of holes in regions $1, \ldots, \frac{2k}{b}$, respectively.

The slots in region j are written to by the thread that successfully increments the shared index from (j - 1)b to jb. We refer to this thread as T_j . Note that multiple regions may have the same writing thread. The shared buffer's owner, T_O , is $T_{\frac{2k}{b}}$. To initiate a batch update, T_O creates a local copy of one G&SBuffer by iteratively reading the array. A hole is read in some region j if T_O reads some index i + 1 in this region before the writer thread T_j writes to the corresponding index in the same region.

Analysis of H_j . When T_O increments the index from 2k-b to 2k, T_j may have completed any number of writes between 0 and b to region j. We first consider the case that T_j hasn't completed any writes. In this case, for a hole to be read in slot i + 1 of region j, T_O 's read of slot i + 1 must overtake T_j 's write of the same slot. To this end, T_O must write b values (from its own local buffer), read (j - 1)b values from the first j - 1 regions and then read values from slots $1, \ldots, i + 1$ in this region before T_j takes i + 1 steps. The probability that T_O reads a hole for

the first time in this region in slot i + 1 is:

$$\pi_{i,j} \triangleq P[\text{hole in slot } i+1 \mid \text{no hole in slots } 1 \dots i]$$
$$\cdot P[\text{no hole in slots } 1 \dots i]$$

For a hole to be read in slot i + 1 of region j, T_O must take b + (j - 1)b + i + 1steps while T_j takes at most i steps, with T_O 's read of slot i + 1 being last. But if T_j takes fewer than i steps, a hole is necessarily read earlier than slot i + 1. Therefore, we can bound $\pi_{i,j}$ by considering the probability that T_j takes exactly i steps while T_O takes b + (j - 1)b + i steps, and then T_O takes a step. Ignoring steps of other threads, each of T_j and T_O has a probability of $\frac{1}{2}$ to take a step before the other. Therefore,

$$\pi_{i,j} \le \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{jb+2i+1} \binom{jb+2i}{i}.$$

Note that this includes schedules in which T_O reads holes in previous slots in the same region, therefore it is an upper bound. Given that T_j has not yet written in region j, the probability, p_j , that T_O reads at least 1 hole in region j is bounded as follows:

$$p_j \le \sum_{i=0}^{b-1} \pi_{i,j}$$

If T_j has completed writes to region j, the probability that T_O reads holes is even lower. Therefore, the probability that $H_j \ge 1$ is bounded from above by p_j . Using this, we bound the expected total number of holes in region j:

$$E[H_j] = P(H_j = 0) \cdot 0 + P(H_j = 1) \cdot 1 + \dots + P(H_j = b) \cdot b.$$

 T_O can read at most *b* holes, therefore,

$$E[H_j] < b \cdot (P(H_j = 1) + \dots + P(H_j = b))$$

= $b \cdot P(H_j \ge 1) < b \cdot p_j.$

Using the linearity of expectation, we bound the expected number of holes in a batch:

$$E[H] = E[H_1] + E[H_2] + \dots + E\left[H_{\frac{2k}{b}}\right].$$

In the supplementary material, we prove that

$$\forall j \ge 1, b \in \mathbb{N}, \ E[H_{j+1}] \le 0.5 \cdot E[H_j]$$
$$\forall b \in \mathbb{N}, \ E[H_1] \le 1.4$$

Together, this implies that $E[H] \leq 2.8$ for all $b \in \mathbb{N}$.

4.2 Error Analysis

The source of Quancurrent's estimation error is twofold: (1) the error induced by sub-sampling the stream, and (2) the additional error induced by concurrency. For the former, we leverage the existing literature on analysis of sequential sketches. We analyze the latter. As the expected number of holes is fairly small and the holes are random, we disregard their effect on the error analysis.

First, our buffering mechanism induces a relaxation. Let S be the number of NUMA nodes. Recall that each NUMA node has a Gather&Sort object that contains two buffers of size 2k. In addition, each of the N update threads has a local buffer. When the G&SBuffer is full, the local buffer of the owner is empty so at most N-S threads lcally buffered elements. Therefore, the buffering relaxation r is 4kS + (N - S)b.

Rinberg et al. [19] show that for a query of a ϕ -quantile, an r-relaxation of a Quantiles sketch with parameters ϵ_c and δ_c , returns an element whose rank is in the range $[(\phi - \epsilon_r)n, (\phi + \epsilon_r)n]$ with probability at least $1 - \delta_c$, for $\epsilon_r = \epsilon_c + \frac{r}{h}(1 - \epsilon_c)$.

On top of this relaxation, our cache mechanism induces further staleness. Here, the staleness depends on ρ . Let n_{old} be the stream size of the cached snapshot, and let n_{new} be the current stream size. If $n_{new}/n_{old} \leq \rho$ then the query is answered from the cached snapshot. Denote $\rho \triangleq 1 + \epsilon'$ for some $\epsilon' \geq 0$. The element returned by the cached snapshot is in the range:

$$\left[\left(\phi - \epsilon_r\right) n_{old}, \left(\phi + \epsilon_r\right) n_{old}\right]$$

As $n_{old} \leq n_{new}$, then,

$$(\phi + \epsilon_r) n_{old} \le (\phi + \epsilon_r) n_{new} \le (\phi + (\epsilon' + \epsilon_r)) n_{new}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\phi - \epsilon_r\right) n_{old} &\geq \left(\phi - \epsilon_r\right) \frac{n_{new}}{\rho} = \\ & \left(\frac{\phi}{1 + \epsilon'} - \frac{\epsilon_r}{1 + \epsilon'}\right) n_{new} = \\ & \left(\phi - \frac{\phi\epsilon'}{1 + \epsilon'} - \frac{\epsilon_r}{1 + \epsilon'}\right) n_{new} \geq \\ & \left(\phi - \left(\epsilon' + \epsilon_r\right)\right) n_{new} \end{aligned}$$

Because $\phi \leq 1$ and $\epsilon' \geq 0$ then, $\frac{\phi \epsilon'}{1+\epsilon'} \leq \frac{\epsilon'}{1+\epsilon'} \leq 1$. Therefore, the query returns a value within the range

$$\left[\left(\phi - \epsilon\right)n, \left(\phi + \epsilon\right)n\right]$$

for $\epsilon \triangleq \epsilon_r + \epsilon'$.

5 Evaluation

In this section we measure Quancurrent's throughput and estimation accuracy. Section 5.1 presents the experiment setup and methodology. Section 5.2 presents throughput measurements and discusses scalability. Section 5.3 experiments with different parameter setting, examining how performance is affected by query freshness. Section 5.4 presents an accuracy of estimation analysis. Finally, Section 5.5 compares Quancurrent to the state-of-the-art.

5.1 Setup and Methodology

We implement Quancurrent in C++. Our memory management system is based on IBR [23], an interval-based approach to memory reclamation for concurrent data structures. The experiments were run on a NUMA system with four Intel Xeon E5-4650 processors, each with 8 cores, for a total of 32 threads (with hyperthreading disabled).

Each thread was pinned to a NUMA node, and nodes were first filled before overflowing to other NUMA nodes, i.e., 8 threads use only a single node, while 9 use two nodes with 8 threads on one and 1 on the second. The default memory allocation policy is local allocation, except for Quancurrent's shared pointers. Each Gather&Sort unit is allocated on a different NUMA node and threads update the G&SBuffers allocated on the node they belong to. The stream is drawn from a uniform distribution, unless stated otherwise. Each data point is an average of 15 runs, to minimize measurement noise.

5.2 Throughput Scalability

We measured Quancurrent's throughput in three workloads: (1) update-only, (2) query-only, and (3) mixed update-query. In the update-only workload, we update Quancurrent with a stream of 10M elements and measure the time it takes to feed the sketch. For the other two workloads, we pre-fill the sketch with a stream of 10M elements and then execute the workload (10M queries only or queries and 10M updates) and measure performance. Figure 6 shows Quancurrent's throughput in those workloads with k = 4096 and b = 16,

As shown in Figure 6a, Quancurrent's performance with a single thread is similar to the sequential algorithm and with more threads it scales linearly, reaching 12x the sequential throughput with 32 threads. We observe that the speedup is faster with fewer threads, we believe this is because once there are more than 8 threads, the shared object is accessed from multiple NUMA nodes.

Figure 6b shows that, as expected, the throughput of the query-only workload

scales linearly with the number of query threads, reaching 30x the sequential throughput with 32 threads.

In the mixed workload, the parameter ρ is significant for performance - when $\rho = 0$ (no caching), a snapshot it reproduced on every query. Figure 6c presents the update throughput (left) and query throughput (right) in the presence of 1 or 2 update threads, with staleness thresholds of $\rho = 0$ and $\rho = 0.05$. We see that the caching mechanism ($\rho > 0$) is indeed crucial for performance. As expected, increasing the staleness threshold allows queries to use their local (possibly stale) snapshot, servicing queries faster and greatly increasing the query throughout. Furthermore, more update threads decrease the query throughput, as the update threads interfere with the query snapshot. Finally, increasing the number of query threads decreases the update threads interfere with update throughput, as query threads interfere with update threads, presumably due to cache invalidations of the shared state.

5.3 Parameter Exploration

We now experiment with different parameter settings with up to 32 threads. In Figure 7a we vary k from 256 to 4096, in update-only scenario with b = 16 and up to 32 update threads. We see that the scalability trends are similar, and that Quancurrent's throughput increases with k, peaking at k = 2048, after which increasing k has little effect. This illustrates the tradeoff between the sketch size (memory footprint) to throughput and accuracy.

Figure 7b experiments with different local buffer sizes, from 1 to 64, in updateonly scenario with k = 4096 and up to 32 update threads. Not surprisingly, the throughput increases as the local buffer grows as this enables more concurrency.

In Figure 7c we vary ρ , in a mixed update-query workload with 8 update threads, 24 query threads, k = 1024, and b = 16, exploring another aspect of query freshness versus performance. As expected, increasing ρ has a positive impact on query throughput, as the cached snapshot can be queried more often. Figure 7c also shows the miss rate, which is the percentage of queries that need to re-construct the snapshot.

5.4 Accuracy

To measure the estimate accuracy, we consider a query invoked in a quiescent state where no updates occur concurrently with the query. Figure 8 shows the standard error of 1M estimations in a quiescent state. We see that Quancurrent's estimations are similar to the sequential ones using the same k, and improves with larger values of k as known from the literature on sequential sketches [6].

To illustrate the impact of k visually, Figure 9 compares the distribution measured by Quancurrent (red open-circles) to the exact (full information) stream distribution (green CDF filled-circles). In Figure 2 (in the introduction), we depict the accuracy of Quancurrent's estimate of a normal distribution with k = 1024. Figure 9b (left) shows that when we reduce k to 32, the approximation is less tight while for k = 256 (Figure 9b right) it is very accurate. We observe similar results for the uniform distribution in Figure 9a. We experimented with additional distributions with similar results, which are omitted due to space limitations.

5.5 Comparison to state of the art

Finally, we compare Quancurrent against a concurrent Quantiles sketch implemented within the FCDS framework [19], the only previously suggested concurrent sketch we know that supports quantiles. Figure 10 shows the throughput results (log scale) for 8, 16, 24 and 32 threads and k = 4096. FCDS satisfies relaxed consistency with a relaxation of up to 2NB, where N is the number of worker threads and B is the buffer size of each worker. Recall that Quancurrent's relaxation is at most r = 4kS + (N - S)b. For a fair comparison, we compare the two algorithms in settings with the same relaxation.

For 8 update threads (S = 1) and b = 2048, the relaxation of Quancurrent is $r \approx 30K$. The same relaxation in FCDS with the same number of update threads is achieved with a buffer size of B = 1920. With 8 threads, Quancurrent reaches a throughput of $22M \ ops/sec$ for a relaxation of 30K whereas FCDS reaches a throughput of $25M \ ops/sec$ for a much larger relaxation of 137K. Also, with 32 threads, Quancurrent reaches a throughput of $62M \ ops/sec$ for a relaxation of 122K, but FCDS only reaches a throughput of $19M \ ops/sec$ with a relaxation of more than 500K.

Overall, we see that FCDS requires large buffers (resulting in a high relaxation and low query freshness) in order to scale with the number of threads. This is because, unlike Quancurrent, FCDS uses a single thread to propagate data from all other threads' local buffers into the shared sketch. The propagation involves a heavy merge-sort, so large local buffers are required in order to offset it and keep the working threads busy during the propagation. In contrast, Quancurrent's propagation is collaborative, with merge-sorts occurring concurrently both at the NUMA node level (in Gather&Sort buffers) and at multiple levels of the shared sketch.

6 Conclusion

We presented Quancurrent, a concurrent scalable Quantiles sketch. We have evaluated it and shown it to be linearly scalable for both updates and queries while providing accurate estimates. Moreover, it achieves higher performance than state-of-the-art concurrent quantiles solutions with better query freshness. Quancurrent's scalability arises from allowing multiple threads to concurrently engage in merge-sorts, which are a sequential bottleneck in previous solutions. We dramatically reduce the synchronization overhead by accommodating occasional data races that cause samples to be duplicated or dropped, a phenomenon we refer to as holes. This approach leverages the observation that sketches are approximate to begin with, and so the impact of such holes is marginal. Future work may leverage this observation to achieve high scalability in other sketches or approximation algorithms.

References

- Apache DataSketches. https://datasketches.apache.org/, 2019.
- [2] Compare and exchange. https://c9x.me/x86/html/file modulex86id41.html, Accessed: March 2022.
- [3] Exchange and Add. https://c9x.me/x86/html/filemodule x86id327.html, Accessed: March 2022.
- [4] Lior Abraham, John Allen, Oleksandr Barykin, Vinayak Borkar, Bhuwan Chopra, Ciprian Gerea, Daniel Merl, Josh Metzler, David Reiss, Subbu Subramanian, et al. Scuba: Diving into data at facebook. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 6(11):1057–1067, 2013.
- [5] Yehuda Afek, Guy Korland, and Eitan Yanovsky. Quasi-linearizability: Relaxed consistency for improved concurrency. volume 6490, pages 395–410, 12 2010.
- [6] Pankaj K. Agarwal, Graham Cormode, Zengfeng Huang, Jeff Phillips, Zhewei Wei, and Ke Yi. Mergeable summaries. In *Proceedings of the 31st* ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS '12, page 23–34, New York, NY, USA, 2012. Association for Computing Machinery.

- [7] Dan Alistarh, Keren Censor-Hillel, and Nir Shavit. Are lock-free concurrent algorithms practically wait-free? *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 63(4):1–20, 2016.
- [8] Hans-J. Boehm and Sarita V. Adve. Foundations of the c++ concurrency memory model. In Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI '08, page 68–78, New York, NY, USA, 2008. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [9] Mihai Budiu, Parikshit Gopalan, Lalith Suresh, Udi Wieder, Han Kruiger, and Marcos K Aguilera. Hillview: a trillion-cell spreadsheet for big data. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 12(11):1442–1457, 2019.
- [10] Graham Cormode, Zohar Karnin, Edo Liberty, Justin Thaler, and Pavel Vesely. Relative error streaming quantiles. In Proceedings of the 40th ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, pages 96–108, 2021.
- [11] Druid. Apache Druid. https://druid.apache.org/ docs/latest/development/extensions-core/ datasketches-quantiles.html, Accessed February 16, 2022.
- [12] Edward Gan, Jialin Ding, Kai Sheng Tai, Vatsal Sharan, and Peter Bailis. Moment-based quantile sketches for efficient high cardinality aggregation queries. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 11(11):1647–1660, 2018.
- [13] Wojciech Golab, Lisa Higham, and Philipp Woelfel. Linearizable implementations do not suffice for randomized distributed computation. STOC '11, page 373–382, New York, NY, USA, 2011. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [14] Rachid Guerraoui, Alex Kogan, Virendra J Marathe, and Igor Zablotchi. Efficient multi-word compare and swap. In 34th International Symposium on Distributed Computing, 2020.
- [15] Timothy L. Harris, Keir Fraser, and Ian A. Pratt. A practical multi-word compare-and-swap operation. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Distributed Computing*, DISC '02, page 265–279, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2002. Springer-Verlag.
- [16] Thomas A. Henzinger, Christoph M. Kirsch, Hannes Payer, Ali Sezgin, and Ana Sokolova. Quantitative relaxation of concurrent data structures. In Proceedings of the 40th Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles

of Programming Languages, POPL '13, page 317–328, New York, NY, USA, 2013. Association for Computing Machinery.

- [17] Charles Masson, Jee E Rim, and Homin K Lee. Ddsketch: a fast and fullymergeable quantile sketch with relative-error guarantees. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 12(12):2195–2205, 2019.
- [18] Presto. PrestoDB. https://prestodb.io/docs/current/ functions/aggregate.html, Accessed February 16, 2022.
- [19] Arik Rinberg, Alexander Spiegelman, Edward Bortnikov, Eshcar Hillel, Idit Keidar, Lee Rhodes, and Hadar Serviansky. *Fast Concurrent Data Sketches*, page 117–129. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2020.
- [20] Spark. Apache Spark. https://spark.apache.org/docs/ latest/api/python/reference/api/pyspark.sql. DataFrame.approxQuantile.html, Accessed February 16, 2022.
- [21] Charalampos Stylianopoulos, Ivan Walulya, Magnus Almgren, Olaf Landsiedel, and Marina Papatriantafilou. Delegation sketch: a parallel design with support for fast and accurate concurrent operations. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth European Conference on Computer Systems*, pages 1–16, 2020.
- [22] Manasi Vartak, Sajjadur Rahman, Samuel Madden, Aditya Parameswaran, and Neoklis Polyzotis. Seedb: Efficient data-driven visualization recommendations to support visual analytics. In *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment International Conference on Very Large Data Bases*, volume 8, page 2182. NIH Public Access, 2015.
- [23] Haosen Wen, Joseph Izraelevitz, Wentao Cai, H. Alan Beadle, and Michael L. Scott. Interval-based memory reclamation. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming*, PPoPP '18, page 1–13, New York, NY, USA, 2018. Association for Computing Machinery.



(b) Query-only, 10M elements prefilled, 10M queries.



(c) One or two update threads, up to 32 query threads, k=1024, 10M elements inserted after a pre-fill of 10M elements.

Figure 6: Quancurrent throughput, k=4096, b=16.



Figure 7: Quancurrent parameters impact.



Figure 8: Standard error of estimation in quiescent state, keys=1M, runs=1000.



(b) Normal distribution.

Figure 9: Quancurrent quantiles vs. exact CDF, with 32 threads, b=16, and a stream size of 10M.



Figure 10: Quancurrent vs. FCDS, k = 4096.

A **Proofs**

In Section A.1 we present preliminaries needed for our proofs. In Section A.2 we prove that the query operation collects a consistent snapshot at some point in the execution. In Section A.3 we prove that Quancurrent is strongly linearizable with respect to the relaxed specification. Finally, Section A.4 provides proofs for the claims made in Section 4.

A.1 Preliminaries

We consider a shared memory model, where a finite number of threads execute *operations* on shared *objects*. An operation consists of an *invocation* and a matching *response*. A *history* H is a finite sequence of operation invocation and response steps. A history H defines a partial order \prec_H on operations: Given operations *op* and *op'*, *op* \prec_H *op'* if and only if response(op) precedes invocation(op') in H. Two operations that do not precede each other are concurrent. In a *sequential history*, there are no concurrent operations. An object is specified using a *sequential specification* \mathcal{H} , which is the set of its allowed sequential histories. An operation *op* is *complete* in a history H if both invocation(op) and its matching response(op) are in H. A *linearization* of a concurrent history H, is a sequential history H' such that: (1) $H' \in \mathcal{H}$, (2) H' contains all completed operations and possibly additional non-complete ones, after adding matching responses, and, (3) $\prec_{H'}$ extends \prec_H . A correctness condition for randomized algorithms *strong linearizability* [13], defined as follows:

Definition 1 (Strong linearizability). A function f mapping executions to histories is prefix-preserving if for any two executions σ , σ ', where σ is a prefix of σ ', $f(\sigma)$ is a prefix of $f(\sigma')$.

An object A is a strongly linearizable if there is a prefix-preserving function f that maps every history H of A to a linearization of H.

Our algorithm is randomised and we consider a weak adversary that determines the scheduling without observing the coin-flips.

As previously mentioned, we adopt a flavor of *relaxed semantics*, as defined in [16]:

Definition 2 (*r*-relaxation). A sequential history H is an *r*-relaxation of a sequential history H', if H is comprised of all but at most r of the invocations in H' and their responses, and each invocation in H is preceded by all but at most r of the invocations that precede the same invocation in H'. The *r*-relaxation of a sequential specification H is the set of histories that have *r*-relaxations in H:

 $H^{r} \triangleq \left\{ H' \mid \exists H \in \mathcal{H} : H \text{ is an } r \text{-relaxation of } H' \right\}.$

A.2 Query Proof

Let σ be an execution of Quancurrent and let tm1 and tm2 be responses of two read operations of tritmap, op_1 and op_2 , respectively, in σ , such that op_1 precedes op_2 . Let A be the stream represented by tm1. We will prove that the constructed *snapshot* in Algorithm 5, Lines 57-63, summarizes the same stream A. We denote by |A| to be the stream size and by |snapshot| to be the size of the stream currently represented by snapshot. Let snapLevels be the set all levels read between op_1 and op_2 .

First, we show that tm1 and tm2 represent the same stream, i.e. A.

Lemma 1. Let tm1 and tm2 be responses of two read operations of tritmap. If tm1 and tm2 represent streams with equal size then tm1 and tm2 represent the same stream.

Proof. By definition the variable tritmap is 3-based, 31 digits non-negative integer that is atomically updated by DCAS operation and is only increasing. \Box

Second, we show that snapLevels contains all sampled elements in the sketch, immediately after tm2, summarizing the stream A.

Lemma 2. The set of levels, snapLevels, read between the two tritmap's reads, op_1 and op_2 , contains all sampled elements summarizing the stream A.

Proof. Let x be an element in level j immediately after tm1. If x exists in level j during the read of sketch's levels in Algorithm 5 Line 54, then we are done. Otherwise, a propagation occurred in between the reads such that level j was merged with the next level and cleared. During this merge, all level j's elements, including x, were sampled and propagated to level j+1. If x exists in level j+1 in the set snapLevels then we are done, if not, we apply the above argument again. This continues up to MAX_LEVEL and therefore snap contains the element x. \Box

The following refers to the construction of the subset *snapshot* from level MAX_LEVEL to 0:

Lemma 3. If level *j* contains an element represented by the snapshot thus far, all elements in level *j* are also (already) represented by this snapshot.

Proof. During a call to the procedure *propagate* with level j, the elements in that level are sampled and merged with level j + 1, resulting in level j + 1 representing also the elements of (former) level j. Let x be an element represented by level j in the set *snapLevels*. x is also represented by level i such that level i is in the current *snapshot* and i > j. Consider the process of propagation from level j to level i, it follows from the above that level i also represents all the elements in level j.

Each element in level j represents 2^i elements from the processed stream.

Lemma 4. If level *j* represents new elements that are not represented by snapshot, the size of the sub-stream left to represent is at least the size of the representation of level *j*.

If level j represents elements already represented by snapshot, the sub-stream left to represent is smaller than the representation of level j.

Proof. We will prove the first part by contradiction. Assume by contradiction that the size of sub-stream left to represent is smaller than the size of the representation of level j such that $|snapshot \cup level[j]| > |A|$. It follows from Lemma 2 that level j contains at least one duplicated element (an element already represented by level i in *snapshot* such that i > j). From Lemma 3 all level j's elements are duplicated and already being represented by the current *snapshot*. Contradiction.

Now, for the second part, assume that an element x is represented more than once by the current *snapshot*. Let level j be the second level to be added to *snapshot* that also represents x (first time to duplicate the representation of x). From Lemma 3, all elements in level j are already represented by this snapshot. If level j contains 2k elements, the size of sub-stream represented by level j is $2k \cdot 2^j$, and the size of the sub-stream left to represent is at most represented by levels 0 to j - 1, meaning the size is at most $2k(1 + 2 + \cdots + 2^{j-1}) = 2k(2^j - 1)$ which is smaller than the size of sub-stream represented by level j. If level j contains k elements and is already represented by level i, i > j, in *snapshot*, level j - 1must have propagated level j deeper, i.e. level j - 1 is also represented by level i, therefore, also already represented by *snapshot*. Level j represents $k \cdot 2^j$. The size of the sub-stream left to represent is at most represented by levels 0 to j - 2, meaning the size is at most $2k(1+2+\cdots+2^{j-2}) = k(2^{j-1}-2)$, which is smaller than the size of sub-stream represented by level j.

Lemma 5. The snapshot constructed in Algorithm 5, Lines 57-63, summarizes the same stream, A, as represented by the second tritmap read, tm2, in Algorithm 5, Line 55.

Proof. From Lemma 4 |snapshot| = |A| and every element is represented at most once in the constructed *snapshot*.

A.3 Correctness Proof

Queries are answered from an array of ordered tuples summarizing the total stream processed so far and denoted as *samples*. Each tuple contains a summary point (i.e.,a value from the sketch) and its associated weight. The samples array contains all the sketch's summary points and is sorted according to their values. Note that, only levels with $tritmap[i] \in 1, 2$ are included.

As described in Section 3.2, the update operation is divided into 3 stages: (1) gather and sort is the process of ingesting stream elements into a Gather&Sort unit. (2) batch update is the process of copying 2k elements from one of the G&SBuffers into Quancurrent's first level. (3) propagate levels is the process of merging base level up the sketch's levels until reaching an empty level.

Correctness of an object's implementation is defined with respect to a sequential specification \mathcal{H} . Sequential specification is defined with respect to deterministic objects. Therefore, we de-randomized the Quantiles sketch by providing coin flips with every update. We call the set of sequential histories of the deterministic Quantiles sketch as *SeqSketch*.

Rinberg et al. [19] defined the relation between a sequential history and a stream:

Definition 3. Given a finite sequential history H, S(H) is the stream a_1, \ldots, a_n such that a_k is the argument of the k^{th} update in H.

The notion of *happens before* in a sequential history as defined in [19]:

Definition 4. Given a finite sequential history H and two method invocation M_1, M_2 in H, if M_1 precedes M_2 in H, we denote $M_1 \prec_H M_2$.

Definition 5 (Unprop updates). Given a finite execution σ of Quancurrent, we denote by suffix(σ) as the suffix of σ starting at the last successful batchupdate event, or the beginning of σ if no such event exists. We denote by $up_suffix(\sigma)$ the sub-sequence of $H(suffix(\sigma))$ consisting of updates operations in the Gather&Sort units. We denote by $up_suffix_i(\sigma)$ the sub-sequence of $H(suffix(\sigma))$ consisting of updates operations in the local buffer of thread T_i .

Definition 6 (Updates Number). *We denote the number of updates in history* H *as* |H|.

Lemma 6. Quancurrent is strongly linearizable with respect to the relaxed specification $SeqSketch^r$ with r = 4kS + (N - S)b, where S is the number of NUMA nodes, k is the sketch summary size, b is the size of threads local buffer and N is the number of update threads.

Proof. Quancurrent is an r-relaxed concurrent Quantiles sketch. The correctness condition for randomized algorithms under concurrency is strong linearizability [13]. Strong linearizability is defined with respect to the sequential specification of a data structure. We denote by SeqSpec the sequential specification of Quancurrent.

A relaxed consistency extend the sequential specification of an object to a larger set that contains sequential histories which are not legal but are at bounded "distance" from a legal sequential history [16, 5, 19]. We convert Quancurrent into a deterministic object by providing a coin flip with every update. We re-define (derandomized) Quancurrent sequential specification by relaxing it. Intuitively, we allow a query to "miss" a bounded number of updates that precede it. Quantiles sketch is order agnostic, thus re-ordering updates is also allowed.

Let σ be a concurrent execution of Quancurrent. We use two mappings from concurrent executions to sequential histories defined as follows. We define a mapping, l, from a concurrent execution to a serialization, by ordering operations according to the following linearization points:

- Query linearization point is the second *tritmap* read, tm2, such that it summarizes the same stream size as tm1 (Algorithm 5, Line 56).
- **Update** linearization point is the insertion to threads local buffers (Algorithm 2, Line 17).

Strong linearizability requires that the linearization of a prefix of a concurrent execution is a prefix of the linearization of the whole execution. By definition, $l(\sigma)$ is prefix-preserving. Note that $l(\sigma)$ is a serialization that does not necessarily meets the sequential specification.

Relaxed consistency extends the sequential specification of an object to include also relaxed histories. We define a mapping, f, from a concurrent execution to a serialization, by ordering operations according to visibility points:

- Query visibility point is its query's linearization point.
- **Update** visibility point is the time after its invocation in σ such that the *G&SBuffer* (this update is inserted into) is batched updated into level 0 with DCAS. If there is not such time, then this update does not have a visibility point, meaning, it is not included in the relaxed history, $f(\sigma)$.

To prove correctness we need to show that for every execution σ of Quancurrent: (1) $f(\sigma) \in SeqSpec$, and (2) $f(\sigma)$ is an *r*-relaxation of $l(\sigma)$ for r = 4kS + (N - S)b.

We show the first part.

Lemma 7. Given a finite execution σ of Quancurrent, $f(\sigma)$ is in the sequential specification.

Proof. First, we present and prove some invariants.

Invariant 1. The Gather&Sort object summarises at most 4k elements.

Proof. The Gather&Sort unit contains two buffers of 2k elements. Elements are ingested into the buffer without a sampling process. The desired summary is agnostic to the processing order, therefore S summarises history of 4k update operations and their responses.

Lemma 8. The variable tritmap is a monotonic increasing integer.

Proof. The variable tritmap is altered only in Line 33 of Algorithm 3, in Line 42 of Algorithm 4 and in Line 45 of Algorithm 4. By definition, it is only incremented.

Invariant 2. The variable tritmap represents the sketch state:

- If tritmap[i] = 0, then levels[i] is empty or does not contained in the sketch's samples array.
- If tritmap[i] = 1, then levels[i] contains k points associated with a weight of 2^i .
- If tritmap[i] = 2, then levels[i] contains 2k points associated with a weight of 2^i .

Proof. The proof is by induction on the length of levels array (or the current maximum depth of levels[]).

<u>Base</u>: By definition, tritmap is initialized to 0 and updated only at the batchUpdate procedure and the propagate procedure. After the first batch update, level 0 contains 2k elements and tritmap is increased by 2 such that tritmap[0]=2. When this first batch is merged with the next level, level 1 contains k elements and tritmap is increased by 1 such that tritmap[0]=0. On each propagation, we first perform a batch update of one of the G&SBuffer arrays to level 0 and increase tritmap by 2. Then we call propagate() starting with level 0. Level 0 is merged with the next level and tritmap is incremented by 1. Therefore, after each batchUpdate, tritmap[0] = 2 and level 0 contains 2k elements and after each call to propagate(0) tritmap[0] = 0 and level 0] is not contained in the sketch's samples array. The following calls to propagate increase tritmap by 3^i for i > 0 and tritmap[0] = 0 until the end of the current propagation. Inductive hypothesis: We assume the invariant holds for all levels i such that $\overline{i > 0}$ and prove it holds for level i + 1. By definition, tritmap is updated only at batchUpdate and propagate procedures. For i > 0, tritmap is changed only if tritmap[i] = 2. By the inductive hypothesis, if tritmap[i] = 2, then levels[i] contains 2k points associated with a weight of 2^i . If propagation has not yet reached level i+1, it is empty and tritmap[i+1] = 0 from initialization. After a call to propagate(i), levels[i+1] contains k points associated with a weight of 2^{i+1} and tritmap satisfies $[b_{31}, \ldots, b_{i+2}, 0, 2, b_{i-1}, \ldots, b_0] + 3^i = [b_{31}, \ldots, b_{i+2}, 1, 0, b_{i-1}, \ldots, b_0]$ i.e tritmap[i+1] = 1. Next time propagation will reach level i+1, it will contain 2k points associated with a weight of 2^{i+1} and tritmap satisfy $[b_{31}, \ldots, b_{i+2}, 1, 2, b_{i-1}, \ldots, b_0] + 3^i = [b_{31}, \ldots, b_{i+2}, 2, 0, b_{i-1}, \ldots, b_0]$ i.e tritmap[i+1] = 2. Note that each propagation starts from level 0 and stops when reaching an empty level j, the tritmap trit larger then j are not changed.

Invariant 3. Given a finite execution σ of Quancurrent, it summarises $f(\sigma)$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on the length of σ . <u>Base</u>: The base is immediate. *S* summarises the empty history. <u>Inductive hypothesis</u>: We assume the invariant holds for σ' , and prove it holds $\overline{\text{for } \sigma = \{\sigma', step\}}$. We consider only steps that can alter the invariant, meaning steps that can change the sketch state.

• DCAS operation in batchUpdate, increasing tritmap by 2 and copying one of the G&SBuffer arrays into the first level of Quancurrent.

By the inductive hypothesis, before the step, Quancurrent summarises $f(\sigma')$. If the DCAS fails, the sketch state has not change. Else, 2k elements were copied to the level 0 and tritmap was increased by 2. From Invariant 1, a G&SBuffer array summarises a collection of 2k updated elements $\{a_1, \ldots, a_{2k}\}$. By copying, we sequentially ingest the stream $B = \{a_1, \ldots, a_{2k}\}$ to Quancurrent. Let $A = S(f(\sigma'))$. By definition, Quancurrent summarises A||B. Therefore Quancurrent summarises $f(\sigma)$, preserving the invariant.

• DCAS operations in propagate, updating tritmap and merging level *i* with its following level.

By the inductive hypothesis, before the step, Quancurrent summarises $f(\sigma')$. If the DCAS fails, the sketch state has not changed by the step. Else, we propagated level i into level i + 1. By definition, k points from level i were merged with level i + 1, with the weight of each point scaled up by a factor 2. tritmap[i]=0 and therefore level i was disabled from samples[] such that 2k points associated with 2^i weight are not included in the summary. The total weight of the summary points was not changed. The sketch's state summarises the same stream, no new points were added and the stream size was not changed. Quancurrent summarises $f(\sigma)$, preserving the invariant.

• Operations to clear level i, updating $levels[i] \leftarrow \bot$.

By definition, tritmap[i] = 0. By Invariant 2, levels[i] is empty or not included in samples[], meaning clearLevel does not affect the summary points. S summarises $f(\sigma)$, preserving the invariant.

Lemma 9 (Query Correctness). Given a finite execution σ of Quancurrent, let Q be a query that returns in σ . Let v be the visibility point of Q, and let σ' be the prefix of σ until point v. Q returns a value equal to the value returned by a sequential sketch after processing $S(f(\sigma'))$.

Proof. Let σ be an execution of Quancurrent, let Q be a query that returns in σ , and let v be the visibility point of Q. Let σ' be the prefix of σ until point v, and let $A = S(f(\sigma'))$. By definition, the visibility point of a query is when the second tritmap read returns a value representing the same stream size as the previous tritmap read. As proved in Lemma 5, the collected state represents the same stream as Quancurrent at the visibility point. By Invariant 3, at point v, Quancurrent summarises $f(\sigma')$, and, similarly, summarises the stream $A = S(f(\sigma))$. Therefore, query(arg) returns a value equal to the value returned by a sequential sketch after processing $A = S(f(\sigma'))$.

We have shown that each query in $f(\sigma)$ estimates all updates that happened before its invocation. Specifically, a query invocation at the end of a finite execution σ , returns a value equal to the value returned by a sequential sketch after processing $A = S(f(\sigma))$. By this, we have proven that $f(\sigma) \in SeqSpec$. \Box

We now show that for every execution σ , $f(\sigma)$ is an r-relaxation of $l(\sigma)$ for r = 4kS + (N - S)b. The order between operations satisfies:

Lemma 10. Given a finite execution σ of Quancurrent, and given an operation O (query or update) in $l(\sigma)$, for every query Q in $l(\sigma)$ such that Q happened before O in $l(\sigma)$, then Q happened before O in $f(\sigma)$:

$$Q \prec_{l(\sigma)} O \Rightarrow Q \prec_{f(\sigma)} O$$

Proof. If O is a query then the proof is immediate since the visibility point and the linearization point of query are equal. Else, O is an update. By definitions, the linearization point of update happens before its visibility point. As the linearization point and visibility point of query Q are equal, it follows that if $Q \prec_{l(\sigma)} O$ then $Q \prec_{f(\sigma)} O$.

Note that as query linearisation point is equal to its visibility point, all queries in $f(\sigma)$ will also be in $l(\sigma)$.

Lemma 11. Given a finite execution σ of Quancurrent, the maximum number of unpropagated updates operations in Gather&Sort units is $S \cdot 4k$:

$$|up_suffix(\sigma)| \leq S \cdot 4k$$

, where S is the number of NUMA nodes

Proof. If update operation is included in $up_suffix(\sigma)$, the size of the array in G&SBuffer that the update is a member of, is less-equal 2k. By definition, if both arrays in a Gather&Sort unit are full, no update thread (pinned to the same node as the Gather&Sort unit) can copy his local buffer's elements. It follows that $|up_suffix(\sigma)| \leq S \cdot 4k$.

We give an upper bound on the number of updates in a threads local buffers.

Lemma 12. Given a finite execution σ of Quancurrent, the number of unpropagated updates in the local buffer of thread T_i is bounded by b,

$$|up_suffix_i(\sigma)| \leq b$$

Proof. If update is included in $up_suffix_i(\sigma)$, it follows that $|items_b uf_i| \leq b$ and therefore $|up_suffix_i(\sigma)| \leq |items_b uf_i| \leq b$. When the local buffer of thread T_i is full, it copies $items_b uf_i$ to one of the G&SBuffer's arrays and the corresponding updates will not be included in $up_suffix_i(\sigma)$. \Box

To prove that $f(\sigma)$ is an (4kS + (N - S)b)-relaxation of $l(\sigma)$, first, we will show that $f(\sigma)$ comprised of all but at most r = 4kS + (N - S)b invocations in $l(\sigma)$ and their responses.

Lemma 13. Given a finite execution σ of Quancurrent,

$$|f(\sigma)| \ge |l(\sigma)| - (4kS + (N - S)b)$$

Proof. $l(\sigma)$ contains all updates, $f(\sigma)$ contains all updates with visibility points. Updates without visibility points are the unpropagated updates in G&SBuffers and unpropagated updates in the local buffer of each update thread. There are N update threads, therefore, excluding S update thread that may continue, $|f(\sigma)| = |l(\sigma)| - (\sum_{i=1}^{N-S} |up_suffix_i(\sigma)|) - |up_suffix(\sigma)|$. From Lemma 12, $|up_suffix_i(\sigma)| \le b$ and from Lemma 11, $|up_suffix(\sigma)| \le S \cdot 4k$. Therefore, $|f(\sigma)| \ge |l(\sigma)| - (4kS + (N - S)b)$.

To complete the poof that $f(\sigma)$ is an (4kS + (N - S)b)-relaxation of $l(\sigma)$, we will show that each invocation in $f(\sigma)$ is preceded by all but at most (4kS + (N - S)b) of the invocations that precede the same invocation in $l(\sigma)$.

Lemma 14. Given a finite execution σ of Quancurrent, $f(\sigma)$ is an (4kS + (N - S)b)-relaxation of $l(\sigma)$.

Proof. Let O be an operation in $f(\sigma)$ such that O is also in $l(\sigma)$. Let *Ops* be a collection of operations preceded O in $l(\sigma)$ but not preceded O in $f(\sigma)$, i.e *Ops* = $\{O'|O' \prec_{l(\sigma)} O \land O' \not\prec_{f(\sigma)} O\}$. By Lemma 10, query $Q \notin Ops$. Let σ^{pre} be the prefix of σ and let σ^{post} be the suffix of σ such that $l(\sigma) = \sigma^{pre}, O, \sigma^{post}$. From Lemma 12, $|f(\sigma^{pre})| \ge |l(\sigma^{post})| - (4kS + (N - S)b))$. As $|f(\sigma^{pre})|$ is the number of updates preceded O in $f(\sigma^{pre})$, and $|l(\sigma^{pre})|$ is the number of updates preceded O $l\sigma^{pre}$, it follows that $|Ops| = |l(\sigma^{pre})| - |f(\sigma^{pre})| \le |l(\sigma^{post})| - (4kS + (N - S)b))$. Therefore, by Definition 2, $f(\sigma)$ is an (4k + b(N - 1))-relaxation of $l(\sigma)$.

Finally, we have proven that given a finite execution σ of *Quancurrent*, $l(\sigma)$ is strongly linearizable, $f(\sigma) \in SeqSpec$ and $f(\sigma)$ is an (4kS+(N-S)b)-relaxation of $l(\sigma)$. We have proven Lemma 6.

н		
L		
н		
н		

A.4 Hole Analysis Proofs

To show the bound on the expected number of holes, we first show the following claim.

Claim 15. $\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{jb+2i+1} {\binom{jb+2i}{i}}$ is monotonically increasing for $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, b-1\}$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Denote by f(i):

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{jb+2i+1}\binom{jb+2i}{i}.$$

For b = 1 the claim is immediate. For b = 2:

$$f(1) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2j+3} \binom{2j+2}{1} = f(0) \cdot \frac{2j+2}{4} \ge f(0) \cdot \frac{2+2}{4} = f(0).$$

For b > 2, we show that $f(i + 1) \ge f(i)$ for all $0 \le i \le b - 2$.

$$f(i+1) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{jb+2i+3} \binom{jb+2i+2}{i+1}$$
$$= \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{jb+2i+3} \cdot \frac{(jb+2i+2)!}{(jb+i+1)! \cdot (i+1)!}$$
$$= f(i) \cdot \frac{1}{4} \cdot \frac{(jb+2i+2)(jb+2i+1)}{(jb+i+1)(i+1)}$$

Consider the following function:

$$g(x) = \frac{1}{4} \cdot \frac{(jb + 2x + 2)(jb + 2x + 1)}{(jb + x + 1)(x + 1)}$$

It is monotonically decreasing for $0 \le x \le b - 1$. Consider g(b - 2):

$$\frac{1}{4} \cdot \frac{(jb+2b-2)(jb+2b-3)}{(jb+b-1)(b-1)}.$$

Denote this function as h(j).

$$h(1) = \frac{1}{4} \cdot \frac{(3b-2)(3b-3)}{(2b-1)(b-1)} \ge 9/8$$

Furthermore, h(j) is a monotonically increasing function, therefore $h(j) \ge 1$ for all $j \ge 1$.

Therefore:

$$f(i) \cdot \frac{1}{4} \cdot \frac{(jb+2i+2)(jb+2i+1)}{(jb+i+1)(i+1)} \ge f(i).$$

Using Claim 15 we have shown that:

$$E[H_j] \le b \cdot b \cdot \binom{(j+2)b-2}{b-1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{(j+2)b-1}$$

We first show that $E[H_1] \leq 1.4$ for all b.

Lemma 16. $E[H_1] \leq 1.4$ for all $b \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Denote by f(b) the value of $E[H_1]$ for parameter $b \in \mathbb{N}$. We first show that $\frac{f(b+1)}{f(b)} < 1$ for all $b \ge 12$.

$$\frac{f(b+1)}{f(b)} = \frac{(b+1)^2 \cdot \binom{3b+1}{b} \cdot 0.5^{3b+2}}{b^2 \cdot \binom{3b-2}{b-1} \cdot 0.5^{3b-1}}$$
$$= \left(\frac{b+1}{b}\right)^2 \cdot \frac{3b+1}{2b+1} \cdot \frac{3b}{2b} \cdot \frac{3b-1}{b} \cdot 0.5^3$$

Note that $\frac{3b+1}{2b+1}$ is monotonically increasing for $b \ge 1$, and is bounded by 3/2. Furthermore, $\frac{3b-1}{b}$ is also monotonically increasing for $b \ge 1$, and is bounded by 3. Therefore,

$$\left(\frac{b+1}{b}\right)^2 \cdot \frac{3b+1}{2b+1} \cdot \frac{3b}{2b} \cdot \frac{3b-1}{b} \cdot 0.5^3 \leq \left(\frac{b+1}{b}\right)^2 \cdot \frac{6.75}{8}$$

Finally, note that $\left(\frac{b+1}{b}\right)^2$ is a monotonically decreasing series for $b \ge 1$. For b = 12:

$$\left(\frac{12+1}{12}\right)^2 \cdot \frac{6.75}{8} < 1$$

Therefore, $f(b+1) \leq f(b) < 1$ for all $b \geq 12$. Lastly:

$$\max_{1 \le b \le 12} \{ f(b) \} = f(9) = 1.305 < 1.4.$$

Therefore $E[H_1] < 1.4$, as required.

Next, we show that $E[H_{j+1}] \leq 0.5 \cdot E[H_j]$.

Lemma 17. $E[H_{j+1}] \leq 0.5 \cdot E[H_j]$ for all $b \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \geq 1$. *Proof.*

$$E[H_{j+1}] = b^2 \cdot \binom{(j+3)b-2}{b-1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{(j+3)b-1} \\ = \frac{1}{2}b^2 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{(j+2)b-1} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{b-1} \cdot \binom{(j+3)b-2}{b-1} \\ b-1$$

We next show that:

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{b-1} \cdot \binom{(j+3)b-2}{b-1} \le \binom{(j+2)b-2}{b-1},$$

which completes the proof.

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}^{b-1} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} (j+3)b-2 \\ b-1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}^{b-1} \cdot \frac{((j+3)b-2)!}{((j+2)b-1)! \cdot (b-1)!}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}^{b-1} \cdot \frac{((j+2)b-2+b)!}{((j+1)b-1+b)! \cdot (b-1)!}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} (j+2)b-2 \\ b-1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}^{b-1} \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{b} \frac{(j+2)b-2+k}{(j+1)b-1+k}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} (j+2)b-2 \\ b-1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{b} \frac{(j+2)b-2+k}{(j+2)b-2+k+jb+k}$$

$$\le \begin{pmatrix} (j+2)b-2 \\ b-1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{b} 1 = \begin{pmatrix} (j+2)b-2 \\ b-1 \end{pmatrix}$$