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ABSTRACT
With the growing DRAM capacity and core count in modern servers, database systems are becoming increasingly multi-engine to feature a heterogeneous set of engines. In particular, a memory-optimized engine and a conventional storage-centric engine may coexist for various application needs. However, handling cross-engine transactions that access more than one engine remains challenging in terms of correctness, performance and programmability.

This paper describes Skeena, a holistic approach to cross-engine transactions. We propose a lightweight transaction tracking structure and an atomic commit protocol to ensure correctness and support various isolation levels in multi-engine systems. Evaluation on a 40-core server shows that Skeena (1) does not penalize single-engine transactions and (2) enables the use of cross-engine transactions to improve throughput by up to 30× and/or reduce storage cost by judiciously placing tables in different engines.

1 INTRODUCTION
Traditional database engines are storage-centric: they assume data is storage-resident and optimize for storage accesses. Modern database servers often feature large DRAM that fits the working set or entire databases, enabling memory-optimized database engines [5, 21, 29, 36–38, 41, 43, 59, 61] that perform drastically better with lightweight concurrency control, index and durability designs.

Now suppose you are a database systems architect, and inspired by recent advances, built a new memory-optimized engine. But soon you found it was very hard to attract users: some do not need such fast speed; some say “I want it only for some tables or part of my application.” A common solution is to integrate the new engine into an existing system, side-by-side with the traditional engine, resulting in a multi-engine database system (Figure 1). The application can judiciously create and access tables in both engines. Although engines share certain services (e.g., SQL parser, networking and schema management), they are autonomous, each implementing its own indexes, concurrency control, etc. Some systems (e.g., SQL Server [20], MySQL [47] and PostgreSQL [53]) already take this approach for easier migration and backward compatibility.

1.1 Cross-Engine: a Poorly-Supported Necessity
As an experienced architect—perhaps even before a user did—you realized it was necessary to support cross-engine transactions that use multiple engines. For example, a finance application may use a memory table for fast trading and keep other data in the traditional engine for low cost; some transactions need to access both engines [19]. The application may use a unified SQL interface to access all engines, but internally, because of engine autonomy the system has to employ each engine’s own transaction abstractions to access data; we refer to them as sub-transactions. A transaction then consists of one or multiple sub-transactions. In Figure 1, S is single-engine with S1, while T is cross-engine with T1 (memory-optimized) and T2 (storage-centric). Cross-engine transactions can be very useful, but existing support is inadequate and leaves non-trivial challenges in correctness, performance and programmability.

Although it suffices to simply start and commit sub-transactions to support single-engine transactions, doing so does not guarantee correct cross-engine execution. As we elaborate later, cross-engine transactions over two engines that both implement correct snapshot isolation (SI) [6] can still end up using inconsistent data and run under a lower-than-SI isolation level. Even if both engines guarantee serializability, the overall execution is not necessarily serializable. Simply committing sub-transactions also risks durability and atomicity if any sub-transaction commit failed. Similar issues were also identified in federated and distribute systems where each “engine” is a full system. But prior solutions [8, 11, 18, 24, 32, 54, 55, 57, 58] are often partial (e.g., focusing on SI only) and more importantly, do not consider the characteristics of modern multi-engine systems.

Modern multi-engine systems often exhibit the fast-slow structure where a memory-optimized engine and a storage-centric engine coexist in a single node. The former can outperform the latter by orders of magnitude, so it is vital for the cross-engine solution to impose low (if any) overhead, especially on the faster engine. Previous solutions were not designed in this context, by integrating systems interconnected via a network and using two-phase commit (2PC) for atomicity. However, fast-slow systems allow engines to communicate via fast shared memory, and some designs explicitly avoid 2PC for scalability [68]. These issues call for new solutions.

These problems become more challenging when it is desirable to (1) keep engine autonomy for maintainability as engines are...
typically developed by different teams, and (2) ease application development. Prior solutions often require non-trivial changes to the application, by forcing users to declare whether a transaction is cross-engine upon start, and forcing the application to use particular isolation levels [20], which can be complex and affect performance.

1.2 Skeena

We present Skeena, a holistic approach to efficient and consistent cross-engine transactions. Skeena solves the aforementioned problems in the context of multi-versioned, fast-slow systems: multi-versioning is widely used and as evidenced by real use cases, cross-engine transactions can be very useful in fast-slow systems.\(^1\)

We make three key observations to guide Skeena’s design. First, as noted by prior work [8], inconsistent snapshots can be avoided by carefully selecting a snapshot in each engine. This requires efficient tracking of snapshots whose results can be safely used by later transactions. Second, in addition to using correct snapshots and enforcing sub-transactions commit in the same order across engines, for serializability it suffices to require each engine use commit ordering, i.e., forbid schedules where commit and dependency orders mismatch [1, 55]. Many concurrency control protocols exhibit this property, including 2PL and optimistic concurrency control (OCC), which are widely used in traditional and memory-optimized engines [21, 39, 43, 50, 61]. Finally, since engines are developed and/or well understood by the same vendor, it is usually feasible to make non-intrusive changes to engines, allowing more optimizations.

Based on these observations, we design Skeena to consist of (1) a cross-engine snapshot registry (CSR) and (2) an extended pipelined commit protocol. The former ensures efficient and correct snapshot selection, and the latter ensures atomicity and durability without expensive 2PC. Both building blocks can be easily plugged into an existing system with few or no changes to engines.

Conceptually, CSR maintains mappings between commit timestamps (therefore snapshots) in one engine and those in another. A transaction may start by accessing any engine using the latest snapshot \(s\). Upon accessing another engine \(E\), it queries CSR using \(s\) select a snapshot in \(E\) using which would avoid incorrect executions. Further, with CSR one only needs to set each engine to use a serializable protocol that exhibits commit ordering to guarantee serializability. Later, we discuss the detailed algorithms to realize this idea and techniques that make CSR lightweight and easy to maintain. In fast-slow systems, CSR incurs negligible overhead as the storage accesses in the traditional engine present a bigger bottleneck, and single-engine transactions do not access CSR at all.

Leveraging the fact that engines can communicate via fast shared memory (e.g., by sharing the same process address space), Skeena extends the widely-used group/pipelined commit protocols [35, 62, 66] to ensure atomicity and durability. Upon commit, the worker thread detaches the transaction and places it on a commit queue, before continuing to work on the next request. Meanwhile, a background committer thread monitors the queue and durable log sequence numbers in both engines to dequeue transactions whose sub-transactions’ log records have been fully persisted. This way, Skeena ensures cross-engine transactions are not committed (i.e., with results made visible to the application) until all of its sub-transactions are committed, while avoiding expensive 2PC.

We adopted Skeena in MySQL to enable cross-engine transactions across its default InnoDB engine and ERMIA [37], an open-source main-memory engine.\(^2\) This required 83 LoC changes (out of its over 200k LoC) in core InnoDB code and no change in ERMIA. Evaluation using variants of YCSB [17] microbenchmarks and TPC-C [60] on a 40-core server shows that Skeena retains memory-optimized engine’s high performance without impacting single-engine transactions, and incurs up to \(\approx 5\%\) higher abort rate for cross-engine transactions. Further, by judiciously placing tables in both engines, cross-engine transactions can help improve the throughput of realistic workloads by up to 30× and/or reduce total cost of ownership, compared to single-engine storage- and memory-optimized systems, respectively.

Note that our goal is not to build faster database engines, nor to invent new concurrency control protocols for cross-engine transactions; both are well studied by prior work. Instead, we aim to (1) enable cross-engine transactions without excessive overhead and (2) explore practical designs that fit modern fast-slow systems.

1.3 Contributions and Paper Organization

This paper makes four contributions. (1) We analyze the correctness requirements of cross-engine transactions under various isolation levels, ranging from read committed to serializable. (2) We distill a set of desirable properties and design principles to be followed by multi-engine systems. (3) We propose Skeena, a holistic approach to consistent cross-engine transactions by leveraging the properties of the fast-slow multi-engine architecture. (4) We show Skeena’s feasibility and explore practical design issues by integrating an open-source memory-optimized engine (ERMIA) into MySQL alongside its storage-centric engine (InnoDB). Through comprehensive experiments, we explore the potential and distill useful recommendations of using cross-engine transactions to improve performance and/or reduce storage cost under realistic workloads.

Next, we describe background in Section 2, design principles and details of Skeena in Sections 3–4, and how Skeena works in real MySQL in Section 5, followed by evaluation results in Section 6. We survey related work in Section 7 and conclude in Section 8.

2 BACKGROUND

In this section, we give the necessary background for cross-engine transactions and motivate our work.

2.1 Modern Fast-Slow Multi-Engine Systems

We have described the idea of multi-engine systems in Section 1. Several production systems already adopted the fast-slow architecture: SQL Server supports memory-optimized tables managed by its Hekaton main-memory engine [21, 46]; PostgreSQL supports additional engines through foreign data wrapper [53], which is used by Huawei GaussDB to integrate a main-memory engine [5].

Multi-engine systems bare similarities to distributed and federated database systems [8, 9, 11, 18, 24, 32, 42, 54, 58], but are unique in several ways. As Table 1 summarizes, a multi-engine system integrates engines developed and/or understood by the same vendor;
Table 1: Multi-engine vs. distributed and federated systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Multi-Engine</th>
<th>Federated</th>
<th>Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engine Internals</td>
<td>Transparent</td>
<td>Opaque</td>
<td>Transparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine Types</td>
<td>Heterogeneous</td>
<td>Heterogeneous</td>
<td>Homogeneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Almost full</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalability</td>
<td>Up and/or out</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in contrast, federated systems consist of opaque systems developed by different vendors. Distributed systems typically involve a set of nodes that run the same engine carefully designed to support distributed transactions, exhibiting low autonomy. Fast-slow systems integrate different engines that vary in performance, so an inefficient cross-engine solution may penalize single-engine transactions, defeating the purpose of adopting a fast engine; mitigating such overhead is the major goal of our work. Note that multi-engine systems often allow slightly trading autonomy for performance and compatibility, e.g., by managing schemas in all engines centrally. However, federated systems allow little room for doing so, as each system is usually a proprietary package. Multi-engine systems can scale up and out, whereas the other two types of systems mainly focus on scaling out. We focus on single-node fast-slow systems and leave scaling out as future work.

2.2 Database Model and Assumptions

Now we lay out the preliminaries for analyzing cross-engine transactions in fast-slow systems.

Multi-Versioning. Many fast-slow systems are multi-versioned, including all those mentioned previously. Following prior work [1, 2, 8, 13, 63], we model databases as collections of records, each of which is a totally-ordered sequence of versions. Updating a record appends a new version to the record’s sequence. Inserts and deletes are special cases of updates that append a valid and special “invalid” version, respectively. Obsolete versions (as a result of deletes) are physically removed only after no transaction will need them, using reference counting or epoch-based memory management [10, 37].

Reading a record requires locating a proper version; this is dictated by the concurrency control protocol. We base our discussion on a common design [21, 37, 41, 65] where the engine maintains a global, monotonically increasing counter that can be atomically read and incremented. Note that in a multi-engine system, engines maintain their own internal timestamp counters, i.e., each engine maintains its own internal “timeline” invisible to other engines; for now we assume single-engine transactions and expand to cross-engine cases later. Each transaction is associated with a begin timestamp and a commit timestamp, both drawn from the counter. Upon commit, the transaction obtains its commit timestamp (which determines its commit order relative to other transactions) by atomically incrementing the counter. Each version is associated with the commit timestamp of the transaction that created it. Transactions access data using a snapshot (aka read view), which is a timestamp that represents the database’s state at a particular point in (logical) time.

Isolation Levels. Various isolation levels can be implemented under this database model. For read committed we always read the latest committed version. Under snapshot isolation, the transaction uses its begin timestamp (obtained upon the first data access or transaction creation) as its snapshot and is allowed to access the latest versions created before its snapshot. A transaction can update a record if its snapshot is newer than the latest committed version. Serializability can be achieved by locking [15, 16, 22] and certifiers [13, 39, 63]. Our goal is to ensure these isolation levels are properly enforced in the presence of cross-engine transactions.

Cross-Engine ACID Properties. Analogous to maintaining ACID properties in a single engine, a cross-engine system must maintain these for both single- and cross-engine transactions:

- Atomicity: All the sub-transactions should eventually reach the same commit or abort conclusion, i.e., either all or none of the sub-transactions commit in their corresponding engines.
- Consistency: All transactions (single- or cross-engine) should transform the database from one consistent state to another, enforcing constraints within and across engines.
- Isolation: Changes in any engine made by a cross-engine transaction must not be visible until the cross-engine transaction commits, i.e., all sub-transactions have committed.
- Durability: Changes made by cross-engine transactions should be persisted while guaranteeing atomicity.

Enforcing cross-engine ACID mandates careful coordination of sub-transactions to avoid anomalies, as we describe next.

2.3 Cross-Engine Anomalies and Motivation

To access data records, cross-engine transactions rely on engine-level sub-transactions, which may begin and commit in any order depending on the workload. The relative ordering and timing of sub-transaction begin/commit events directly determine correctness, as certain ordering may lead to anomalies and violate ACID requirements. We summarize the issues below.

Issue 1: Inconsistent Snapshots. There are two cases where a transaction may be given an inconsistent view of data. As Figure 2(a) shows, S started in E1 with a snapshot 1000, while T started in E2 with snapshot 100. Suppose another transaction in E1 committed by incrementing E1’s timestamp counter to 3000. Then, T accesses E1, which assigns T1 its latest snapshot 3000, and S2 obtains snapshot 200 in E2. Compared to S, T sees a newer version of the database in E1, but an older version in E2. This would require S and T to start before each other, which is impossible in a correct SI schedule [1]. This is the same as the “cross” phenomenon in distributed SI [8].

Figure 2: Inconsistent snapshots. (a) S uses an older (newer) snapshot in E1 (E2). (b) U sees partial results: U1 sees T1’s results, U2 does not see T2’s. Both also happen in distributed SI [8], but isolation failure affects all isolation levels.
Another anomaly (isolation failure) may allow partial results to become visible earlier than they should be. In Figure 2(b), T first commits T₁ with timestamp 4000. Until T₂ is fully committed, T is still in-progress, so none of its changes should be visible to other transactions. Meanwhile, U starts in E₂ with timestamp 250, and continues to open U₁; since U₁ started after T₁ committed, by definition its read view should include T₁’s changes. Thus, U sees partial results: T’s results are visible in U’s snapshot in E₁, but not E₂. This anomaly corresponds to the serial-concurrent phenomenon in distributed SI [8]. Compared to skewed snapshots which concern the order in which sub-transactions are opened, isolation failure arises when sub-transaction begin and commit actions are interleaved and inflict a different write-read dependency per engine.

**Issue 2: Serializability.** Snapshot isolation may lead to non-serializable results with the write-skew and read-only anomalies [27, 28]. Various approaches can forbid them [13, 21, 26, 39, 63], however, in a multi-engine system, even if both engines guarantee full serializability, the overall execution may not be serializable. As Figure 3(a) shows, S and T are concurrently executing in two engines that offer serializability. Each engine runs a serializable schedule, with an anti-dependency shown in Figure 3(b). However, as shown in Figure 3(c), the overall execution exhibits write skew with cyclic dependencies (T → S → T), indicating non-serializable execution.

**Issue 3: Atomicity and Durability.** Similar to single-engine transactions, a cross-engine transaction needs to be committed in its entirety, i.e., either all sub-transactions are successfully committed with their changes persisted, or none of them. This means the system needs to commit each sub-transaction in its corresponding engine. Should any sub-transaction fail to commit (e.g., due to serializability violations), other sub-transactions must also abort. The dominant solution in distributed systems has been 2PC, but it may not be the best choice for single-node multi-engine systems. Unlike distributed systems where each node often has baked-in 2PC support, engines in a multi-engine system may not directly support 2PC: many newer main-memory systems explicitly avoided 2PC by design [7, 68]. Moreover, 2PC can be unnecessarily complex to implement and heavyweight for a shared memory system.

**Summary and Motivation.** As noted earlier, the issues identified here also arise in distributed SI and federated systems, and prior work has laid the foundation in concurrency control theory for solving these problems [8, 55] (described later). In practice, however, existing approaches targeted distributed environments without considering the characteristics of single-node, fast-slow systems. For example, incremental distributed SI [8] allows transactions to acquire consistent snapshots as needed following a set of rules, but uses a central coordinator node and global IDs across all participating nodes with engine-level changes. Prior solutions relied on 2PC for atomicity, which as we mentioned does not suit single-node systems. Finally, although serializability and concurrency control have been discussed extensively [12, 32, 54, 55], there is a lack of focus on consolidating these results to devise a holistic solution to supporting various isolation levels in fast-slow systems.

### 3 DESIGN PRINCIPLES

We distill a set of desired properties and design principles that a cross-engine mechanism like Skeena should follow:

- **Low Overhead.** The mechanism should introduce as low overhead as possible. Especially, it should not penalize single-engine transactions, especially those running in the faster engine; only cross-engine transactions should pay the extra cost (if any).

- **Engine Autonomy.** Engines should be kept as-is, or only be minimally modified to cope with the cross-engine mechanism and/or optimize for performance, leveraging the fact that engines are typically developed by the same vendor.

- **Full Functionality.** The mechanism should support various isolation levels for both single- and cross-engine transactions, unless it is limited by individual engine capabilities.

- **Transparent Adoption.** The application should not be required to make logic changes. Rather, it should only need to declare the “home” engine of each table in database schema.

### 4 SKEENA DESIGN

Skeena is a holistic approach to cross-engine transactions in fast-slow systems that feature a main-memory and a storage-centric engine. We start with an overview with transaction workflow, and then describe its design in detail. For clarity, we base our discussion on two engines that use snapshot isolation, before expanding to other isolation levels and supporting more than two engines.

#### 4.1 Overview

Skeena’s key functionality is to ensure correct snapshot selection and atomic commit with proper ACID guarantees. Figure 4 gives an overview of Skeena which consists of (1) the cross-engine snapshot registry (CSR) and (2) a pipelined commit protocol. The former tracks recent valid snapshots, and the latter is an adaptation of the well-known pipelined group commit protocol [35] to support atomically committing cross-engine transactions that consist of multiple sub-transactions. As we discuss later, adopting neither in a real system requires intrusive changes to engines. Now we briefly describe how transactions are handled under Skeena.

**Initialization.** Transactions (single- or cross-engine) can keep using the APIs (e.g., SQL) provided by the database system. Skeena does not require additional hints from the application (e.g., whether a transaction will be cross-engine). Figure 4 shows an example of a SQL program, which is written in the same way as without Skeena. Skeena does not force transactions to run under specific isolation levels. However, the system may allow users to specify an isolation level (e.g., SET TRANSACTION ISOLATION LEVEL in MySQL [48]).
for all engines. As part of the integration effort, Skeena can detect and enforce such setting across all engines (Sections 4.2–4.6).

Data Accesses. The system routes requests to the target engine which uses a sub-transaction to access data. Skeena requires no change to the routing mechanism provided by the multi-engine system. Upon start or accessing the first record, the sub-transaction obtains a snapshot. Depending on whether the transaction is single- or cross-engine, the system may directly obtain the latest snapshot in the underlying engine, or consult CSR to obtain a proper snapshot that would not cause anomalies (steps 3, 4 Query/set). If such a snapshot does not exist, the transaction will be aborted; we quantify the impact on realistic workloads in Section 6.

Finalization. To commit, the cross-engine transaction consults CSR to verify that committing its sub-transactions would not lead to inconsistent snapshots for future transactions; single-engine transactions commit directly without using Skeena. Transactions that have passed CSR verification are marked as pre-committed and placed on the commit queue. Once the log is persisted, we dequeue the transaction and notify the application of a successful commit (step 1 Enqueue/Dequeue). If the verification failed, we abort the transaction by rolling back all its sub-transactions.

In the rest of this section, we describe how Skeena facilitates snapshot selection, atomicity and recovery, beginning with CSR.

4.2 Basic Cross-Engine Snapshot Registry

The key to avoiding inconsistent snapshots is ensuring the sub-transactions of different cross-engine transactions follow the same start order in each engine [8]. That is, if $T$’s sub-transaction $T_1$ uses an older snapshot than $S_1$ does in engine $E_1$, then $T_2$ should also use an older snapshot compared to that of $S_2$ in $E_2$. For example, in Figure 4, $T$ first started as a single-engine transaction accessing Orders’s in $E_1$, using snapshot 80. When $T$ starts to access Products in $E_2$, $T$ needs to use a snapshot (s) in $E_2$ such that s is between the snapshots of its “neighbors” in $E_1$, i.e., $S_1$ and $T_1$. Thus, $T$ may use any valid $E_2$ snapshot between 1200 and 3000 (inclusive), although using 3000 would allow it to see fresher data.

Algorithm 1 Snapshot selection for cross-engine transactions.

```python
1 def select_snapshot(e1_snap, engine e2):
2     # Find existing snapshots that could be used
3     candidates[] = CSR.forward_scan_1st(e1_snap)
4     if candidates is empty:
5         # No existing mapping, obtain the latest from e2
6         e2_snap = e2.timestamp_counter
7     else:
8         # Use the latest snapshot mapped to s >= e1_snap
9         e2_snap = max(candidates)
10     CSR.map(e1_snap, e2_snap)
11     return e2_snap
```

To facilitate such snapshot selection process, CSR tracks valid snapshots (i.e., commit timestamps of recent cross-engine transactions) that can be safely used by cross-engine transactions. Conceptually, it is a table that maintains many-to-many mappings and supports point and range queries, where each "row" (CSR entry) is a pair of snapshots (i.e., commit timestamps), one from each engine as depicted by Figure 4. When a transaction crosses to access an additional engine, it uses the current engine’s snapshot as the key to query CSR for a snapshot in the other engine. As Algorithm 1 shows, to access a new engine $e_2$, the worker thread issues a non-inclusive forward scan over CSR using the snapshot in the current engine $e_1$ as the key ($e_1$ snapshot) to obtain a set of candidate snapshots. The scan returns once a first key greater than $e_1$ snapshot is met or no such key is found. If the scan returns an empty set, then no past transaction has set up any mapping, or the current transaction is using the latest $e_1$ snapshot. Then we use the latest $e_2$ snapshot (lines 4–6). However, if any candidate is found, we must take an $e_2$ snapshot that is already mapped to $e_1$ snapshot to avoid anomalies (lines 7–9). Finally, we ensure the mapping is recorded at line 10, which skips adding a new entry in CSR if the mapping already exists. Under snapshot isolation, the algorithm is executed only once per transaction when it becomes cross-engine. Subsequent accesses continue to use the previously acquired snapshots.

In addition to acquiring snapshots, committing a cross-engine transaction implicitly limits the ranges of snapshots (a future) cross-engine transaction may use: recall that the commit timestamp of a previous transaction $T$ in fact is the snapshot of a future transaction that reads the results generated by $T$. Thus, CSR also tracks commit timestamps of cross-engine transactions. Algorithm 2 describes the process at a high level. Here, we assume the sub-transaction commit timestamps are given (as the commit_ts member in each sub-transaction); we revisit this assumption later in more detail.

The idea is to ensure that committing a cross-engine transaction—i.e., adding a new mapping entry to CSR—would not cause the new table to exhibit skewed snapshots. To achieve this, upon commit, we issue a reverse scan and a forward scan over CSR using a sub-transaction’s (sub_t1) commit timestamp to obtain the lower and higher bound for the other commit timestamp (lines 4–11 in Algorithm 2). If sub_t2’s commit timestamp falls between the higher and lower bounds, we can safely commit this cross-engine transaction and setup a new mapping in CSR (line 18). Otherwise, the
Algorithm 2 Commit check for cross-engine transactions.

```python
def cross_engine_commit_check(sub_t1, sub_t2):
    # Obtain lower and upper bounds for sub-transaction t2
    low = -inf
candidates[] = CSR.reverse_scan_1st(sub_t1.commit_ts)
    if candidates[] is not empty:
        low = max(candidates)
    high = +inf
candidates[] = CSR.forward_scan_1st(sub_t1.commit_ts)
    if candidates[] is not empty:
        high = min(candidates)

    # Check if committing t2 would cause future anomalies
    if low > sub_t2.commit_ts or high < sub_t2.commit.ts:
        return false
    else:
        # Check passed, setup mapping and return
        CSR.map(sub_t1.commit_ts, sub_t2.commit.ts)
        return true
```

transaction must be aborted. Note that the mapping step in Algorithm 1 is still necessary: (1) single-engine commits are not covered by CSR to avoid unnecessary overwrites, and (2) a cross-engine transaction may access data generated by single-engine transactions and form new cross-engine snapshots.

Since a transaction may access engines in any order (e.g., from the storage-centric engine and crosses over to the memory-optimized engine, and vice versa), CSR needs to support queries from either engine. CSR may be implemented using a relational table in one of the supported engines with full-table scan or two range indexes, each of which is built on a “column” of the CSR table. However, this can create dependency on a particular engine and incur much overhead of keeping two index structures consistent, as well as possible overhead of maintaining extra (meta)data of a full-fledged relational table. The snapshot selection algorithms and CSR structure discussed so far assumed single-threaded execution; a practical design must also support concurrent accesses for reasonable performance. We address these issues next.

### 4.3 Lightweight Multi-Index CSR

We take advantage of the unique properties of fast-slow systems to devise a lightweight CSR that mitigates the above issues. In a fast-slow system, compared to the storage-centric engine, it is typically very cheap to obtain a snapshot in the memory-optimized engine. In most cases this is as simple as reading the 8-byte timestamp counter without entering a critical section. However, obtaining a snapshot in a storage-centric system can be much more complex, e.g., the process in MySQL InnoDB involves taking multiple mutexes to compute watermark values (see Section 5). Therefore, Skeena designates an anchor engine and always follows the snapshot order in the anchor engine, removing the need for CSR to support querying against snapshots from either engine. The anchor engine typically is the engine where it is cheaper to acquire a snapshot (usually the memory-optimized one). Then a transaction always starts by acquiring the latest snapshot from the anchor engine, and uses it to query the CSR when it extends to the other engine. This allows us to maintain one-to-many mapping (instead of many-to-many mappings in Section 4.2), which simplifies CSR to become a single range index that uses the anchor engine’s snapshots as “keys” and lists of snapshots in the other engine as “values.” Our implementation uses Masstree [44], a high-performance in-memory index, but any concurrent data structure that supports range queries would suffice. A side effect is transactions that only access the “slower” engine become cross-engine and need to use Algorithms 1–2. As Section 6 shows, the overhead is negligible compared to data accesses which may involve the storage stack while CSR is fully in-memory.

Since CSR tracks cross-engine snapshot and commit histories, its size can grow quickly, making it slower to query over time; entries that are no longer needed should also be cleaned up. We solve these problems by partitioning CSR by snapshot ranges, reminiscent of multi-rooted B-trees [52]. The result is a multi-index design shown in Figure 5. Each partition is an index (Masstree in our case) and covers a range of snapshots. In Figure 5, the first two indexes cover mappings in the ranges of [30, 400] and [401, 500], respectively. Note that each index covers a unique range so that a transaction only uses a single index. Each partition has a fixed capacity, and a new index is created when the current open index is full. As a result, we maintain one open index that accepts new mappings; other indexes are read-only but can continue to serve existing transactions for snapshot selection. However, since inactive indexes are read-only, if a transaction needs to setup a new mapping in an inactive index during snapshot selection or commit check, it must be aborted; in practice, such aborts are rare (Section 6).

The multi-index design simplifies garbage collection as we can delete an entire index once its mappings are no longer needed instead of issuing of key delete operations. To recycle, we iterate over all active transactions to find the oldest anchor-engine snapshot (min_snap), and then go through the list of indexes to remove indexes that cover ranges below min_snap. Recycling is triggered between CSR accesses based on a user-defined threshold (e.g., once per 5000 accesses); it could also be delegated to a background thread.

Supporting concurrency is straightforward using index-level latches in multi-index CSR. We protect the list of all indexes using a reader-writer lock (e.g., pthread_rwlock_lock [33]) for mutual exclusion between threads that only query an index (without modifying the index list using the reader mode) and those that may add or remove an index using the writer mode. Each index is protected by a mutex yet without becoming a bottleneck: (1) CSR is fully in-memory and synchronization presents negligible overhead compared to data
accesses in the storage-centric engine. (2) “Truly” single-engine transactions in the anchor engine do not use CSR. Although our scheme is blocking in nature, it is easy to implement and enables cross-engine transactions without high overhead.

4.4 Commit Protocol

Once all accesses are finished, Skeena checks whether both sub-transactions can commit using engine-level commit timestamps that represent the sub-transactions’ commit ordering. This is usually easy for memory-optimized engines which break the commit process into pre- and post-commit. During pre-commit, the engine assigns a commit timestamp and uses it to determine whether the transaction can commit without violating correctness criteria [37, 40]. If so, post-commit will finish the commit by marking new records as visible, etc. Otherwise the transaction is aborted. Some (mainly storage-centric) engines may not provide pre-commit, but engines in a multi-engine system are maintained by the same vendor. This justifies simple changes to expose a pre-commit interface, which is straightforward in practice (Section 5). Single-engine transactions directly execute the two steps without commit check.

With the pre-commit interfaces, the first step to commit a cross-engine transaction pre-commit both sub-transactions. Then, using the timestamp obtained from the anchor engine, Skeena conducts the commit check (Algorithm 2). If it passes, we post-commit both sub-transactions which is a two-step approach that calls the post-commit function in both engines. Before both sub-transactions are post-committed, changes by either should be kept invisible, yet from the perspective of an engine, a post-committed (sub-)transaction is fully committed with its results visible. Skeena must ensure partial results are not visible until all sub-transactions are post-committed.

Skeena solves this problem by extending pipelined commit [35] which was initially proposed to hide log flush latency. It decouples transactions waiting for log flushes and worker threads to keep I/O off the critical path. Upon commit, instead of directly issuing a log flush, the thread detaches the transaction and appends it to a global commit queue (or a partitioned queue to avoid introducing a central bottleneck). Results by these transactions are immediately visible internally but are not returned to applications until their log records have been persisted. A daemon tracks transactions awaiting log durability on the commit queue, and dequeues transactions whose log records have been persisted. Some systems use this approach to improve throughput without sacrificing correctness [34, 35, 62, 64].

Based on this idea, Skeena (1) pushes both sub-transactions onto the commit queue upon post-commit and (2) has the commit daemon monitor both engine’s log flushes to dequeue transactions. If an engine already implements commit pipelining, Skeena can directly extend it. Note that single-engine and read-only transactions must also use commit pipelining [31] as they may read cross-engine transactions’ results; we quantify its impact on latency in Section 6.

4.5 Durability and Recovery

In multi-engine systems, each engine implements its own approach to durability and crash recovery. Therefore, sub-transactions still follow their corresponding engines’ approach to persist data and log records. Checkpoints can be taken as usual independently by each engine. To ensure atomicity of cross-engine transactions, Skeena maintains a lightweight log to denote the pre-commit and post-commit of cross-engine transactions. This can be done by maintaining a standalone log or piggybacking on individual engines. The latter can be easier to implement: upon pre-commit we append a commit-begin record, and after post-commit finishes, the engine appends a commit-end record. During recovery, each engine executes its recovery mechanism and rolls back any changes done by cross-engine transactions whose sub-transactions are not fully committed, using the aforementioned additional log records. Alternatively, the recovery procedure may first inspect the logs of each engine and truncate at the first “hole” where only one sub-transaction of a cross-engine transaction is committed. This is safe because transactions that depend on partially committed cross-engine transactions will wait on the commit queue and their results were never made visible to applications.

4.6 Serializability

As we discussed in Section 2.3, the overall cross-engine execution may not be serializable even if both involved engines are set to offer full serializability. The key reason is that dependency cycles may continue to form among cross-engine transactions by combining acyclic dependencies in each engine. Corroborating with prior work in federated and distributed systems [55], we note that disallowing anti-dependencies (i.e., using commit ordering as dependency order) in each engine is sufficient to achieve serializability for cross-engine transactions. This translates into choosing a concurrency control protocol for each engine where a sub-transaction can only commit if its read records are not concurrently modified. A wide range of serializable protocols and systems [5, 21, 26, 38, 40, 41, 43, 59, 61] exhibit this property: classic two-phase locking avoids clobbered reads by ensuring readers and writers block each other; OCC conducts a commit-time verification to ensure read records are not modified [39]. Coupled with other Skeena techniques, the execution is serializable as long as both engines are set to run at the serializable isolation level that is based on 2PL or OCC.

Some protocols [13, 14, 27, 63] allow more valid schedules than OCC and 2PL do by tolerating certain safe anti-dependencies, but supporting them requires implementing verification in Skeena. This needs engines to expose dependency information and tightly couple Skeena with engine design, going against our principle of maintaining engine autonomy as much as possible. Thus, we take the former approach that impose no engine-level changes, and explore other protocols in future work.

4.7 Discussions

In essence, Skeena is a coordinator that enforces correct snapshots and atomic commit in fast-slow systems. As Table 2 lists, the system may selectively use Skeena’s building blocks. For read committed, by definition Skeena should guarantee transactions see committed records, without seeing partial results. So only the pipelined commit protocol is required for read committed. SI and serializable require all building blocks. For all isolation levels, each engine also needs to be set to run at 2PL to ensure sub-transactions are correctly scheduled.

Our focus has been dual-engine, fast-slow systems in the context of interpreted queries. To support more engines, a straightforward
Table 2: Requirements for individual engines and Skeena to achieve different isolation levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isolation Level</th>
<th>Engines:</th>
<th>Skeena:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read Committed</td>
<td>Isolation level ≥</td>
<td>Commit protocol only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read Committed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snapshot Isolation</td>
<td>Isolation level ≥</td>
<td>All techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Snapshot Isolation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skeena: All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serializable</td>
<td>Skeena:</td>
<td>Serializable, no anti-dependencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

way is to extend the multi-index CSR to be a hierarchy of indexes, each is the anchor of the next lower-level engine. This enforces ordering between sub-transactions. If more engine- and/or system-level changes are tolerable, one may adopt existing solutions from distributed SI [8], although the efficiency and engineering efforts required by them remain to be explored. Memory-optimized engines can compile queries to machine code for faster execution [21, 45, 49]. Skeena is orthogonal to whether queries are compiled or interpreted, although we focus on the latter as accesses in conventional engines can easily cancel out the benefits of query compilation.

Finally, Skeena does not require significant engine-level changes. The most notable (yet simple) change that may be required (mainly for conventional engines) is exposing commit ordering via a pre-commit interface. The remaining effort is mainly on integrating Skeena with the existing multi-engine support. As we describe next in Section 5, these changes are not intrusive or complex.

5 SKEENA IN PRACTICE

We explore the effort needed to adopt Skeena in real systems, by enabling cross-engine transactions in open-source MySQL between its default storage-centric InnoDB and ERMIA [37], an open-source main-memory engine. MySQL supports multiple engines and defines a set of core interfaces (e.g., search, update and commit) for engines to implement [47]. This allowed us to integrate ERMIA easily with < 2000 LoC. Both InnoDB and ERMIA share MySQL’s SQL API and parser, optimizer, networking layer and thread pool. The application only needs to specify each table’s home engine in its schema, which is managed by and an existing feature of MySQL.

To support cross-engine transactions using CSR, it is necessary to understand each engine’s database model. Similar to most memory-optimized engines, ERMIA follows closely the database model in Section 2.2, so we do not repeat it here. To obtain a snapshot, the worker thread atomically reads the counter without any locking, which is much more lightweight than InnoDB’s approach that uses global latches. We thus designate ERMIA as the anchor engine.

In contrast, InnoDB uses transaction IDs (TIDs) to determine record visibility and ordering. Here we describe the necessary basics and how we reconcile the differences between real implementation and our database model. Each read-write transaction in InnoDB is uniquely identified by a TID drawn from a central counter. Updates are handled in-place (unlike ERMIA which is append-only). Each record is stamped with the TID of the transaction that last updated it. Old versions are generated on-demand using undo logs. The freshness (or the amount of undo log to apply) is determined by the transaction’s read view (snapshot) which is acquired upon the first data access. An InnoDB read view consists of low/high watermarks (both are TIDs) and an active transactions list captured at the read view’s creation time. With a read view, the transaction is not allowed to see versions created by transactions with TIDs above the high watermark, but can see the results of transactions with TIDs below the low watermark. Versions created by transactions with TIDs between the two watermarks are also invisible only if the TIDs are in the active transactions list. As a result, read views are not directly comparable and cannot be directly used by CSR, creating a mismatch with our assumed database model.

Our solution is to use the high watermark in CSR. Specifically, sub-transactions in InnoDB first acquire the latest read view using the original approach. We then adjust its high watermark using CSR and leave the active transactions list unchanged. In case the new high watermark is even lower than the low watermark, we adjust both to be the same as the high watermark. The sub-transaction can then use the adjusted read view as usual to test record visibility.

In our database model snapshots are prior commit timestamps that indicate transaction commit ordering. InnoDB shares a similar property, although it is based on TIDs: during commit, InnoDB assigns a serialization number (serialisation_no) drawn from the TID counter to represent transaction commit ordering. Thus, we use serialisation_nos for Skeena’s commit check. This required us to break the monolithic commit procedure into pre-commit and post-commit functions. The former only involved isolating out the logic to acquire a serialisation_no from the commit function, which took 6 LoC. For the latter we perform the real commit process once commit check passes. Breaking the monolithic commit function into pre- and post-commit took 74 LoC.

For atomic commit, we piggyback on the thread pool in MySQL and ERMIA’s existing commit pipelining mechanism. Upon commit, the worker thread pushes a commit entry to ERMIA’s commit queue before starting to process another request. We extend the commit entry design in ERMIA to include commit LSNs in both engines, along with a MySQL callback function for notifying the client of concluded transactions. ERMIA uses a dedicated commit thread to monitor the commit queue. We extend it to also monitor InnoDB commit LSNs and invoke the callback function to notify clients.

In total, we needed to modify 83 LoC of core InnoDB code; no change in core ERMIA code was required. Other necessary efforts such as adding a new engine to MySQL were straightforward thanks to its existing multi-engine support. As MySQL is a representative architecture and covers a wide range of use cases both on premise and in the cloud, we expect other systems to also require a low amount of effort to adopt Skeena.

6 SKEENA IN ACTION

We empirically evaluate Skeena to understand its performance characteristics and explore the potential of cross-engine transactions under realistic workloads. Through experiments, we show that:
We devise a set of YCSB-like [17] microbenchmarks to stress test Skeena. In line with prior work, we use jemalloc [25] to reinitialize the database for each run which then starts with a tmpfs (such as data files and logs) in /dev/shm. We plan to experiment on a dual-socket server equipped with two 20-core Intel Xeon Gold 6242R CPUs (80 hyperthreads in total) and 384GB of main memory. Each CPU has 35.75MB of cache and is clocked at 3.1GHz. All experiments are conducted in the MySQL 8.0 setup as described in Section 5. We use SysBench [51] to issue database benchmarks (described later). MySQL uses a client-server architecture. To reduce the impact of network latency, we run the database server on one CPU socket, and the client (SysBench) on the other socket. Since our database server and client run on the same machine, we use a Unix Domain Socket (instead of TCP/IP) for faster communication between the server and client [67]. We use snapshot isolation (repeatable read) in InnoDB to run all experiments as they are respectively the default isolation levels in ERMIA and InnoDB, and widely used in practice. We report the average throughput and latency of three 60-second runs.

To stress test Skeena and both engines, we store persistent data (such as data files and logs) in tmpfs so that all storage accesses in fact go through main memory. ERMIA is memory-optimized so all records are in heap memory. For InnoDB, we test both the memory- and storage-resident cases: the former uses a large enough buffer pool to avoid accessing storage (tmpfs); the latter uses a small buffer pool that would mandate accessing the storage stack. In both cases, we initialize the database for each run which then starts with a warm buffer pool. In line with prior work, we use jemalloc [25] to avoid memory management becoming a major bottleneck.

### 6.1 Experimental Setup

We run experiments on a dual-socket server equipped with two 20-core Intel Xeon Gold 6242R CPUs (80 hyperthreads in total) and 384GB of main memory. Each CPU has 35.75MB of cache and is clocked at 3.1GHz. All experiments are conducted in the MySQL 8.0 setup as described in Section 5. We use SysBench [51] to issue database benchmarks (described later). MySQL uses a client-server architecture. To reduce the impact of network latency, we run the database server on one CPU socket, and the client (SysBench) on the other socket. Since our database server and client run on the same machine, we use a Unix Domain Socket (instead of TCP/IP) for faster communication between the server and client [67]. We use snapshot isolation (repeatable read) in InnoDB to run all experiments as they are respectively the default isolation levels in ERMIA and InnoDB, and widely used in practice. We report the average throughput and latency of three 60-second runs.

To stress test Skeena and both engines, we store persistent data (such as data files and logs) in tmpfs so that all storage accesses in fact go through main memory. ERMIA is memory-optimized so all records are in heap memory. For InnoDB, we test both the memory- and storage-resident cases: the former uses a large enough buffer pool to avoid accessing storage (tmpfs); the latter uses a small buffer pool that would mandate accessing the storage stack. In both cases, we initialize the database for each run which then starts with a warm buffer pool. In line with prior work, we use jemalloc [25] to avoid memory management becoming a major bottleneck.

### 6.2 Benchmarks

We devise a set of YCSB-like [17] microbenchmarks to stress test Skeena, and then explore the usefulness and behavior of cross-engine transactions in realistic scenarios with TPC-C [60].

**Microbenchmarks.** We devise three microbenchmarks based on access patterns: read-only, read-write, and write-only. Each transaction accesses ten records uniformly chosen from a set of tables. Out of the ten accesses, eight are point reads and two are updates. For each engine, we create 250 tables, each of which contains a certain number of records depending on whether the engine is memory- or storage-resident for InnoDB. Each record is 232-byte, consisting of two INTEGER and one VARCHAR. For memory-resident experiments, each table contains 25000 records which brings the total data size of 250 tables to ~1.35GB; the buffer pool size in InnoDB is set to 32GB. For storage-resident experiments, we set each table to contain 250000 records, and the total data size is ~13.5GB; we set the buffer pool to be 2GB. Under both settings, ERMIA is populated with the same amount of data as InnoDB (i.e., 500 tables across two engines).

**TPC-C.** We use TPC-C for the dual-purpose of (1) understanding Skeena’s performance under non-trivial transactions, and (2) exploring the potential benefits and tradeoffs of cross-engine transactions in realistic scenarios. Similarly, we run both memory- and storage-resident experiments: the former uses a scale factor which is the same as the number of concurrent connections and the latter uses 200 warehouses. For memory-resident experiments, each connection works on a different home warehouse but the 1% of New-Order and 15% of Payment transactions may respectively access a remote warehouse; we set InnoDB buffer pool to be 32GB which is large enough to hold all the data (~14GB). With the 200-warehouse setting for storage-resident experiments, the total data size is ~55GB, for which we set InnoDB to use a buffer pool of 5GB and set each thread (connection) to always pick a random warehouse as its home warehouse to ensure the footprint covers the entire database. Finally, we gradually move tables from InnoDB to ERMIA, making the affected transactions cross-engine. This allows us to explore the effectiveness of cross-engine transactions and distill several useful suggestions on how to optimize performance in fast-slow systems; we discuss more detailed setup later.

### 6.3 Single-Engine Performance

An important goal of Skeena is to ensure single-engine transactions (especially those running in the faster engine, i.e., ERMIA) do not need to pay extra cost due to the cross-engine mechanism. Our first experiment evaluates this aspect by turning Skeena on and off under six variants that only access tables in either ERMIA or InnoDB. As a result, all transactions are single-engine.

Table 3 summarizes the results. Variants with Skeena turned on carry an S suffix, and the M suffix for InnoDB indicates the memory-resident setup. Overall, for all variants, Skeena incurs negligible overhead which is mainly due to the slightly more complex logic for commit pipelining. Moreover, “single-engine” transactions in InnoDB/InnoDB-M are in fact cross-engine, as they must follow the start order in the anchor engine (ERMIA) although they do not access any records in ERMIA. This means CSR will only maintain a single mapping (using ERMIA’s initial snapshot) which incurs a constant but very small amount of overhead (up to 5.6%); garbage collection is also never needed with a single mapping. Compared to InnoDB, InnoDB-M performs up to over ∼ 3x better thanks to its large buffer pool. InnoDB-M and InnoDB-MS perform similar to ERMIA under the read-only microbenchmark, but fall behind as we add more writes to the workload, signifying the potential benefits
As a result, with more ERMIA accesses, CSR becomes larger and InnoDB-MS non-negligible for read-intensive workloads, which themselves are ErMIA still writes a commit log record for read-only transactions. Access InnoDB. However, results in Figures 6(a)–(b) show the opposite for memory-resident data: InnoDB-M outperforms all the cross-engine cases (30–80% InnoDB). The reason is two-fold. First, ErMIA still writes a commit log record for read-only transactions. As a result, with more ErMIA accesses, CSR becomes larger and requires more cycles to traverse its indexes per data access. This is non-negligible for read-intensive workloads, which themselves are already very lightweight in a main-memory environment. Second, and more importantly, under InnoDB-MS, CSR is very small as it only maintains one mapping as we mentioned earlier. However, under 30–80% InnoDB, more ErMIA accesses lead to Skeena tracking more mappings in CSR, which then becomes more expensive to query and necessitates garbage collection. The memory-resident write-only workload follows the expectation more in Figure 6(c), although the difference is not significant as InnoDB exhibits much lower raw performance than ErMIA due to the use of pessimistic 2PL for write operations. As the workload becomes storage-resident, the overhead incurred by Skeena becomes negligible, showing the expected behavior: more ErMIA accesses directly lead to higher performance. For example, in Figure 7, 30% InnoDB is up to 75%/40% faster than InnoDB for read-only/write-only workloads.

To summarize, the relative overhead caused by a cross-engine mechanism varies depending whether data is memory- or storage-resident. The former is becoming a norm for OLTP and requires Skeena to be as lightweight as possible because accessing CSR and data records may require the same level of CPU cycles, while for the latter case storage access overshadows CSR cost.

6.4 Cross-Engine Performance

Now we explore the behavior of cross-engine transactions using microbenchmarks. For each transaction, we vary the percentage of InnoDB and ErMIA accesses out of ten accesses. For example, with 30% InnoDB, three accesses per transaction are done in InnoDB, the remaining seven accesses go to ErMIA. We use the same -M and -S notations from Section 6.3 for single-engine transactions whose results are shown to calibrate expectations. For cross-engine transactions we mark the percentage of InnoDB accesses and note whether the experiment is memory- or storage-resident as needed.

In theory, because InnoDB is more heavyweight, with more accesses in it performance should drop, e.g., transactions with 30% InnoDB accesses should achieve lower throughput than those only access InnoDB. However, results in Figures 6(a)–(b) show the opposite for memory-resident data: InnoDB-M outperforms all the cross-engine cases (30–80% InnoDB). The reason is two-fold. First, ErMIA still writes a commit log record for read-only transactions. As a result, with more ErMIA accesses, CSR becomes larger and requires more cycles to traverse its indexes per data access. This is non-negligible for read-intensive workloads, which themselves are already very lightweight in a main-memory environment. Second, and more importantly, under InnoDB-MS, CSR is very small as it only maintains one mapping as we mentioned earlier. However, under 30–80% InnoDB, more ErMIA accesses lead to Skeena tracking more mappings in CSR, which then becomes more expensive to query and necessitates garbage collection. The memory-resident write-only workload follows the expectation more in Figure 6(c), although the difference is not significant as InnoDB exhibits much lower raw performance than ErMIA due to the use of pessimistic 2PL for write operations. As the workload becomes storage-resident, the overhead incurred by Skeena becomes negligible, showing the expected behavior: more ErMIA accesses directly lead to higher performance. For example, in Figure 7, 30% InnoDB is up to 75%/40% faster than InnoDB for read-only/write-only workloads.

To summarize, the relative overhead caused by a cross-engine mechanism varies depending whether data is memory- or storage-resident. The former is becoming a norm for OLTP and requires Skeena to be as lightweight as possible because accessing CSR and data records may require the same level of CPU cycles, while for the latter case storage access overshadows CSR cost.

6.5 Effectiveness of Cross-Engine Transactions

Realistic workloads may use cross-engine transactions to improve performance (using the memory-optimized engine) and/or reduce storage cost (archiving data in the storage-centric engine). This is done by judiciously placing tables in both engines. We use TPC-C to explore this aspect. We start with all tables in InnoDB and then gradually move tables to ErMIA. We observed similar trends for memory- and storage-resident InnoDB setups, so we only show the results from the storage-resident setup with up to 50 connections where the system is fully saturated. In Figure 8, tables in TPC-C are gradually moved to ErMIA from bottom up. Overall, throughput improves with more tables in ErMIA, however, most tables do not affect performance much until the New-Orders table is moved to ErMIA (~10× faster than InnoDB).

At a first glance, placing New-Orders in ErMIA should be the key to improving overall throughput, but it is unclear how each transaction benefits from this. We further run individual TPC-C transactions (instead of the full-mix) under a variant that only places New-Orders in ErMIA (leaving the rest in InnoDB). Figure 9
Figure 9: Throughput (kTPS) of individual TPC-C transactions when only New-Orders is placed in ERMIA (+New-Orders) compared to 100% InnoDB and two other variants that place cumulatively up to Orders and New-Orders in ERMIA. The Delivery transaction (e) is the key reason that allowed full-mix throughput to drastically improve.

Figure 10: Throughput (kTPS) of TPC-C mix and individual transactions by varying table placement at 50 connections.

is still much more expensive than SSDs and disks. Finally, thanks to commit pipelining, storing such archival tables in the storage-centric engine would not negatively impact throughput [35].

6.6 End-to-End Cross-Engine TPC-C

Based on the results from the Section 6.5, we distill three additional preferred cross-engine table placement schemes:

- New-Order–Opt: The Customer and Item tables are placed in ERMIA to optimize the New-Order transaction.
- Payment–Opt: Only Customer is placed in ERMIA to optimize the Payment transaction, which intensively accesses Customer.
- Archive: All the tables except History are placed in InnoDB, leveraging its cheaper storage cost compared to ERMIA.

The first two schemes aim to optimize a storage-centric database with select use of a memory-optimized engine, while Archive attempts to reduce storage cost of in-memory databases using a conventional engine. Figure 11 shows how they compare to baselines that place all tables in ERMIA and InnoDB. As expected, New-Order–Opt and Payment–Opt improve the performance of the affected transactions compared to InnoDB. Further, since Archive executes almost fully in ERMIA, its performance overlaps with ERMIA because the History table (1) is only inserted and never queried, and (2) only occupies less than 600MB of space in our experiments. In reality, such workloads usually run for much longer and accumulate much more history data; placing it in InnoDB therefore can drastically reduce storage cost as main memory (DRAM)
These systems are mostly deployed in a distributed environment. Skeena adopts commit ordering \[55\] to avoid introducing non-trivial commitments for serializability and atomicity. Compared to prior work, Skeena can be easily adopted by real systems, as shown in Figure 11. At 80 connections, the absolute latency unavoidably increases. However, in cross-model analytical queries, while our focus is OLTP. Explore how Skeena may fit in a polystore system is promising future work as they also require efficient metadata management.

### Distributed SI and Replication

Prior work on federated snapshot databases identified the anomalies that would lead to inconsistent read views \[56\]. Binnig et al. \[8\] further identified the cross phenomena under distributed snapshot isolation and proposed incremental distributed SI to correctly support snapshot isolation in a distributed setting. Our analysis of multi-engine transactions are based on these results. Compared to prior work, we further support various isolation levels. Elnikety et al. \[24\] present Generalized Snapshot Isolation (GSI) for replicated databases. GSI differs from conventional SI by allowing transactions to use an older snapshot instead of the latest snapshot. Skeena shares the similar property by selecting snapshots for sub-transactions using CSR.

Modern Database Engines. Modern multicores and large DRAM have led to numerous new memory-optimized engines \[5, 21, 29, 36–38, 41, 43, 59, 61\]. They feature new designs such as commit pipelining \[35\], lightweight concurrency control \[39, 61\] and parallel logging \[66\] that drastically improve performance. Our work explores one of the possible ways to adopt them in practice.

### 7 RELATED WORK

Our work builds upon rich literature in federated systems, distributed and replicated SI systems, and modern database engines.

**Federated, Multidatabase (MDBS) and Polystore Systems.** These systems are mostly deployed in a distributed environment. Prior work mainly focused on guaranteeing serializability which is challenging due to the (full) autonomy and heterogeneity of member systems. Georgakopoulos et al. \[30\] proposed a ticket method to enforce serializability of global transactions. Superdatabase \[54\] addresses the consistent update issue by exporting transaction ordering via commit vote messages. Breitgart et al. \[12\] proposed a consistency protocol that detects cycles to resolve consistency and deadlock issues in MDBS. Myriad \[32, 42\] uses 2PL and 2PC for serializability and atomicity. Compared to prior work, Skeena adopts commit ordering \[55\] to avoid introducing non-trivial complexities. Although following commit ordering limits the types of concurrency control protocols that can be used with Skeena, it strikes a balance between easy implementation and engine autonomy. Recent polystore systems \[3, 4, 23\] mainly focus on supporting cross-model analytical queries, while our focus is OLTP. Explore how Skeena may fit in a polystore system is promising future work as they also require efficient metadata management.

### 8 CONCLUSION

Cross-engine transactions can be very useful in modern fast-slow multi-engine systems, but are poorly supported with various limitations and may lead to incorrect execution results without proper coordination. This paper proposes Skeena, a holistic approach to efficient and consistent cross-engine transactions. Skeena consists of a cross-engine snapshot registry (CSR) that keeps track of snapshots and a pipelined commit protocol extended for multi-engine systems. Skeena can be easily adopted by real systems, as shown by our experience of adopting it in MySQL. Evaluation on a 40-core dual-socket server show that Skeena incurs negligible overhead and maintains the benefits of single-engine memory-optimized transactions. Moreover, with Skeena, cross-engine transactions can be judiciously used to improve the performance of realistic workloads by up to 30% compared to single-engine storage-centric systems, and/or cut storage cost for memory-optimized engines by archiving data in a storage-centric engine.