

S/C: Speeding up Data Materialization with Bounded Memory

Zhaoheng Li, Xinyu Pi, Yongjoo Park
CreateLab @ UIUC
{zl20, xinyupi2, yongjoo}@illinois.edu

Abstract—With data pipeline tools and the expressiveness of SQL, managing interdependent materialized views (MVs) are becoming increasingly easy. These MVs are updated repeatedly upon new data ingestion (e.g., daily), from which database admins can observe performance metrics (e.g., refresh time of each MV, size on disk) in a consistent way for different types of updates (full vs. incremental) and for different systems (single node, distributed, cloud-hosted). One missed opportunity is that existing data systems treat those MV updates as independent SQL statements without fully exploiting their dependency information and performance metrics. However, if we know that the result of a SQL statement will be consumed immediately after for subsequent operations, those subsequent operations do not have to wait until the early results are fully materialized on storage because the results are already readily available in memory. Of course, this may come at a cost because keeping those results in memory (even temporarily) will reduce the amount of available memory; thus, our decision should be careful.

In this paper, we introduce a new system, called S/C, which tackles this problem through *efficient creation and update of a set of MVs with acyclic dependencies among them*. S/C judiciously uses bounded memory to reduce the end-to-end MV refresh time by short-circuiting expensive reads and writes; S/C’s objective function accurately estimates the time savings from keeping intermediate data in memory for particular periods. Our solution jointly optimizes an MV refresh order, what data to keep in memory, and when to release the data from memory. At a high level, S/C still materializes all data exactly as defined in MV definitions; thus, it does not impact any service-level agreements. In our experiments with TPC-DS datasets (up to 1TB), we show that S/C’s optimization can speedup end-to-end runtime by $1.04\times$ – $5.08\times$ with (only) 1.6GB memory.

I. INTRODUCTION

To accelerate query processing, intermediate tables and (materialized) views—both of which we refer to as MVs—are frequently used in databases [1]–[5]. When there are dependencies among MVs, updates follow their topological order to minimize redundant computation, which can be managed using tools like Google Napa [6], dbt [7], Apache Airflow [8], LookML [9], etc. Exploiting the widespread adoption and expressive semantics of SQL, we can define both full refreshes and incremental updates [1], [10] for various data systems, ranging from a single-node database (e.g., PostgreSQL [11]), to self-managed distributed data warehouses (e.g., Hive [12], SparkSQL [13], Presto [14]), and to cloud-hosted data services (e.g., Snowflake [15], Azure SQL [16]). Database admins can obtain empirical performance metrics (e.g., elapsed time for updating each MV, the size of each MV) based on the recurrent




Fig. 1: Our intuition: we can reduce an overall MV refresh time by exploiting existing dependency relationships. If we know SQL B will depend on the output of SQL A, we don’t have to wait until the result of SQL A is fully materialized.

runs of update pipelines, while the dependency relationships can easily be extracted from MV definitions.

Missed Opportunity. When updating a set of MVs that are dependent on one another, existing data systems do not introduce special optimizations besides caching. Our idea is that by exploiting (i) the explicit knowledge of dependency relationships among MVs and (ii) the performance metrics observed from previous runs, we can further improve data systems operations to reduce the end-to-end MV refresh time. Among possible ways, we pursue one significant optimization opportunity based on the following observation: *While persisting intermediate data might be unavoidable due to service level agreements (SLAs), writing/reading intermediate data can be short-circuited via bounded memory (if the data fits) by letting a data system read input data directly from in-memory objects rather than reading from persisted tables.* Figure 1 depicts our idea: by keeping Table A in memory after computation, the downstream tasks SQL B and SQL C can be executed with minimal delay in parallel with the materialization of Table A. Since the memory size is finite, the intermediate data must be kept in memory only when the benefits of doing so are significant. This approach is general because we make no assumptions about the content of computation tasks (i.e., full vs. incremental MV refresh) and how they are performed (i.e., single-node vs. distributed). Moreover, since some data systems allow explicit data placement (e.g., Presto [14], Spark [13], Polars [28]), we can easily implement this optimization using existing features without modifying their internals. Note that our approach still persists all intermediate tables; we only reduce the wait times for subsequent updates exploiting the dependency relationships.

TABLE I: Comparison between S/C and other data warehouse optimization problems

Topics	Optimization Objective
Incremental Query Processing [17], [18]	Early querying on incomplete data, progressive update with the arrival of remaining data
Cache prefetching [19], [20]	SLO-aware prefetching for anticipated jobs
Incremental view maintenance [21], [22]	Individual MVs update faster
MV refresh scheduling [5], [23], [24]	Updates some MVs earlier than others (but the total time remains the same)
Intermediate result reuse [25]–[27]	Cache and reuse intermediate results to speedup future jobs (but no job reordering)
Ours (S/C)	Speedup end-to-end refresh time of a set of MVs via job reordering and caching data

Challenge. Unfortunately, achieving our goal is technically challenging because naïve approaches (e.g., greedily caching as much data as possible and LRU for cache eviction) offer limited performance benefits (§ VI). For significant gains, we must consider several factors simultaneously. First, we must optimize the order of MV refresh, as it impacts which intermediate data we can keep and release from memory. Off-the-shelf topological sort algorithms [29] may not produce an order optimized for our problem. Second, we must determine which intermediate MVs to keep in bounded memory. A greedy approach (i.e., keep if there is available space) or a random selection performs poorly, according to our study. Third, we must develop an adaptable strategy based on user workloads and intermediate data sizes; a fixed, heuristic strategy may result in suboptimal solutions if users’ workloads change. To overcome these challenges, we pursue a principled method by representing MVs using a graph and by investigating several optimization algorithms, as will be described below.

Our Approach. In this paper, we introduce a system (called Short-Circuit or S/C) that specializes in refreshing a graph of MVs. S/C speeds up end-to-end MV refresh using bounded memory by exploiting the dependency relationships among MVs and their observed performance metrics. The dependency relationships among MVs are modeled using an acyclic graph where nodes represent individual MV updates, and the edges represent dependencies. To optimize the end-to-end performance, S/C solves the following problem at a high level:

$$\min_{O, U} \sum_{n_i \in O} \text{data-access-time}(n_i; U), \quad (1)$$

Where O is an MV refresh order, U is the set of nodes for which we temporarily keep their results in memory, and n_i is the i -th node. U must be *feasible*; that is, the sum of all the intermediate data we keep in memory cannot exceed a predefined limit at any point in time while updating MVs.

To solve the above problem, we alternatively optimize O and U , as follows: first, we find U that can minimize the objective function (Equation (1)) for fixed O ; second, we find O that can lower overall memory usage, expecting such an order can lead to more optimal U in the following iteration (§ V). While this approach may find locally optimal solutions, our empirical study suggests that starting from a specialized designed variant of DFS (depth-first search) can offer high-quality solutions (§ VI-F).

Comparison to Other Work. This work adopts mathematical optimization for memory management and scheduling in data systems with a focus on reducing an end-to-end MV

refresh time by exploiting observed performance data. While optimizations and statistical techniques for data systems have been explored in various related problems (e.g., incremental query processing [17], [18], [30], cache prefetching [19], [20], indexing [31], [32]), they are aimed towards resource management for standalone queries. The problem addressed in this work is significantly different, notably including the joint scheduling of MV updates. While optimizing MV updates via incremental updates [21], [22] and scheduling [5], [23], [24] pursues the same high-level goal as ours because we aim to improve data preparation stages, the specific problem we address in this work is largely orthogonal to them. Works in intermediate result reuse [25]–[27], [33] similarly selectively store items to speedup future workloads (i.e., MV refresh runs); however, to the best of our knowledge, we are the first work that considers both job execution (re)order as well as intermediate result caching with a bounded amount of memory. Table I summarizes core differences.

Our technical contributions can potentially be applied to accelerating a wider class of workloads that consist of repetitive jobs with their dependencies expressed in a directed acyclic graph, such as Extract-Load-Transform (ETL) with Hadoop and Spark [13], job coordination via Apache Airflow [8] and Apache Oozie [34], etc.,. However, for concrete discussions, we focus on MV refresh in this work.

Contributions. Our contributions are as follows:

- **System architecture.** We propose the architecture of a system (S/C) aimed at reducing end-to-end runtimes of MV refresh workloads in data warehouses and provide an efficient Presto-based [14] implementation. (§ III)
- **Problem definition.** We propose and formally define an optimization problem (S/C Opt) on MV refresh workloads, namely selecting intermediate data to persist in bounded memory to maximize read/write time reductions. (§ IV)
- **Algorithm and Analysis.** We employ an alternating optimization algorithm to solve S/C Opt. This algorithm decomposes S/C Opt into two subproblems, for which we provide efficient and empirically effective solutions. (§ V)
- **Experimental Analysis.** We verify the effectiveness of S/C on improving MV refresh speed. We find that S/C speedups end-to-end runtimes by $1.04\times$ – $5.08\times$ using 1.6GB Memory Catalog on TPC-DS datasets (up to 1TB).

II. MATERIALIZATION IN MODERN DATA WAREHOUSES

Provisioning materialized views (i.e., data materialization) is effective in speeding up OLAP queries. In this section, we describe significant occurrences of data materialization in modern data warehouses and the I/O overhead we observe.




Fig. 2: Runtime breakdown by query type for 10 real-world workloads (W1–W10). Data from Amirhossein et al. [35], [36].

A. Acceleration by Data Materialization

Modern data warehouses manage massive volumes of data. Horizontal scaling might not be cost-efficient in reducing the latencies of analytical queries. For a better cost-benefit trade-off, data materialization is frequently employed.

Large Data, Complex Queries. Real-world data warehouses manage a large volume of data. According to an analysis of 1.54 billion queries and 1.7 million tables across 40 different data warehouse accounts [35], [36], 12.1% of tables are larger than 3.625 TB, and 29.1% of the tables are between 725 GB and 3.625 TB. Most analytical queries include data-intensive, time-consuming operations: 31% of `select` queries are reported to include at least one join. 32% of time is spent on queries longer than 10 minutes. According to another analysis by Tableau [37], machine-generated queries are often complex due to the impedance mismatch between BI-driven analysis and SQL-based expressions. Generally, a large amount of data and costly operations lead to longer query latencies.

While horizontal scaling [13], [14], [38] and aggressive caching [39] could mitigate the issue to some extent, they are not budget-friendly solutions. Specifically, to benefit from caching, users must pay more to keep clusters up and running even when query workloads are relatively lightweight [40]. To save cost, one could elastically scale clusters according to their query workloads; however, this approach increases the chance of cache misses, requiring data transfers over the network [15]. Fetching data over the network is slower than reading from local storage. Tiered storage layers [41]–[43] might be a more cost-effective solution to keep data access fast; however, quickly fetching terabytes of data remains challenging.

Materialization for Faster Querying. Data materialization can reduce query latencies by precomputing costly operations in advance and using the results. MVs have been studied extensively in the literature. The topics include efficient refresh/updates of MVs [1]–[3], [44], recommending useful MVs for observed query workloads [33], [45], [46], optimizing queries using MVs [47], [48], approximate aggregation [49]–[51], etc. While sketching [52] and sampling [3] can also be considered as a special case of MVs, we do not discuss them.

Automated management of materialized data is gaining interest. Napa [6] enables both high-throughput data ingestion and fast query speed using MVs. Keebo [53] automates materialized view creation by mining from query workloads. Also, there are tools that can help users manually define data




Fig. 3: Runtime breakdown by operation. Compressing/writing the result to storage takes much longer. A cloud data warehouse is used to join four tables (`customer`, `orders`, `lineitem`, `nation`) appearing in TPC-H Q8.

materialization strategies; we describe a few commonly used tools in the following section.

B. Data Materialization: Significant Fraction

Real-world data warehouses spend much time materializing data. By optimizing MV refresh, we can reduce infrastructure costs and data staleness. Managing complex MVs is becoming easier due to newly available tools providing templating languages, visualizations, and web-based interfaces.

Heavily Used in Warehouses. Data materialization makes up a significant fraction of modern data warehouse workloads. Figure 2 shows statistics across ten independent workloads [35]. Based on query runtime, data materialization (e.g., DDL, DML) takes 2%–38% of each workload. Interestingly, in W6, a warehouse spends $2.2\times$ time on materialization than analytics.

We have also spoken with several data engineers at big and small companies about their data ingestion and preparation pipelines. They are customers of cloud-managed data warehouses. In their environments, periodic (e.g., daily) data ingestion (using tools like Airflow [8], Fivetran [54], etc.) is followed by several hours of recurring in-warehouse operations for creating and updating dependent tables.¹ Dashboards are set up to use these precomputed tables to serve user-facing queries (instead of computing all the way from base tables); thus, end-users can see results more quickly (e.g., when they change filtering conditions). Data materialization is mostly managed via web-based tools (rather than hand-written DDL/DML statements sent directly to warehouses), which we will describe shortly.

Tools for Materialization. With high-level admin tools, managing a graph of MVs has become easier. First, Looker offers a data modeling language, LookML [9]. With LookML, users can express complex joins and nested structures. Based on LookML, Looker provides a feature called PDT [55] to store views as materialized tables. Once built, Looker uses materialized tables in its generated queries. Second, dbt [7] is a data modeling tool based on nested table/view definitions. Since a definition can reference other definitions, the overall structure forms a directed acyclic graph where nodes represent table/view definitions, and edges represent the dependencies

¹MVs are not currently first-choice because popular data warehouses like Amazon Redshift, BigQuery, and Snowflake do not support MVs with joins.




Fig. 4: Input to S/C for an example workload. Left: The workload’s dependency graph. Right: *plan* (execution order, nodes to keep in memory) for the MV refresh run by Optimizer.

among those definitions. dbt then uses a topological sort to determine the order of table updates. Note that while these tools offer convenient ways of constructing intermediate tables, all the operations are eventually compiled into SQL and sent to connected warehouses; data warehouses then perform the actual computation and data manipulation. Thus, what we discuss in this paper—speeding up warehouses’ internal operations—is orthogonal to what these tools offer.

C. Overhead of Data Materialization

Reading/writing data is often a significant bottleneck in data systems. That is, much of data transformation/materialization is spent on persisting data.

First, read/write often carries a large overhead (compared to compute) in modern data warehouses. To study this, we measured how much time a system spends on read/write operations (e.g., serialization, compression) relative to compute operations (e.g., join, filtering). Using an (anonymous) commercial data warehouse managed by its vendor, we ran CTAS statements containing three inner joins (or equivalently, four joined tables) which appear in TPC-H query #8—joins of `customer`, `orders`, `lineitem`, and `nation`. Figure 3 shows the result for different sizes of datasets, i.e., from scale factor 1 (or 1 GB) to scale factor 1000 (or 1000 GB). On the X-axis, a dataset size is accompanied by a respective total runtime (i.e., 5.4 seconds for the 1 GB dataset). According to this study, writing joined results into persistent storage (which could include compression, serialization, and network I/O) took 37%–69% of the total runtime (of each statement).

Second, read/write also takes significant time for open-source data systems. We compared a few different implementations for Apache Parquet (e.g., C++ Arrow [56], Rust Arrow [57]), a widely used columnar data format for data warehouses [12]–[14], [58], [59]. In our environment, we could achieve the best serialization speed with Rust Arrow compiled from its source. Under this setup, we tested the overhead of read/write in creating intermediate tables for TPC-DS queries (see § VI-A). Overall, read/write took 85% of the time spent on compute operations (e.g., join, filtering, etc.).

III. S/C: SYSTEM OVERVIEW

S/C is a system such that, given a list of materialized view (MV) definitions, it refreshes all the MVs (or more accurately, it generates data for those MVs). This section overviews how S/C performs this operation: § III-A describes S/C’s inputs, § III-B introduces S/C’s subcomponents and their roles and § III-C overviews the execution of an MV refresh run.




Fig. 5: S/C architecture. Optimizer determines which intermediate data to keep in Memory Catalog. DBMS can directly access data (temporarily) kept in Memory Catalog for computations, saving the time for reading data from external storage.

A. Workload Specification

A list of MVs to update (and their dependencies) are formally expressed using a *dependency graph*. Then, *execution metadata* records additional information about those MVs (e.g., the size on disk) useful for optimization.

Dependency Graph. The set of MVs to refresh is to be provided to S/C in the form of a dependency graph (Figure 4, left). Each node corresponds to a single MV update, and edges correspond to dependencies between MVs. Each node contains a SQL statement for a specific MV update.

Execution Metadata. S/C’s optimization requires information from DBMS-side SQL executions from past MV refresh runs, namely (1) the estimated size of the output table from executing the SQL statement in each node and (2) the estimated time savings of keeping a node output in memory (see § IV).

B. Internal Architecture

S/C’s Controller coordinates MV updates according to the *plan*—order of updates and in-memory caching—created by Optimizer (see Figure 5).

Controller. Controller directs the order of node (i.e., MV) materialization and how/where to store the output of individual nodes (i.e., keep in memory vs. materialize on external storage²) according to the directions provided by the Optimizer (see below). The directions are compiled into a corresponding SQL statement and sent to the DBMS for execution. The Controller additionally manages the materialization of intermediate tables kept in memory. (§ III-C)

Optimizer. The Optimizer computes the MV refresh order (e.g., MV1, MV2, MV3) and nodes to keep in memory (Figure 4, right) for the Controller using the metadata gathered from SQL executions in the DBMS and our proposed algorithm S/C Opt (described in §§ IV and V).

DBMS. The DBMS executes SQL statements from Controller (e.g., joins, aggregation). Input tables are from either Memory Catalog (described shortly) or read from external storage (e.g., disk). Our current implementation uses a Presto DBMS cluster [14], but any DBMS may be used in its place.




Fig. 6: The example MV refresh process by timestamp (t1-t4) for the workload given the plan in Figure 4.

C. Performing an MV Refresh Run

During an MV refresh run, Controller directs the DBMS to execute nodes (i.e. running their SQL statements) one by one according to the execution order computed by the Optimizer.

Memory Management. S/C ensures that the size of nodes kept in memory (called the Memory Catalog) is bounded correctly. Let n be a node that is to be kept in memory according to the Optimizer’s plan: n is created directly in the Memory Catalog, and freed from the Memory Catalog as soon as all the nodes depending on n complete their execution.

Parallelizing Compute and Materialization. S/C aims to maximize the usage of compute and I/O bandwidth of a DBMS. Nodes created in memory are materialized to external storage immediately after their creation; this materialization process occurs in parallel with the execution of downstream nodes.

Example. Based on Figure 4, we present a concrete example in Figure 6 to illustrate how S/C coordinates MV refreshes while maintaining the correct usage of the Memory Catalog and parallelizing I/O and compute. The MVs are refreshed in the order of MV1, MV2, MV3 according to the timeline below; MV1 is the only MV to be kept in memory:

- **t1:** MV1 is created in the Memory Catalog.
- **t2:** MV1 is fully created in memory. It is materialized to disk concurrently while refreshing MV2 (using the newly created MV1); MV2 will be directly created on disk.
- **t3:** MV2 is now fully refreshed. the refresh of MV3 starts on storage reading from MV1 in memory.
- **t4:** MV3 is fully refreshed and MV1 is fully materialized. MV1 in memory is deleted, concluding the MV refresh run.

IV. S/C Opt: PROBLEM SETUP

This section formally defines S/C Opt, namely *speeding up MV refresh runs via intermediate data storage under bounded memory*. Table II lists symbols we use in describing S/C Opt.

Problem Inputs. S/C Opt has 3 inputs:

1. A directed acyclic graph (DAG) $\mathcal{G} := \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$ of the MV refresh run. $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ is the set of n individual MV updates (nodes), and \mathcal{E} is the set of dependencies between the MV updates (edges).
2. The set of intermediate table sizes produced by each node $\mathcal{S} = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$, which we will abbreviate as *node sizes*.

²Our implementation of S/C uses NFS for storage. This can be substituted with alternative materialization locations.

TABLE II: Table of Symbols

Symbols	Definition
$\mathcal{G} := \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$	The dependency graph
$\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$	Set of $ \mathcal{V} = n$ nodes
\mathcal{E}	Set of $ \mathcal{E} = m$ dependencies
$\mathcal{S} = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$	Set of intermediate table (node) sizes
$\mathcal{T} = \{t_1, \dots, t_n\}$	Set of speedup scores
M	Memory Catalog size
$\tau : [1..n] \rightarrow [1..n]$	MV refresh (execution) order
$\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$	Nodes results kept in memory (flagged nodes)

Each s_i measures the amount of memory space required to keep the intermediate table produced by v_i .

3. The set of speedup scores of each node $\mathcal{T} = \{t_1, \dots, t_n\}$, where t_i measures the estimated speedup for the MV refresh run achieved by keeping the output of v_i in memory (which we say *flagging the node*).

Speedup Scores. The speedup score t_i of node n_i is computed as follows:

$$t_i = \left(\sum_{(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}} \text{data-access-time}(v_j | v_i \text{ on disk}) - \text{data-access-time}(v_j | v_i \text{ in memory}) \right) + \text{time}(\text{create } v_i \text{ on disk}) - \text{time}(\text{create } v_i \text{ in memory})$$

Speedup t_i of flagging v_i is computed w.r.t. to the baseline approach of performing MV refresh operations sequentially: For each downstream node v_j depending on v_i , data access time is saved by reading v_i from memory instead of from external storage. For executing v_i , write time can be reduced by materializing v_i to external storage in parallel with minimal interference with downstream computations. (§ III-C)

Memory Usage and Execution Order. Given the Memory Catalog size M , the peak memory usage of an MV refresh run—the maximum combined size of flagged nodes coexisting in memory—at any time during the run should not exceed M . The peak memory usage of a set of flagged nodes depends on the execution order $\tau : [1..n] \rightarrow [1..n]$ in which the nodes are executed: v_i is the $\tau(i)^{th}$ executed node.

The execution order determines when a flagged node can be released from memory—a flagged node can be released only when all of its downstream nodes (children) are computed. Hence, it plays a key role in determining the feasibility of a set of flagged nodes under the Memory Catalog size constraint. A good execution order will allow us to release flagged nodes faster, which in turn allows us to flag more nodes throughout the MV refresh run, leading to a higher total speedup score under the same Memory Catalog size constraint.

Consider the toy example shown in Figure 7. For simplicity, assume the speedup score of a node is equal to its size in GB; ideally, we want to flag both 100GB nodes v_1 and v_3 with Memory Catalog size $M = 100GB$. As v_1 can be released after v_4 is executed, τ_2 allows both v_1 and v_3 to be flagged by executing v_4 before v_3 , while τ_1 does not. The maximum possible score of 210 is achieved under τ_2 by flagging both of v_1 and v_3 (and v_6). This is much higher than the maximum possible score of 120 achieved by flagging v_1, v_5, v_6 under τ_1 .




Fig. 7: Execution order matters: v_1 and v_3 cannot both be flagged under τ_1 , but can under τ_2 . The larger the combined size of flagged nodes, the better.

Problem Definition. According to our problem setup, we define S/C Opt as a joint optimization problem of the set of flagged nodes \mathcal{U} and execution order τ :

Problem 1. S/C Opt

- Input: 1. Dependency graph $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$
 2. Node sizes \mathcal{S}
 3. Speedup scores \mathcal{T}
 4. Memory Catalog size M

- Output: 1. A subset $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ of flagged nodes
 2. An execution order τ

Objective function: Maximize total speedup score $\sum_{i:v_i \in \mathcal{U}} t_i$ of flagged nodes

Constraint: Flagging \mathcal{U} is feasible under execution order τ and Memory Catalog size M

V. S/C Opt: JOINT OPTIMIZATION

We present our solution to S/C Opt. Unlike previous work on scheduling refresh order of a set of MVs [5], [23] and storing select intermediate data to reduce job latency [18], [19], [60], we are, to the best of our knowledge, the first to consider joint optimization of both items.

S/C Opt is NP-hard via a reduction from the 0-1 knapsack problem, which necessitates the usage of an efficient approximation algorithm. While S/C Opt has 2 distinct outputs flagged nodes \mathcal{U} and execution order τ , standard alternating optimization [61] is not applicable due to improving τ while holding \mathcal{U} constant does not improve the objective function of total speedup score. We still decompose S/C Opt into 2 distinct subproblems and solve S/C Opt by starting from an initial execution order τ_0 and an empty set of flagged nodes (i.e., $\mathcal{U}_0 = \emptyset$); however, differing from standard alternating optimization, we decompose S/C Opt into 2 subproblems with different objective functions:

Problem 2. S/C Opt Nodes

Input: Inputs of S/C Opt, Execution order τ

Output: Flagged nodes \mathcal{U}

Objective function: Maximize total speedup score $\sum_{v_i \in \mathcal{U}} t_i$

Constraint: Same as S/C Opt

Problem 3. S/C Opt Order

Input: Inputs of S/C Opt, Flagged nodes \mathcal{U}

Output: Execution order τ

Objective function: Minimize average memory usage

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:v_i \in \mathcal{U}} (\max_{(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}} \tau(j) - \tau(i)) s_i$$

Constraint: Same as S/C Opt

Instead of improving the objective function, we 'relax the constraints' in S/C Opt Order by using the average memory usage as its objective function, which we define as the average size of flagged nodes stored in Memory Catalog assuming unit job execution times (illustrated as shaded regions in Figure 8). A lower average memory usage corresponds to more efficient usage of Memory Catalog through a more timely release of flagged nodes, potentially allowing us to add more nodes into \mathcal{U} in future iterations of alternating optimization.

We optimize for average memory usage in S/C Opt Order despite peak memory usage being the constraint of S/C Opt due to the latter failing to meaningfully differentiate between execution orders. Figure 8 showcases an example: nodes v_1, v_3, v_4, v_5 are flagged. While both refresh orders have the same peak memory usage, the refresh order found by our solution to S/C Opt Order (MA-DFS, § V-B) attains the peak memory for a shorter period of time - hence having a lower average memory usage - allowing an additional node to be flagged in the next iteration of solving S/C Opt Nodes.

In the following subsections, we describe our solutions to S/C Opt Nodes (§ V-A) and S/C Opt Order (§ V-B). Finally, we explain how we combine them to form our alternating optimization algorithm for solving S/C Opt (§ V-C).

A. S/C Opt Nodes: Solution

We solve S/C Opt Nodes exactly by formulating it as a multidimensional 0-1 knapsack problem (MKP) [62]. We have also considered approximate solutions such as greedy algorithms; however, they exhibit considerably worse performance compared to our MKP formulation while having a negligible runtime advantage. (§ VI-F)

MKP Setup. For each node v_i and execution order τ , let \mathcal{V}_i denote a set of nodes that, when flagged, will be kept in memory during the time of v_i 's execution. According to the memory management scheme of S/C, a flagged node v_j is kept in memory at the time of v_i 's execution if there is at least 1 child of v_j yet to be executed:

$$\mathcal{V}_i := \{v_j | \tau(j) \leq \tau(i) \leq \max_{(v_j, v_k) \in \mathcal{E}} \tau(k)\}$$

The set of all \mathcal{V}_i s form the constraints of the MKP such that the total size of flagged nodes in each \mathcal{V}_i does not exceed Memory Catalog size M . Using speedup scores \mathcal{T} as coefficients of the MKP's objective function, we define S/C Opt Nodes in integer linear programming format³ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{i=1}^n x_i t_i \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{j:v_j \in \mathcal{V}_i} x_j s_j \leq M, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \\ & && x_i \in \{0, 1\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \end{aligned}$$

³We round speedup scores to the nearest integer.

Algorithm 1: SimplifiedMKP

Input : (1) Dependency graph $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$
(2) Node sizes \mathcal{S} and speedup scores \mathcal{T}
(3) Memory Catalog size M
(4) Execution order τ

Output: Set of flagged nodes \mathcal{U}

- 1 Initialize $\mathcal{V}_{exclude} = \{v_i | s_i > M \vee t_i = 0\}$;
 - 2 $constraint_sets = GetConstraints(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{V}_{exclude}, M, \tau)$;
 - 3 Initialize $\mathcal{V}_{mkp} = \bigcup_{\mathcal{V}_i \in constraint_sets} \mathcal{V}_i$;
 - 4 Initialize $|constraint_sets| = k, |\mathcal{V}_{mkp}| = l$;
 - 5 Set profits $P_{1 \times l} = [t_{i_1}, \dots, t_{i_l}], v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_l} \in \mathcal{V}_{mkp}$;
 - 6 Set weights $W_{k \times l}, w_{xy} = (\text{if } v_{i_y} \in \mathcal{V}_x \text{ then } s_i \text{ else } 0), 1 \leq x \leq k, 1 \leq y \leq l$;
 - 7 Set capacities $C_{k \times 1} = [M, \dots, M]$;
 - 8 $\mathcal{U} = BinaryMKPSolver(P, W, C)$;
 - 9 $\mathcal{U} \leftarrow \mathcal{U} \cup (\mathcal{V} - \mathcal{V}_{mkp} - \mathcal{V}_{exclude})$;
 - 10 **Return** the set of nodes to store in memory \mathcal{U} .
-

Simplifying the MKP. We proceed to simplify the MKP by identifying and removing redundant variables (nodes) present in the MKP. A node v_i is redundant and does not need to be evaluated in the MKP if either:

- $s_i > M$: v_i has size larger than Memory Catalog size —flagging v_i by itself violates the constraint
- $t_i = 0$: storing v_i does not contribute to the objective

We can exclude such nodes from our constraint sets \mathcal{V}_i :

$$\mathcal{V}_i := \{v_j | \tau(j) \leq \tau(i) \leq \max_{(v_j, v_k) \in \mathcal{E}} \tau(k) \wedge v_j \notin \mathcal{V}_{exclude}\}$$

where $\mathcal{V}_{exclude} := \{v_i | i : s_i > M \vee t_i = 0\}$

A constraint set \mathcal{V}_i is redundant and does not need to be evaluated in the MKP if either:

- \mathcal{V}_i is not maximal: $\exists \mathcal{V}_j s.t. \mathcal{V}_i \subsetneq \mathcal{V}_j$; the constraint set \mathcal{V}_i is a strict subset of another constraint set \mathcal{V}_j
- \mathcal{V}_i is trivial: $\sum_{j: v_j \in \mathcal{V}_i} s_j \leq M$; the constraint \mathcal{V}_i cannot be violated even if all nodes in \mathcal{V}_i are flagged

Solving the MKP. We present our completed solution (MKP) to S/C Opt Nodes in Algorithm 1. The set of all relevant (maximal and non-trivial) constraint sets is efficiently computed with `GetConstraints` in linear time by a linear scan over the nodes (line 2). Note that not every non-excluded node $v_i \in \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{V}_{exclude}$ appears in a constraint set. If a node does not appear in any constraint set and is also not in $\mathcal{V}_{exclude}$, it can be trivially flagged because doing so will not violate memory constraints; these nodes are manually added to the solution returned from the MKP solver (line 9).

We choose branch-and-bound method⁴ for subroutine `BinaryMKPSolver` (line 8). While the method has worst-case exponential time complexity, we empirically verify that Algorithm 1 has satisfactory scalability in general (§ VI-H): it scales roughly linearly with the number of nodes in the dependency graph and takes on average 0.02 seconds to find the optimal set of nodes to flag in a 100-node graph.

⁴Our S/C implementation uses the BnB solver from Google OR-Tools [63].




Fig. 8: Intuition behind MA-DFS. Tie-breaking is performed when deciding to schedule v_2 or v_3 first. MA-DFS correctly schedules v_2 first, enabling further speedup by allowing v_6 to be flagged. This is not guaranteed under an execution order produced by DFS with random tie-breaking.

B. S/C Opt Order: Solution

We solve S/C Opt Order by formulating a *memory-aware* DFS-based scheduling algorithm. We have experimented with other methods, such as hill-climbing [64] and recursive graph separators [65]⁵, though we find them to be less effective in comparison. (§ VI-F)

Optimizing Average Memory Usage. The DFS-based scheduling algorithm aims to minimize the time between a node’s execution and its children’s by finishing a branch of execution before starting a new one, which minimizes average memory usage of flagged nodes by freeing them as soon as possible.

However, we find that off-the-shelf DFS-based sorts in existing work [67] are insufficient in our case. In particular, DFS traversals must choose a path to proceed onto (tie-break) at branches, and a random selection without considering the node size can result in suboptimal performance. A random selection may keep large flagged nodes in memory for an extended period of time, which reduces the amount of memory space available for flagging additional nodes (see Figure 8).

Memory-Aware DFS. To address this, we propose a *memory-aware* DFS-based scheduling algorithm (MA-DFS), which prioritizes nodes with lower actual memory consumption to tie-break: A node’s actual memory consumption is equal to its size if it is flagged and is equal to 0 otherwise. MA-DFS aims to compute the largest flagged dependencies (in terms of size) of a node last in order to minimize the time these large dependencies are kept in memory, which frees up memory space to potentially flag more nodes.

The toy example in Figure 8 illustrates this idea. We have Memory Catalog size $M = 100GB$; for simplicity, assume the speedup score of a node is equal to its size in GB. When performing tie-breaking between v_2 and v_3 , MA-DFS schedules v_2 first as v_3 has higher actual memory consumption; despite being larger than v_3 , v_2 is not flagged. v_3 is kept in memory for only 3 node executions (v_3, v_5, v_6), freeing memory space for v_6 to be additionally flagged. This would not be possible with

⁵While there exists an ILP formulation for this problem, [66], it contains $O(n^3)$ variables and constraints making it too inefficient for real-time scheduling. We defer exploration of this direction to future work.

Algorithm 2: AlternatingOptimization

Input : (1) Dependency graph $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$
(2) node sizes \mathcal{S} and speedup scores \mathcal{T}
(3) Memory Catalog size M
Output: (1) Set of flagged nodes \mathcal{U}
(2) execution order τ

```
1 Initialize  $\tau = \text{GetTopologicalOrder}(\mathcal{G})$ ;  
2 Initialize  $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$ ;  
3 while the algorithm does not converge do  
4    $\mathcal{U}_{new} = \text{SimplifiedMKP}(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}, M, \tau)$ ;  
5   if  $\sum_{i:v_i \in \mathcal{U}_{new}} s_i \leq \sum_{i:v_i \in \mathcal{U}} s_i$  then return  $\mathcal{U}, \tau$  ;  
6    $\mathcal{U} \leftarrow \mathcal{U}_{new}$  ;  
7    $\tau_{new} = \text{MA-DFS}(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}, M, \mathcal{U})$   
8   if  $\text{PeakMemoryUsage}(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{U}, \tau_{new}) > M$  then  
9     return  $\mathcal{U}, \tau$  ;  
9    $\tau \leftarrow \tau_{new}$  ;  
10 end
```

a DFS-based sort with random tie-breaking in cases where it schedules v_3 instead of v_2 first. Such a sort would keep v_3 in memory for 5 node executions, taking up memory space that could have been used for flagging v_6 .

We verify the validity of MA-DFS’s execution order in each iteration of alternating optimization to preserve the memory constraint M . In a rare case where MA-DFS outputs an infeasible execution order—violating the memory constraint M —we conclude that the execution order from the previous iteration of alternating optimization is optimal and terminate the alternating optimization algorithm. While our solution may find locally optimal solutions, we empirically verify that the local optimums that our solution finds are still of high quality compared to solutions found by other methods. (§ VI-F)

C. S/C Opt: Putting Everything Together

With solutions to both subproblems, we present our alternating optimization algorithm for solving S/C Opt in Algorithm 2.

Any topological sorting algorithm can be used as the `GetTopologicalOrder` subroutine for obtaining the initial execution order on line 1.⁶ In each iteration of alternating optimization, `PeakMemoryUsage` on line 8 is efficiently computed in linear time by a linear scan over the nodes. We alternate between solving S/C Opt Nodes and S/C Opt Order we can no longer improve our outputs:

- No better set of flagged nodes \mathcal{U}_{new} is found by `SimplifiedMKP` (line 5)
- The execution order τ_{new} found by MA-DFS violates the memory constraint M (line 8)

Our solution is guaranteed to converge as the total speedup score of \mathcal{U} must increase in each iteration for alternating optimization to continue. Our solution typically converges in <10 iterations for dependency graphs with up to 100 nodes.

⁶Our implementation of S/C uses the `topological_sort` function in the Python NetworkX package [68].

VI. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we empirically study the effectiveness of S/C. We make the following claims:

1. **Faster end-to-end MV refresh:** S/C is capable of speeding up *end-to-end MV refresh time* by $1.04\times-5.08\times$ compared to an unoptimized raw Presto DBMS, which is up to an additional $2.22\times$ compared to other existing off-the-shelf methods. (§ VI-B)
2. **Consistent execution time savings:** S/C’s optimization results in consistent savings across different dataset sizes ranging from 10GB up to 1TB. (§ VI-C)
3. **Effective utilization of memory:** S/C effectively utilizes varying Memory Catalog sizes. S/C’s Memory Catalog can be allocated from spare memory in the system or from query memory with minimal loss of speedup. (§ VI-D)
4. **Table read time reduction:** S/C’s storage of intermediate tables in memory results in a $1.42\times-1.51\times$ reduction in the table read latency. (§ VI-E)
5. **Effectiveness of solution to S/C Opt:** Solving S/C Opt with our solution (MKP + MA-DFS) results in a $1.06\times-1.23\times$ total time reduction compared to ablated methods. (§ VI-F)
6. **Scalability of S/C on distributed setups:** S/C is capable of achieving consistent speedup on multi-node DB clusters regardless of the number of nodes. (§ VI-G)
7. **Scalability of S/C on complex workloads:** Our solution to S/C Opt has a negligible $< 0.02s$ optimization time on complex DAGs with up to 100 nodes. (§ VI-H)

A. Experiment Setup

Dataset. We use the table generator and queries included in the TPC-DS [69] decision support benchmark in our experiments. We generate TPC-DS datasets from 5 distinct scale factors (10, 25, 50, 100, 1000); the scale factor determines the total size in GB of the tables in the generated dataset.

We create two copies of each dataset for each scale. One is a normal dataset generated as is (i.e., TPC-DS). The other is a *date-partitioned* dataset wherein the three largest tables (`store_sales`, `catalog_sales`, `web_sales`) are partitioned by year based on a join with the `date_dim` table (i.e., TPC-DSp).

Methods. We evaluate the effectiveness of the S/C Opt framework by comparing it to both off-the-shelf algorithms and previously proposed algorithms:

- Greedy: Iterate through nodes in execution order and flag nodes if doing so doesn’t violate the memory constraint.
- Random: Iterate through nodes in random order and flag nodes if doing so doesn’t violate the memory constraint.
- Ratio-based selection [60]: Heuristic method prioritizing flagging nodes with high speedup score/node size ratio.
- The LRU cache in the DBMS caches query results. We increase the size of the LRU cache by an amount equal to the size of Memory Catalog.

We additionally perform an ablation analysis to evaluate the effectiveness of our solution to S/C. Specifically, we evaluate our individual solutions to the subproblems S/C Opt Nodes and




Fig. 9: End-to-end MV refresh times on 100GB datasets. S/C achieves 1.04x–5.08x speedup with 1.6/0.8GB Memory Catalog compared to an unoptimized raw engine. This is an additional up to 2.22x speedup compared to other off-the-shelf methods.

TABLE III: Summary of workloads. I/O percentage estimated from profiling equivalent operations with Python Polars [28].

Workload	TPC-DS Queries	# Nodes	I/O ratio
I/O 1	5, 77, 80	21	51.5%
I/O 2	2, 59, 74, 75	19	59.0%
I/O 3	44, 49	26	46.6%
Compute 1	33, 56, 60, 61	21	0.9%
Compute 2	14, 23	16	28.3%

S/C Opt Order by swapping out one subproblem solution for a baseline method during alternating optimization.

We compare our MKP solution to S/C Opt Nodes to the Greedy and Random methods. We compare our MA-DFS solution to S/C Opt Order to two baseline methods:

- Simulated annealing (SA) [64]: A hill-climbing algorithm that iteratively improves an execution order. In each iteration, two swappable nodes (i.e. doing so doesn’t violate dependencies) are randomly selected; A swap is performed if doing so decreases the average memory usage. The swap is still performed with a certain probability to escape possible local minima. We set the iteration count to 10,000.
- Separator [70], [71]: A divide-and-conquer algorithm that recursively finds separators/cuts in the DAG to partition nodes. In each iteration, a subgraph is partitioned into two via a cut; the algorithm stops when the original DAG has been partitioned into a series of singleton nodes by the cuts. These cuts define the execution order. This algorithm notably offers a lower bound of $O(n \log(n))$.

Real Workload. We construct MV refresh workloads from TPC-DS queries. We create one node/MV for each *select-project-join* (SPJ) unit in the query and merge graphs of TPC-DS queries that share similar intermediate nodes and topics (i.e. profit report, sales analysis) into one larger graph. Each graph represents a set of MVs to refresh together in a workload. As a result, we obtain five workloads with dependency graphs, each consisting of 16–26 nodes (Table III).

Generated Workload. To investigate the scalability of our solution on more complex workloads, we create a workload generator for systematically creating realistic dependency graphs with a larger number of nodes (25–100).

Our workload generator consists of two components:

- A DAG generator for determining dependency between individual jobs in the workload [72]. We set generation

parameters based on empirical analysis of real-world query structures (TPC-DS and Spider [73]).

- A Markov chain—trained on the same query set—for determining node operations (i.e. JOIN, AGG). Operations are used to derive the sizes and speedup scores of nodes from their inputs. The sizes of nodes with no parents (i.e. reading directly from base tables) are randomly sampled from table sizes in the 100GB TPC-DS dataset.

Environment. All experiments are performed on an Ubuntu server with an AMD EPYC 7552 48-Core Processor and 1TB RAM. The disk read and write speeds are 519.8 MB/s and 358.9 MB/s, respectively, with a read latency of 175 μ s. For most of our experiments, the Presto cluster consists of 1 worker node with 50GB/300GB query memory for the <100GB/1TB datasets respectively; however, we also study with distributed setups in § VI-G. S/C’s Memory Catalog is independent of query memory unless otherwise stated.

Implementation. We implement S/C as a Python front-end over a Presto DBMS. The front-end performs optimization and sends queries to the DBMS via the Presto python connector [74]; the Presto DBMS is created on top of a Hive Metastore [12], which stores created tables in an NFS.

We control data placement in the DBMS by creating tables either (i) in the Hive catalog [75] to materialize or (ii) in the memory catalog [76] to keep in memory. Base TPC-DS tables are stored in the ORC format [77] native to Apache Hive. We create MVs/intermediate tables in the Apache Parquet format.

Time Measurement. We measure the end-to-end time as the time from starting the MV refresh workload to having all MVs in the workload materialized on our NFS. For each setting, we measure the average end-to-end runtime over 5 runs to reduce variance and report the median.

The solution runtime for solving S/C Opt is not included in the end-to-end time as (i) optimization can be performed prior to data ingestion and (ii) solution runtimes are negligibly short compared to end-to-end MV refresh times.

B. Faster End-to-End MV Refresh

In this section, we study the impact of S/C’s optimization on end-to-end MV refresh times. For this, we compare the average runtimes of our constructed TPC-DS workloads using Presto




Fig. 10: S/C’s optimization achieves consistent speedup on a range of dataset scales. Memory Catalog set to 1.6% data size.




Fig. 11: S/C achieves more savings with larger Memory Catalog on the 100GB TPC-DSp dataset. Significant savings are achieved even with a small Memory Catalog (0.4%) relative to dataset size. S/C’s Memory Catalog can also be reallocated from query memory with minimal impact on speedup.

DBMS with S/C, without S/C, and with other algorithms on the 100GB TPC-DS dataset.

We report the results in Figure 9. The design goal of S/C is to reduce the overhead of intermediate table read/write times, which is successfully reflected in our speedups achieved on the I/O heavy workloads, as follows. Compared to executing the workloads in serial fashion without keeping any data in memory, S/C is able to speed up end-to-end workload execution time by 1.05x–2.72x using 1.6GB Memory Catalog. The savings increase to up to 1.20x–5.08x on datasets with smaller intermediate table sizes (100GB date-partitioned TPC-DS datasets), which S/C takes full advantage of to keep more data in memory throughout workload executions.

Compared to other algorithms, S/C achieves up to 2.22x speedup in end-to-end workload execution time. Specifically, the performance of S/C over other methods can be attributed to (i) S/C additionally optimizing the execution order of the workload and (ii) greedy/heuristic selection can perform arbitrarily badly on workloads.

C. S/C Handles Large Workloads

In this section, we evaluate the performance gain from S/C across varying dataset sizes. We measure the speedup achieved by S/C on the total execution time of the 5 workloads on regular and date-partitioned TPC-DS datasets of different sizes (10GB–1TB), with Memory Catalog 1.6% of the dataset size.

Figure 10 report the end-to-end execution time reduction achieved by S/C across different TPC-DS dataset scales. Given an appropriately sized Memory Catalog relative to dataset size, S/C’s optimization results in consistent execution time reductions across different dataset scales - 1.58x–1.71x on the regular TPC-DS datasets, and 2.31x–4.26x on the date-partitioned TPC-DS datasets.

TABLE IV: Effect of S/C’s optimization on various metrics on the 100GB datasets. S/C reduces table read times by storing intermediate tables in the Memory Catalog.

Dataset	Latency(CPU,s)	No opt	0.4%	0.8%	1.6%	3.2%	6.4%
TPC-DS	Table read	4243	4308	3934	3574	3128	2884
	Compute	8533	8587	8319	8283	8249	8286
	Query	12776	12895	12253	11857	11377	11170
TPC-DSp	Table read	1710	1514	1314	1106	1106	1096
	Compute	2843	2756	2709	2657	2636	2644
	Query	4553	4270	4023	3763	3742	3740

D. Efficient Usage of Memory Catalog

In this section, we study S/C’s usage of Memory Catalog by evaluating its performance gain with varying Memory Catalog sizes. We measure speedup on both the total table read latency and total execution time of the 5 workloads on the 100GB TPC-DSp dataset, performing a parameter sweep on Memory Catalog size from 0.4% to 6.4% of data size. Additionally, we compare the achieved speedup between using spare memory in the system and reallocating query memory from the DBMS as Memory Catalog for S/C. This is reported in Figure 11.

Storage of intermediate data in memory results in a notable speedup of 1.50x even with Memory Catalog 0.4% of data size. Further increasing the Memory Catalog size results in a speedup of up to 4.26x with 6.4% of data size.

In the case where no spare memory is available in the system to act as Memory Catalog for S/C, the Memory Catalog can also be reallocated from the query memory of the DBMS with minimal impact on achieved speedup. The reduction in speedup when using reassigned memory compared to spare memory is negligible - only up to 0.25x.

E. S/C Reduces Table Read Times


In this section, we investigate S/C’s query-level benefits. We run the 5 workloads on 100GB datasets with varying Memory Catalog sizes and present CPU metrics reported by Presto.

We provide the breakdown of savings by Memory Catalog size in Table IV. The reduction of table read latency is a major source of S/C’s speedup, reaching 1.51x and 1.42x respectively with 6.4% of data size. S/C’s optimization has a negligible effect on compute latency, which is expected as it is not the target of S/C’s optimization.

F. Our Optimization Finds Higher-Quality Solutions

In this section, we examine the effectiveness of our proposed solution (MKP + MA-DFS) to S/C Opt. We compare the time savings achieved by solving S/C Opt with MKP + MA-DFS to that of ablated methods—one of MKP or MA-DFS paired with an alternative method—under the same Memory Catalog size on the total execution time of the 5 workloads on the 100GB TPC-DS dataset.

Figure 12 showcases this comparison on a variety of datasets. Our solutions to both subproblems—MKP for S/C Opt Nodes and MA-DFS for S/C Opt Order—both outperform their respective alternative methods. MKP paired with MA-DFS achieves up to 1.09x speedup compared to either Greedy,



(a) TPC-DS (1.6% Memory Catalog) (b) TPC-DSp (.8% Memory Catalog)
 Fig. 12: Comparison between different methods for solving S/C Opt on the 100GB datasets. Our solution (MKP + MA-DFS) outperforms ablated methods by saving up to an additional 3%–11% of workload execution time.

Random or Ratio-based selection paired with MA-DFS; similarly, MA-DFS paired with MKP achieves up to $1.21\times$ speedup compared to either SA or Separator paired with MKP.

Notably, our individual solutions overcome pitfalls that affect the alternative methods:

- Greedy, Ratio, and Random flag nodes without considering the duration the node will be kept in memory.
- SA and Separator have poor compatibility with the Memory Catalog size constraint, which (i) limits the number of valid node swaps SA can perform and (ii) cannot be integrated into Separator commonly resulting in it unfeasible execution orders, ending alternating optimization early.

G. S/C Scales in Cluster-Based Environments

In this section, we showcase S/C’s ability to achieve speedup in a distributed setting. We vary the worker node count (50GB query memory each) in our Presto cluster and investigate the relationship between node count and total end-to-end time speedup of the 5 workloads on the 100GB TPC-DS dataset.

We present the results in Table V. While the total end-to-end job execution time significantly decreases with each additional node in the distributed DB cluster, the additional savings achieved by S/C’s optimization remains largely consistent irrespective of the number of nodes.

H. S/C’s Handling of Complex Workload Structures

In this section, we study the effect of workload dependency structure on the optimization time and achievable speedup of S/C. We use our workload generator to create DAGs/workloads of up to 100 nodes and (1) compare S/C’s optimization time with baseline methods and (2) perform sweeps to investigate the relationship between generation parameters and estimated savings from S/C. We generate 1000 DAGs for each setting.

Optimization Time. Figure 13 shows the average optimization time of the methods DAGs with up to 100 nodes. The optimization time of our proposed solution, MKP + MA-DFS, scales linearly with the number of nodes in the DAG, with a negligible runtime of 0.02 seconds on DAGs with 100 nodes. While Greedy + MA-DFS, Random + MA-DFS, and Ratio-based selection + MA-DFS have faster optimization times, the advantage (0.001s/0.022s/0.008s vs 0.024s on 100-node graphs) is negligible compared to the additional end-to-end

TABLE V: Effect of S/C’s optimization in DB clusters on the 100GB TPC-DS dataset with 1.6% Memory Catalog.

Metric	1 node	2 nodes	3 nodes	4 nodes	5 nodes
No opt runtime (s)	1528	868	656	546	487
S/C runtime (s)	934	521	383	333	304
Speedup	$1.63\times$	$1.67\times$	$1.71\times$	$1.64\times$	$1.60\times$




Fig. 13: Comparison between runtimes of different methods for solving S/C Opt on synthetic DAGs. The runtime of our solution (MKP + MA-DFS) scales linearly with DAG size and is negligible up to 100 nodes.

workload execution time reduction brought by MKP + MA-DFS (§ VI-F). Both MKP + SA and MKP + Separator are significantly slower compared to the MKP + MA-DFS in terms of optimization time while also providing less benefit in terms of workload execution time reduction.

Parameter Sweep. Figure 14 reports the results of S/C’s optimization vs. various generation parameters. Time savings are normalized w.r.t. parameters in Figure 13 marked in black.

- **DAG size:** The normalized savings achieved by S/C is highly correlated with DAG size. The relationship is not proportional; however, this is expected as deeply nested MVs tend to be smaller from repeated filters/projections.
- **DAG height/width:** The workload generator creates DAGs following the structure of Spark workloads: The height and width correspond to the number of stages in the workload and the number of nodes per stage, respectively. S/C achieves more savings on ‘thinner’ DAGs with higher height/width ratio due to fewer inter-stage dependencies, allowing nodes kept in Memory Catalog to be freed sooner with an efficient execution order.
- **Node max. outdegree:** This parameter controls the number of outgoing edges generated for each node in the DAG, uniformly sampled from $[0, \text{max. outdegree}]$. A higher value results in more savings, a result of individual nodes having higher speedup scores as its flagging reduces the file read latency of more downstream nodes.
- **Stage node count standard deviation (StDev):** This parameter introduces variance into the number of nodes per stage in the DAG. While the DAG structure becomes increasingly irregular with higher variance, the irregularity’s effect on speedup is negligible.

VII. RELATED WORK

Efficient MV Refresh. Incremental view maintenance (IVM) aims to update MVs to reflect newly ingested data, taking advantage of already computed results to perform the update




Fig. 14: Analysis of DAG complexity vs. predicted savings from S/C on synthetic DAGs. Savings normalized w.r.t. DAGs with 100 nodes, height/width ratio 1, max. out-degree 4, and stage node count StDev 1 (Parameters in Figure 13, marked in black).

in a manner more efficient than computing from scratch (full refresh) [1]–[4], [6], [21], [22], [44]. There is an abundance of work in IVM, including incremental updates on duplicate values [21], non-distributive aggregate functions [22], higher-order views [1], and sliding windows [4]. More recent works also investigate the scalability aspect of IVM, proposing scale-independent updates [44] and sampled views [3]. Since S/C is applicable to arbitrary SQL statements, S/C is orthogonal to and is fully compatible with existing IVM techniques.

MV Refresh Scheduling. There exist works on scheduling the refresh of a MV set focusing on resolving cyclic dependencies [23], minimizing weighted average staleness [5], and prioritizing MVs with the highest speedups on predicted future queries [24]. S/C’s scheduling to speed up the end-to-end refresh of the MV set is not addressed in existing works.

DAG Workflow Scheduling. The execution of workloads consisting of individual jobs with acyclic dependencies is a well-studied topic [34], [66], [67], [78], [79]; many of these techniques can be applied to MV refresh runs studied in this paper. Existing workflow scheduling systems such as Apache Oozie [34], Apache Airflow [8], and Spark DAG scheduler [78] automate the execution of user-defined workflows following a topological order. There are recent works aimed at finding more optimal execution orders in terms of peak memory usage [67], [79] and execution time on parallel platforms [66]. While S/C is designed for use with MV refresh runs/workloads, our technique on joint scheduling and optimization can be reasonably applied to general workloads as a possible future direction.

Intermediate Data Caching. Some existing data visualization systems cache user-defined variables to support the typical incremental construction of data visualizations [80], [81] during data analysis sessions [82]–[84]. Recent work proposes a management scheme for these cached variables under a memory constraint that greedily keeps variables with the highest estimated time savings based on predicted future user behavior via neural networks [60]. While useful for data visualization, a greedy approach to memory management fails to achieve satisfactory results compared to S/C.

Intermediate Result Reuse. There exist works on storing intermediate results from computations to speedup future computations [25]–[27], [85], [86]. Studied topics include the identification of reuse opportunities by finding overlaps in computation graphs of successive jobs [25], [27], selective storage under a space constraint with heuristics such as reuse

probability [26], expected savings [25], and recompute-storage cost difference [85], and rewriting incoming jobs to take advantage of stored intermediates [86]. These works share similarity with S/C in their selection of items to store under a memory constraint, however, S/C’s problem setting requires it to uniquely consider the joint (re)ordering of job executions along with the selection of items.

Incremental Query Processing. Incremental processing (IQP) is useful for cases where not all data required for a query is immediately available. Similar to online aggregation [87], initial results of a query are computed on a subset of required data and progressively refined as the rest of the required data arrives in a predictable pattern [17], [18]. Tang et al. propose a dynamic programming formulation to pick intermediate states to store in memory given a limited memory budget [17]. Tempura rewrites the query plan for more efficient execution based on predicted data arrival patterns [18]. While similarities exist between the problem setting of IQP and S/C, such as management of bounded memory, S/C notably includes additional joint optimization for the order of MV updates.

VIII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

Sequentially refreshing materialized views (MVs) according to a topological order bears a noticeable overhead as a result of the significant portion of intermediate I/O spent on reading and writing intermediate data. In this paper, we propose a new system, S/C, which aims to speed up MV refresh workloads by selectively persisting intermediate data in bounded memory during workload execution to reduce the blocking I/O costs, thereby significantly reducing the wait times for reading and writing intermediate data from and to external storage. We propose an effective and scalable algorithm to jointly optimize (1) a subset of intermediate data to persist and (2) a topological order, in order to minimize the end-to-end MV refresh time under bounded memory. S/C is different from and complements existing MV refresh techniques as our approach is oblivious to individual MV refresh operations. We demonstrate that S/C can reduce end-to-end MV refresh workload execution times by $1.04\times$ – $5.08\times$ with 1.6GB memory on a 100GB dataset. Moreover, our optimization algorithm can easily handle complex workloads with 100 MVs.

In the future, we plan to generalize techniques presented in this paper to non-MV refresh recurring workloads containing individual jobs with acyclic dependencies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work is supported in part by Microsoft Azure.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Ahmad, O. Kennedy, C. Koch, and M. Nikolic, "Dbtoaster: Higher-order delta processing for dynamic, frequently fresh views," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 5, no. 10, 2012.
- [2] F. McSherry, D. G. Murray, R. Isaacs, and M. Isard, "Differential dataflow," in *CIDR*, 2013.
- [3] K. Zeng, S. Agarwal, and I. Stoica, "Iolap: Managing uncertainty for efficient incremental olap," in *Proceedings of the 2016 international conference on management of data*, 2016, pp. 1347–1361.
- [4] L. Braun, T. Etter, G. Gasparis, M. Kaufmann, D. Kossmann, D. Widmer, A. Avitzur, A. Iliopoulos, E. Levy, and N. Liang, "Analytics in motion: High performance event-processing and real-time analytics in the same database," in *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*, 2015, pp. 251–264.
- [5] L. Golab, T. Johnson, and V. Shkapenyuk, "Scheduling updates in a real-time stream warehouse," in *2009 IEEE 25th International Conference on Data Engineering*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 1207–1210.
- [6] A. Agiwal, K. Lai, G. N. B. Manoharan, I. Roy, J. Sankaranarayanan, H. Zhang, T. Zou, M. Chen, Z. Chen, M. Dai *et al.*, "Napa: powering scalable data warehousing with robust query performance at google," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 14, no. 12, pp. 2986–2997, 2021.
- [7] "dbt - transform data in your warehouse," www.getdbt.com.
- [8] "Apache airflow," airflow.apache.org.
- [9] "What is lookml?" <https://cloud.google.com/looker/docs/what-is-lookml>.
- [10] J. Krueger, C. Kim, M. Grund, N. Satish, D. Schwalb, J. Chhugani, H. Plattner, P. Dubey, and A. Zeier, "Fast updates on read-optimized databases using multi-core cpus," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1109.6885*, 2011.
- [11] "Postgresql: The world's most advanced open source relational database," www.postgresql.org.
- [12] A. Thusoo, J. S. Sarma, Z. Shao, P. Chakka, S. Anthony, H. Liu, P. Wyckoff, and R. Murthy, "Hive: a warehousing solution over a map-reduce framework," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 1626–1629, 2009.
- [13] M. Armbrust, R. S. Xin, C. Lian, Y. Huai, D. Liu, J. K. Bradley, X. Meng, T. Kaftan, M. J. Franklin, A. Ghodsi *et al.*, "Spark sql: Relational data processing in spark," in *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM SIGMOD international conference on management of data*, 2015, pp. 1383–1394.
- [14] "Distributed sql query engine for big data," prestodb.io, publisher = (Date accessed: December 15, 2022).
- [15] B. Dageville, T. Cruanes, M. Zukowski, V. Antonov, A. Avanes, J. Bock, J. Claybaugh, D. Engovatov, M. Hentschel, J. Huang *et al.*, "The snowflake elastic data warehouse," in *Proceedings of the 2016 International Conference on Management of Data*, 2016, pp. 215–226.
- [16] "Azure sql database," azure.microsoft.com/en-us/products/azure-sql/database.
- [17] D. Tang, Z. Shang, A. J. Elmore, S. Krishnan, and M. J. Franklin, "Intermittent query processing," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 12, no. 11, pp. 1427–1441, 2019.
- [18] Z. Wang, K. Zeng, B. Huang, W. Chen, X. Cui, B. Wang, J. Liu, L. Fan, D. Qu, Z. Hou *et al.*, "Tempura: a general cost-based optimizer framework for incremental data processing," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 14–27, 2020.
- [19] V. Jalaparti, C. Douglas, M. Ghosh, A. Agrawal, A. Floratou, S. Kandula, I. Menache, J. S. Naor, and S. Rao, "Netco: Cache and i/o management for analytics over disaggregated stores," in *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing*, 2018, pp. 186–198.
- [20] J. Yang, R. Karimi, T. Sæmundsson, A. Wildani, and Y. Vigfusson, "Mithril: mining sporadic associations for cache prefetching," in *Proceedings of the 2017 Symposium on Cloud Computing*, 2017, pp. 66–79.
- [21] T. Griffin and L. Libkin, "Incremental maintenance of views with duplicates," in *Proceedings of the 1995 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*, 1995, pp. 328–339.
- [22] T. Palpanas, R. Sidle, R. Cochrane, and H. Pirahesh, "Incremental maintenance for non-distributive aggregate functions," in *VLDB'02: Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Very Large Databases*. Elsevier, 2002, pp. 802–813.
- [23] N. Folkert, A. Gupta, A. Witkowski, S. Subramanian, S. Bellamkonda, S. Shankar, T. Bozkaya, and L. Sheng, "Optimizing refresh of a set of materialized views," in *VLDB*, 2005, pp. 1043–1054.
- [24] R. Ahmed, R. Bello, A. Witkowski, and P. Kumar, "Automated generation of materialized views in oracle," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 13, no. 12, pp. 3046–3058, 2020.
- [25] Z. Yang, D. Jia, S. Ioannidis, N. Mi, and B. Sheng, "Intermediate data caching optimization for multi-stage and parallel big data frameworks," in *2018 IEEE 11th International Conference on Cloud Computing (CLOUD)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 277–284.
- [26] K. Dursun, C. Binnig, U. Cetintemel, and T. Kraska, "Revisiting reuse in main memory database systems," in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM International Conference on Management of Data*, 2017, pp. 1275–1289.
- [27] P. Michiardi, D. Carra, and S. Migliorini, "In-memory caching for multi-query optimization of data-intensive scalable computing workloads," in *EDBT/ICDT Workshops*, 2019.
- [28] "Lightning-fast dataframe library for rust and python," www.pola.rs, publisher = (Date accessed: December 15, 2022).
- [29] "Networkx topological sort," networkx.org/documentation.
- [30] N. Sheoran, S. Chockchowwat, A. Chheda, S. Wang, R. Verma, and Y. Park, "A step toward deep online aggregation," in *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGMOD international conference on management of data*, 2023.
- [31] S. Chockchowwat, C. Sood, and Y. Park, "Airphant: Cloud-oriented document indexing," in *2022 IEEE 38th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1368–1381.
- [32] S. Chockchowwat, W. Liu, and Y. Park, "Automatically finding optimal index structure," in *AIDB workshop at VLDB*, 2022.
- [33] Y. Park, A. S. Tajik, M. Cafarella, and B. Mozafari, "Database learning: Toward a database that becomes smarter every time," in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM International Conference on Management of Data*, 2017, pp. 587–602.
- [34] "Apache oozie," oozie.apache.org.
- [35] A. Aleyasen, "Overcoming barriers in data warehouse replatforming," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2022.
- [36] A. Aleyasen, M. Morcos, L. Antova, M. Sugiyama, D. Korablev, J. Patvarczki, R. Mutreja, M. Duller, F. M. Waas, and M. Winslett, "Intelligent automated workload analysis for database replatforming," in *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data*, 2022, pp. 2273–2285.
- [37] A. Vogelsgesang, M. Haubenschild, J. Finis, A. Kemper, V. Leis, T. Mühlbauer, T. Neumann, and M. Then, "Get real: How benchmarks fail to represent the real world," in *Proceedings of the Workshop on Testing Database Systems*, 2018, pp. 1–6.
- [38] K. Shvachko, H. Kuang, S. Radia, and R. Chansler, "The hadoop distributed file system," in *2010 IEEE 26th symposium on mass storage systems and technologies (MSST)*. Ieee, 2010, pp. 1–10.
- [39] H. Li, A. Ghodsi, M. Zaharia, S. Shenker, and I. Stoica, "Tachyon: Reliable, memory speed storage for cluster computing frameworks," in *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing*, 2014, pp. 1–15.
- [40] A. Gupta, D. Agarwal, D. Tan, J. Kulesza, R. Pathak, S. Stefani, and V. Srinivasan, "Amazon redshift and the case for simpler data warehouses," in *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM SIGMOD international conference on management of data*, 2015, pp. 1917–1923.
- [41] C. Wu, V. Sreekanti, and J. M. Hellerstein, "Autoscaling tiered cloud storage in anna," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 624–638, 2019.
- [42] F. Li, "Cloud-native database systems at alibaba: Opportunities and challenges," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 12, no. 12, pp. 2263–2272, 2019.
- [43] H. Herodotou and E. Kakoulli, "Trident: task scheduling over tiered storage systems in big data platforms," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 2021.
- [44] M. Armbrust, E. Liang, T. Kraska, A. Fox, M. J. Franklin, and D. A. Patterson, "Generalized scale independence through incremental pre-computation," in *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*, 2013, pp. 625–636.
- [45] A. Shukla, P. Deshpande, J. F. Naughton *et al.*, "Materialized view selection for multidimensional datasets," in *VLDB*, vol. 98, 1998, pp. 488–499.
- [46] S. Agrawal, S. Chaudhuri, and V. R. Narasayya, "Automated selection of materialized views and indexes in sql databases," in *VLDB*, vol. 2000, 2000, pp. 496–505.
- [47] S. Chaudhuri, R. Krishnamurthy, S. Potamianos, and K. Shim, "Optimizing queries with materialized views," in *Proceedings of the Eleventh*

- International Conference on Data Engineering*. IEEE, 1995, pp. 190–200.
- [48] D. Calvanese, G. De Giacomo, M. Lenzerini, and R. Rosati, “View-based query answering in description logics: Semantics and complexity,” *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, vol. 78, no. 1, pp. 26–46, 2012.
- [49] S. Heule, M. Nunkesser, and A. Hall, “Hyperloglog in practice: Algorithmic engineering of a state of the art cardinality estimation algorithm,” in *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Extending Database Technology*, 2013, pp. 683–692.
- [50] P. Flajolet, É. Fusy, O. Gandouet, and F. Meunier, “Hyperloglog: the analysis of a near-optimal cardinality estimation algorithm,” in *Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science*. Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science, 2007, pp. 137–156.
- [51] K. Rong, Y. Lu, P. Bailis, S. Kandula, and P. Levis, “Approximate partition selection for big-data workloads using summary statistics,” *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 13, no. 12, pp. 2606–2619, 2020.
- [52] “Bigquery documentation: Introduction to materialized views,” cloud.google.com/bigquery/docs/materialized-views-intro.
- [53] “Keebo: Data learning & dashboard acceleration,” keebo.ai.
- [54] “Fivetran: Automated, reliable, and secure data pipelines,” www.fivetran.com.
- [55] “Derived tables in looker,” <https://cloud.google.com/looker/docs/what-is-looker>.
- [56] “C++ implementation, apache arrow,” arrow.apache.org/docs/cpp/index.html.
- [57] “arrow - rust,” docs.rs/arrow/latest/arrow.
- [58] “Amazon athena,” aws.amazon.com/athena.
- [59] “Snowflake documentation: Script: Loading and unloading parquet data,” docs.snowflake.com/en/user-guide/script-data-load-transform-parquet.html.
- [60] D. Xin, D. Petersohn, D. Tang, Y. Wu, J. E. Gonzalez, J. M. Hellerstein, A. D. Joseph, and A. G. Parameswaran, “Enhancing the interactivity of dataframe queries by leveraging think time,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.02145*, 2021.
- [61] J. C. Bezdek and R. J. Hathaway, “Some notes on alternating optimization,” in *AFSS international conference on fuzzy systems*. Springer, 2002, pp. 288–300.
- [62] H. Kellerer, U. Pferschy, and D. Pisinger, “Multidimensional knapsack problems,” in *Knapsack problems*. Springer, 2004, pp. 235–283.
- [63] “Route. schedule. plan. assign. pack. solve. or-tools is fast and portable software for combinatorial optimization,” developers.google.com/optimization, publisher = (Date accessed: December 15, 2022).
- [64] H. Seitz, “Contributions to the minimum linear arrangement problem,” Ph.D. dissertation, Universität Heidelberg, 2010.
- [65] M. Charikar, M. T. Hajiaghayi, H. Karloff, and S. Rao, “1 2 2 spreading metrics for vertex ordering problems,” *Algorithmica*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 577–604, 2010.
- [66] S. Baruah, “An ilp representation of a dag scheduling problem,” *Real-Time Systems*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 85–102, 2022.
- [67] L. Marchal, H. Nagy, B. Simon, and F. Vivien, “Parallel scheduling of dags under memory constraints,” in *2018 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 204–213.
- [68] “Network analysis in python,” networkx.org, publisher = (Date accessed: December 15, 2022).
- [69] “Tpc-ds,” www.tpc.org/tpcds, publisher = (Date accessed: December 15, 2022).
- [70] R. Ravi, A. Agrawal, and P. Klein, “Ordering problems approximated: single-processor scheduling and interval graph completion,” in *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*. Springer, 1991, pp. 751–762.
- [71] S. Rao and A. W. Richa, “New approximation techniques for some linear ordering problems,” *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 388–404, 2005.
- [72] H. Arabnejad and J. G. Barbosa, “List scheduling algorithm for heterogeneous systems by an optimistic cost table,” *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 682–694, 2014.
- [73] T. Yu, R. Zhang, K. Yang, M. Yasunaga, D. Wang, Z. Li, J. Ma, I. Li, Q. Yao, S. Roman, Z. Zhang, and D. Radev, “Spider: A large-scale human-labeled dataset for complex and cross-domain semantic parsing and text-to-SQL task,” in *Proc. of EMNLP*, 2018.
- [74] “Presto python connector,” github.com/prestodb/presto-python-client.
- [75] “Presto hive connector,” prestodb.io/docs/current/connector/hive.html.
- [76] “Presto memory connector,” prestodb.io/docs/current/connector/memory.html.
- [77] “Orc table format,” orc.apache.org/.
- [78] “Spark dag scheduler,” spark.apache.org/docs/1.2.1/api/java/org/apache/spark/scheduler/DAGScheduler.html.
- [79] G. Bathie, L. Marchal, Y. Robert, and S. Thibault, “Revisiting dynamic dag scheduling under memory constraints for shared-memory platforms,” in *2020 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium Workshops (IPDPSW)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 597–606.
- [80] E. Zraggen, A. Galakatos, A. Crotty, J.-D. Fekete, and T. Kraska, “How progressive visualizations affect exploratory analysis,” *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics*, vol. 23, no. 8, pp. 1977–1987, 2016.
- [81] P. Eichmann, E. Zraggen, C. Binnig, and T. Kraska, “Idebench: A benchmark for interactive data exploration,” in *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*, 2020, pp. 1555–1569.
- [82] “Jupyter notebook: The classic notebook interface,” jupyter.org.
- [83] “Rstudio is now posit, our mission continues,” posit.co.
- [84] “Colaboratory,” colab.research.google.com.
- [85] F. Nagel, P. Boncz, and S. D. Viglas, “Recycling in pipelined query evaluation,” in *2013 IEEE 29th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 338–349.
- [86] A. Galakatos, A. Crotty, E. Zraggen, C. Binnig, and T. Kraska, “Revisiting reuse for approximate query processing,” *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 10, no. 10, pp. 1142–1153, 2017.
- [87] J. M. Hellerstein, P. J. Haas, and H. J. Wang, “Online aggregation,” in *Proceedings of the 1997 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*, 1997, pp. 171–182.

This figure "fig1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2303.09774v1>