





## <section-header><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item>





## **Bus delay analysis**

- From stored bus location data, analyze the traffic fluency
  - From all the observations with delay>5min, use frequent itemset mining to find the lines, locations and times of most regular delays
- Compare a large set of delayed journeys to not delayed journeys to find out the bottlenecks along the bus routes
  - Take the best and worst quartiles and compare to find out the bottlenecks









## "Prisma" junction, left turn, bus line No 3



\*) Computed from a sample of 5744 observations on 76 working days / winter 2014-2015, with 15 minute time resolution



 $80\ \%$  of the traveling times fit between the blue and black lines.

Half of the traveling times are below and half above the red line.

















## MapReduce principles

- Map processes are completely independent of each other, once they are started.
- Map results are combined in the Reduce step.
- After that you can do subsequent MapReduce rounds.
- In the previous example, this was done because of different data sets
  - First MapReduce yesterday's data.
  - Then merge it with the 59 days before yesterday, but on another granularity level.
- Let's check a couple of more cases...









## **Graph Algorithms**

- Many graph algorithms are "walking" around the graph in such a way that we cannot split the graph into suitable slices for MapReduce.
- This means that we are even worse of than in Frequent Sequence Mining – it seems incredibly complicated to write algorithms that operate on "slices" of a graph.





## Stanford maintains an interesting Large Network Dataset Collection

From Facebook, Wikipedia, Amazon reviews, etc. Distribution of graph sizes in the library according to the article

Size (no of edges)	No of graphs
< 0.1 M	18
0.1M – 1M	24
1M – 10M	17
10M – 100M	7
100M – 1B	4 UNIVERSITY
>1B	1 OF TAMPERE



















JN1 Maybe mention that databases tend to go in for uniform structure, rather than ad hoc structures of programming applications Jyrki Nummenmaa; 17.5.2017

## Big Data databases are needed... ...because our data is distributed in servers in different locations! No. Distributed databases are nothing new. They were available ages ago and you can read about them in old database textbooks etc. ...because there is so much data these days that we need to store! No. There are traditional database products developed into Big Data scale and you can put your petabytes of data there.

UNIVERSITY OF TAMPERE







## **Distributed databases**

- More data can be managed and it can be placed in computers in different places.
- This provides performance, but with the cost of increased coordination between the database instances on different computers.
- In particular, the updates need to be coordinated to ensure that they are managed consistently across the distributed database.
- There will be a lot about distributed updates in the next lecture.
- But not so much of distributed commit protocols.





JN9 There are no advantages in terms of quantity of data. If an organization has a distributed database, it will be because it was forced to acceppt the solution. E.g., two companies with different database technologies merged.

Jyrki Nummenmaa; 17.5.2017

JN10 I doubt whether there are any performance benefits. An organization tolerates a distriuted database because integrating the databases would be a nightmare. Jyrki Nummenmaa; 17.5.2017





# <section-header><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><table-container>







## Physical arrangements

- BigTable is Google's Big Data database model.
- Rows maintained in sorted by primary key order
  - Applications can use this property for efficient row scans
- Columns grouped into column families
  - Column key = family:qualifier
  - Column families provide locality hints
  - Unbounded number of columns









UNIVERSITY



- Transactions can write new data
- Transaction can read the "right" data based on its own timestamp and timestamps of the data versions.
- A value is identified by tuple (Table,RowKey,ColFamily,Column,Timestamp)
- By default 3 versions are kept, but this can be configured.

























Exam	ple						
<ul> <li>Example 1. Let (D,M) be a summarization schema in which D =&lt; D<sub>1</sub>, D<sub>2</sub>&gt; and M = {M<sub>1</sub>}. We let D<sub>1</sub> = {A<sup>1</sup>, A<sup>1</sup><sub>2</sub>} and D<sub>2</sub> = {A<sup>1</sup>, A<sup>2</sup>, A<sup>2</sup>, A<sup>2</sup>, A<sup>2</sup>, }. Let r = {t<sub>1</sub>, t<sub>2</sub>, , t<sub>3</sub>} be the following (flat) relation over the summarization schema (D, M).</li> </ul>							
	• A1.1	• A1.2	• A2.1	• A2.2	• A2.3	• M	
• t1	b1	c1	d1	e1	f1	10001	
• t2	b1	c2	d1	e1	f1	10020	
• t3	b2	с3	d1	e1	f2	10300	
• t4	b2	с3	d2	e1	f3	14000	
					UNIVE of tai	RSITY MPERE	







Simple summarization				
SELECT DaysToManufa	acture,			
AVG(StandardCost) AS AverageCost				
FROM Production.Product				
GROUP BY DaysToManufacture;				
DaysToManufacture	AverageCost			
0	5.0885			
1	223.88			
2	359.1082			
4	949.4105			
	UNIVERSITY OF TAMPERE			









### Cube vs. No cube

- CUBE:
- Acceptable performance with small number of dimensions
- Good for complex "navigational" style dimensional queries.
- Pre-aggregation may be needed for performance.
- Examples: Cognos Powerplay, Oracle OLAP Option, Microsoft Analysis Services, Essbase
- NO CUBE:
- Can cope with a large number of dimensions.
- Only suited to relatively simple aggregation expressions.
- Advantageous for unpredictable ad hoc queries.
- Examples: SAP Business Objects, Oracle BI Suite, Microsoft Analysis Services.



















Given a summary state, s = (r, L), and a slicer vector, we can find the collection of tuples() sets which contain the measure values needed by the summary function in order to compute the value for the cell identified by the slicer vector.

Example 7. In our running example, the rollup vector, < 1, 2 >, and the slicer vector, < b1, e1 >, give tuples(1, 1, b1) =  $\{t_1, t_2\}$  and tuples(2, 2, e1) =  $\{t_1, t_2, t_3\}$ .









### **Using Theorem 1**

Thus, given a denormalised [10] table (which contains both the fact data and the dimension data), a rollup vector and a slicer vector, we can use Theorem 1 to compute a summarised value anywhere in the summarization structure directly, without having to create the entire cube.











Performance vs. database size			
Ross & Reports time			
500,000 1674			
600,000 1641			
700,000 2032			
#00,000 1994			
900,000 2137			
	UNIVERSITY OF TAMPERE		

## **Disjointness of summary sets**

Lemma 1. Disjointness of summary rowsets. Let s = (r,L) be a summary state, L =<  $L_1, L_2, ..., L_n >$ , let x and x' be different slicer vectors for s and let T and T' be the corresponding summary rowsets for x and x'. Now,  $T^{\cap}T' = \emptyset$ .

A particular consequence of Lemma 1 is that the calculation of a summary value for different cells does not involve redundant computation.





## Unique slicer vectors for tuples

Lemma. Let  $s=(r,< L_1,L_2,...,L_n>)$  be a summarization instance. For each row,  $t\in r,t$  is in the tuple set of exactly one slicer vector, and that slicer vector can be formed from the values in t.

For any tuple in the relation, there is a unique slicer vector and for any slicer vec- tor there is a unique summary cell. Consequently, a summarization instance defines a settheoretic partition on the set of tuples in the denormalised relation. Given a sum- marization instance, Algorithm 1 computes exactly the non-empty elements of that partition.





## Complexity of computing the tuple sets

Theorem. The tuple sets associated with all non-NULL summary cells in a summarization instance can be computed in time O(nw), where n is the number of dimensions and w is the number of tuples in the denormalised relation.

The proof is based on an algorithm iterating through the tuples of the denormalised relation and for each tuple, constructing an n-place vector. For each such vector, it must check by using a hash function whether or not it has already generated an identical vector for an earlier tuple. There can be no more than w such vectors.





## Complexity of computing the tuple sets

Theorem. The tuple sets associated with all non-NULL summary cells in a summarization instance can be computed in time O(nw), where n is the number of dimensions and w is the number of tuples in the denormalised relation.

The proof is based on an algorithm iterating through the tuples of the denormalised relation and for each tuple, constructing an n-place vector. For each such vector, it must check by using a hash function whether or not it has already generated an identical vector for an earlier tuple. There can be no more than w such vectors.





