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NoSQL databases

- Principle category of Big Data Storage
- Overcome the scalability issues of SQL DBs
- Almost Cloud-friend systems
- Different architectures and data-models

MongoDB

- A document-based NoSQL database (JSON documents)
- It uses *sharding* for distributing data
- Different tools for easy-deployment and migration (Ex. mongorestore, mongodump)
- Simple to use and fit well with various kinds of apps.
NoSQL flexibility: store data; think how to use after!

No schema ⇒ not only one way to query the data

frequent need to create indexes on demand, on large-scale data!
Context

Querying data

- NoSQL flexibility: store data; think how to use after!
- No schema $\Rightarrow$ not only one way to query the data

frequent need to create indexes on demand, on large-scale data!

Problem statement

- MongoDB takes unjustified amount of time for making indexes on a pre-existed data

this problem could affect other NoSQL databases!
Benchmarking?

⇒ Tools such as *Yahoo! Cloud Serving Benchmarks (YCSB)* could:
  - report high level metrics (Ex. throughput, latency, …) ✓
  - reduce the effort for comparing different systems ✓

But
  - could not reflect the complexity of production-like data 😞
  - are not suitable for explaining performance issues 😞

Research objectives

- Identifying the performance issue(s) of MongoDB while indexing data
- Introducing new experimental tools for explaining the causes of performance issue(s)
## Datasets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset type</th>
<th>(min, avrg, max) in Kb</th>
<th>N. of data units</th>
<th>Size (Gb)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$SDU_1$</td>
<td>(1, 3, 6)</td>
<td>20,000,000 docs</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Every doc $x$ (int, date, 2 $x$ string[min, max], array[1..4] $x$ string[min, max])

### MongoDB’s storage engine: Wiredtiger

- The default storage engine for persistent data.
- `_id`s for holding the collection’s records
- collection is a separate file
- Btree data structure on disks
- Contiguous allocation on disk, but unspanned
- Default page size is 4 KB

**Figure** – a) Spanned & b) Unspanned allocation
Experiments

Experimental setup

- Experiments are performed on Grid’5000 testbed
  - Machines x 2 CPUs Intel Xeon E5-2630 v3, 8 cores/CPU, 128GB RAM, 2x558GB HDD, 10Gbps ethernet
- Ubuntu 14.04, Linux 4.9.13, MongoDB v3.4
- wiredTiger cache = 2Gb, replicas are disabled, sharding key is \_id
- Considering only hash sharding in this talk ⇒ load balancing

![Figure -- Experimental scenarios](image-url)
Experiments: Performance results with $SDU_1$
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⇒ Indexing is a 100% read workload
⇒ I/O bounded operations
⇒ Data distribution issue
⇒ Benchmarking is not sufficient to look beyond!
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- **Indexing is a 100% read workload**
- **I/O bounded operations**
- **Data distribution issue**
- **Benchmarking is not sufficient to look beyond!**
Experiments: Performance results with $SDU_1$

- **Standalone MongoDB**
  - Execution time (secs)
  - Throughput (MBps)
  - Utilization (%)

- **Distributed MongoDB**
  - Execution time (secs)
  - Throughput (MBps)
  - Utilization (%)

- **Shard1**: (51% of data)
  - Shard2: (49% of data)

- **Doubling the time!**
  - 0 gain!

⇒ Indexing is a 100% read workload
⇒ I/O bounded operations
⇒ Data distribution issue
⇒ Benchmarking is not sufficient to look beyond!

⇒ How to get the main reason behind these results?
Dynamic tracing with eBPF

**extended Berkeley Packet Filter (eBPF)**

- Connect to all Linux data sources: (Kprobes, Uprobes, tracepoints, …)
- Almost no overhead (4 ns per syscall) [A. Starovoitov]
- In-kernel verifier, JIT-compilation, mapping (kernel-userspace exchange)
- Processing, tracing, filtering inside Linux kernel.
- Suitable to work with system in-production & real data.

**BPF compiler collection (BCC)**

- Like-standard frontend project for eBPF tools
- No more byte code! ⇒ write your BPF code in restricted C
- Write your frontend code using Python or Lua
- Towards script-driven tracing
Dynamic tracing with eBPF, our tool

An eBPF tool is built to evaluate the I/O patterns

- I/O access are no longer considered as black boxes!
- A generic tool, works on VFS layer
- It traces all I/O read requests
- It reports all files offsets, req. latencies & data size
- Could filter the results by file

Tracing impact on our experiments

- Overhead cost is lower than 0.8% of execution time in all Experiments. 😊
- Basically, it depends on the number issued I/O requests.
Experiments: eBPF results with $SDU_1$

I/O access pattern and latency on standalone config.
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I/O access pattern and latency on standalone config.

⇒ Acceptable access pattern on standalone
⇒ Almost random access on shards!
⇒ Data distribution is poorly done

First shard results in two-shards config (50.9% of data)

Second shard results in two-shards config (49.1% of data)
Experiments

The exact issue

- Mismatch between the scanning table vs data stored on disk

Collection _ids:
used by MongoDB process and WiredTiger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_id 1</th>
<th>_id 2</th>
<th>_id 3</th>
<th>_id 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_id 7</td>
<td>_id 8</td>
<td>_id 10</td>
<td>_id 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_id 19</td>
<td>_id 20</td>
<td>_id 27</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collection file on disk:
allocated regarding the key sharding (hashed _id)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_id 1</th>
<th>_id 3</th>
<th>_id 7</th>
<th>_id 5</th>
<th>_id 8</th>
<th>_id 10</th>
<th>_id 2</th>
<th>_id 19</th>
<th>_id 11</th>
<th>_id 20</th>
<th>_id 30</th>
<th>_id 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rec 1</td>
<td>rec 2</td>
<td>rec 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure – MongoDB scanning table Vs records order on the disk
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The exact issue

- Mismatch between the scanning table vs data stored on disk

Collection _ids:
used by MongoDB process and WiredTiger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_id 1</th>
<th>_id 2</th>
<th>_id 3</th>
<th>_id 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_id 7</td>
<td>_id 8</td>
<td>_id 10</td>
<td>_id 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_id 19</td>
<td>_id 20</td>
<td>_id 27</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Get this doc

Collection file on disk:
allocated regarding the key sharding (hashed _id)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_id 1</th>
<th>_id 3</th>
<th>_id 7</th>
<th>_id 5</th>
<th>_id 8</th>
<th>_id 10</th>
<th>_id 2</th>
<th>_id 19</th>
<th>_id 11</th>
<th>_id 20</th>
<th>_id 30</th>
<th>_id 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rec 1</td>
<td>rec 2</td>
<td>rec 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rec(n-1)</td>
<td>rec (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Experiments

The exact issue

1. Mismatch between the scanning table vs data stored on disk

Collection _ids:
used by MongoDB process and WiredTiger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_id 1</th>
<th>_id 2</th>
<th>_id 3</th>
<th>_id 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_id 7</td>
<td>_id 8</td>
<td>_id 10</td>
<td>_id 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_id 19</td>
<td>_id 20</td>
<td>_id 27</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Get this doc
2) Which doc is next?

Collection file on disk:
allocated regarding the key sharding (hashed _id)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_id 1</th>
<th>_id 3</th>
<th>_id 7</th>
<th>_id 5</th>
<th>id 8</th>
<th>_id 10</th>
<th>_id 2</th>
<th>_id 19</th>
<th>_id 11</th>
<th>_id 20</th>
<th>_id 30</th>
<th>_id 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rec 1</td>
<td>rec 2</td>
<td>rec 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The exact issue

- Mismatch between the scanning table vs data stored on disk

Collection _ids:
used by MongoDB process and WiredTiger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_id 1</th>
<th>_id 2</th>
<th>_id 3</th>
<th>_id 5</th>
</tr>
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<td>_id 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_id 19</td>
<td>_id 20</td>
<td>_id 27</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Get this doc
2) Which doc is next?
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</tr>
</tbody>
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The exact issue

- Mismatch between the scanning table vs data stored on disk

Collection _ids:
used by MongoDB process and WiredTiger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_id 1</th>
<th>_id 2</th>
<th>_id 3</th>
<th>_id 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_id 7</td>
<td>_id 8</td>
<td>_id 10</td>
<td>_id 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_id 19</td>
<td>_id 20</td>
<td>_id 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collection file on disk:
allocated regarding the key sharding (hashed _id)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_id 1</th>
<th>_id 3</th>
<th>_id 7</th>
<th>_id 5</th>
<th>_id 8</th>
<th>_id 10</th>
<th>_id 2</th>
<th>_id 19</th>
<th>_id 11</th>
<th>_id 20</th>
<th>_id 30</th>
<th>_id 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rec 1</td>
<td>rec 2</td>
<td>rec 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rec(n-1)</td>
<td>rec (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure – MongoDB scanning table Vs records order on the disk
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The exact issue

- Mismatch between the scanning table vs data stored on disk

Collection _id: used by MongoDB process and WiredTiger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_id 1</th>
<th>_id 2</th>
<th>_id 3</th>
<th>_id 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_id 7</td>
<td>_id 8</td>
<td>_id 10</td>
<td>_id 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_id 19</td>
<td>_id 20</td>
<td>_id 27</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Get this doc
2) Which doc is next?

Collection file on disk: allocated regarding the key sharding (hashed _id)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_id 1</th>
<th>_id 3</th>
<th>_id 7</th>
<th>_id 5</th>
<th>_id 8</th>
<th>_id 10</th>
<th>_id 2</th>
<th>_id 19</th>
<th>_id 11</th>
<th>_id 20</th>
<th>_id 30</th>
<th>_id 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rec 1</td>
<td>rec 2</td>
<td>rec 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_id 2</td>
<td>_id 19</td>
<td>_id 11</td>
<td>_id 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>_id 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure** – MongoDB scanning table Vs records order on the disk
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The exact issue

- **Mismatch between the scanning table vs data stored on disk**
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Collection `_ids`:
used by MongoDB process and WiredTiger

```
_id 1
_id 2
_id 3
_id 5
_id 7
_id 8
_id 10
_id 11
_id 19
_id 20
_id 27
...
```

1) Get this doc

Collection file on disk:
allocated regarding the key sharding (hashed `_id`)

```
_id 1
_id 3
_id 7
_id 5
_id 8
_id 10
_id 2
_id 19
_id 11
_id 20
_id 30
_id 27
```
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The exact issue

- Mismatch between the scanning table vs data stored on disk

Collection `_ids`:
used by MongoDB process and WiredTiger

<table>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_id 7</td>
<td>_id 8</td>
<td>_id 10</td>
<td>_id 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_id 19</td>
<td>_id 20</td>
<td>_id 27</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2) Which doc is next?

Collection file on disk:
allocated regarding the key sharding (hashed _id)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_id 1</th>
<th>_id 3</th>
<th>_id 7</th>
<th>_id 5</th>
<th>_id 8</th>
<th>_id 10</th>
<th>_id 2</th>
<th>_id 19</th>
<th>_id 11</th>
<th>_id 20</th>
<th>_id 30</th>
<th>_id 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rec 1</td>
<td>rec 2</td>
<td>rec 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rec(n-1)</td>
<td>rec (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure** – MongoDB scanning table Vs records order on the disk
Experiments

The exact issue

- Mismatch between the scanning table vs data stored on disk

Collection _ids:
used by MongoDB process and WiredTiger

```
_id 1  _id 2  _id 3  _id 5  
_id 7  _id 8  _id 10 _id 11 
_id 19 _id 20 _id 27  ...
```

1) Get this doc

Collection file on disk:
allocated regarding the key sharding (hashed _id)

```
_id 1  _id 3  _id 7  _id 5  _id 8  _id 10 _id 2  _id 19 _id 11 _id 20 _id 30 _id 27  
rec 1  rec 2  rec 3  rec 5  rec 8  rec 10 rec 2  rec 19 rec 11 rec 20 rec 30 rec 27  
```
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The exact issue

- Mismatch between the scanning table vs data stored on disk

Collection _ids:
used by MongoDB process and WiredTiger

```
_id 1 | _id 2 | _id 3 | _id 5
_id 7 | _id 8 | _id 10 | _id 11
_id 19 | _id 20 | _id 27 | ...
```

1) Get this doc

Collection file on disk:
allocated regarding the key sharding (hashed _id)

```
_id 1 | _id 3 | _id 7 | _id 5 | _id 8 | _id 10 | _id 2 | _id 19 | _id 11 | _id 20 | _id 30 | _id 27
rec 1 | rec 2 | rec 3 | rec 10 | rec 11 | rec 12 | rec 19 | rec 20 | rec 30 | rec (n-1) | rec (n)
```

**Figure** – MongoDB scanning table Vs records order on the disk
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The exact issue

- Mismatch between the scanning table vs data stored on disk

Collection _ids:
used by MongoDB process and WiredTiger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_id 1</th>
<th>_id 2</th>
<th>_id 3</th>
<th>_id 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_id 7</td>
<td>_id 8</td>
<td>_id 10</td>
<td>_id 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_id 19</td>
<td>_id 20</td>
<td>_id 27</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Get this doc
2) Which doc is next?

Collection file on disk:
allocated regarding the key sharding (hashed _id)

<table>
<thead>
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<th>id 11</th>
<th>_id 20</th>
<th>_id 30</th>
<th>_id 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rec 1</td>
<td>rec 2</td>
<td>rec 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The exact issue

- Mismatch between the scanning table vs data stored on disk

![Diagram showing the difference between the scanning table and records order on disk]

Collection `_ids`: used by MongoDB process and WiredTiger

1) Get this doc

Collection file on disk: allocated regarding the key sharding (hashed `_id`)

**Figure** – MongoDB scanning table Vs records order on the disk
Experiments

The exact issue

- Mismatch between the scanning table vs data stored on disk

Collection _ids:
used by MongoDB process and WiredTiger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_id 1</th>
<th>_id 2</th>
<th>_id 3</th>
<th>_id 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_id 7</td>
<td>_id 8</td>
<td>_id 10</td>
<td>_id 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_id 19</td>
<td>_id 20</td>
<td>_id 27</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Get this doc
2) Which doc is next?

Collection file on disk:
allocated regarding the key sharding (hashed _id)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_id 1</th>
<th>_id 3</th>
<th>_id 7</th>
<th>_id 5</th>
<th>_id 8</th>
<th>_id 10</th>
<th>_id 2</th>
<th>_id 19</th>
<th>_id 11</th>
<th>_id 20</th>
<th>_id 30</th>
<th>_id 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rec 1</td>
<td>rec 2</td>
<td>rec 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rec(n-1)</td>
<td>rec(n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure** – MongoDB scanning table Vs records order on the disk
Experiments

The exact issue

- Mismatch between the scanning table vs data stored on disk

Collection _ids:
used by MongoDB process and WiredTiger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_id 1</th>
<th>_id 2</th>
<th>_id 3</th>
<th>_id 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_id 7</td>
<td>_id 8</td>
<td>_id 10</td>
<td>_id 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_id 19</td>
<td>_id 20</td>
<td>_id 27</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Get this doc

Collection file on disk:
allocated regarding the key sharding (hashed _id)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_id 1</th>
<th>_id 3</th>
<th>_id 7</th>
<th>_id 5</th>
<th>id 8</th>
<th>id 10</th>
<th>_id 2</th>
<th>_id 19</th>
<th>id 11</th>
<th>_id 20</th>
<th>_id 30</th>
<th>_id 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rec 1</td>
<td>rec 2</td>
<td>rec 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rec (n-1)</td>
<td>rec (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure** – MongoDB scanning table Vs records order on the disk
Experiments

The exact issue

- Mismatch between the scanning table vs data stored on disk
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Questions are welcome!