





System challenges Different platforms (OS/Software) Efficient query processing over multiple heterogeneous systems Social challenges Find relevant data Convince people to share their data Heterogeneity of data and schemas A problem that even exists if we use same system




Yes, but still why is this problem really so hard? Lack of information: e.g., the attributes of a database schema have only names and data types, but no machine interpretable information on what type of information is stored in the attribute Undecidable computational problems: e.g., to decide whether a user query can be answered from a set of sources that provide different views on the data requires query containment checks which are undecidable for certain query types




























Understand the problems that arise with querying heterogeneous and autonomous data sources Understand the differences and similarities between the data integration/exchange, data warehouse, and Big Data analytics approaches Be able to build parts of a small data integration pipeline by "glueing" existing systems with new code
















Outline O) Course Info 1) Introduction 2) Data Preparation and Cleaning 3) Schema mappings and Virtual Data Integration 4) Data Exchange 5) Data Warehousing 6) Big Data Analytics 7) Data Provenance






































































































































1.3 Data integration architectures

• Virtual data integration

• Data Exchange


• Peer-to-peer data integration


• Datawarehousing


• Big Data analytics


Query Equivalence
 Complexity for different query classes
 Query Containment
 Complexity for different query classes
 Datalog
 Recursion + Negation
 Integrity Constraints
 Logical encoding of integrity constraints
 Similarity Measures/Metrics


















































```
Example

Relation hop (A,B) storing edges of a graph.

Q<sub>2hop</sub>(x,z): hop(x,y),hop(x,z).

Q<sub>reach</sub>(x,y): hop(x,y).
Q<sub>reach</sub>(x,z): Q<sub>reach</sub>(x,y),Q<sub>reach</sub>(y,z).


Q<sub>node</sub>(x): hop(x,y).
Q<sub>node</sub>(x): hop(y,x).
```


```
Example


Relation hop (A,B) storing edges of a graph.


Qnode(x): hop(x,y).
Qnode(x): hop(y,x).


QnotReach(x,y): Qnode(x), Qnode(y), not Qreach(x,y).
```

























































```
    1.4 Containment Background
    Containment Mapping <-> Containment
    Proof idea (boolean queries)


            (only-if direction)
                 Assume Q<sub>2</sub> contained in Q<sub>1</sub>
                  Consider canonical (frozen) database I<sup>Q2</sup>
                 Evaluating Q<sub>1</sub> over I<sup>Q2</sup> and taking a variable mapping that is produced as a side-effect gives us a containment mapping
```


```
1.4 Containment Mappings


Example


Q_{1}(): R(a,b), R(c,b).
Q_{2}(): R(x,y).
Q_{2} \rightarrow Q_{1}: \Psi(x) = a, \Psi(y) = b
I^{Q1} = \{(a,b), (c,b)\}
Q_{2}(I^{Q1}) = \{()\}
\varphi(x) = a, \varphi(y) = b
\varphi \text{ is our containment mapping } \Psi
```


































































Pirst work focused on functional dependencies (FDs) Extensions of FDs have been proposed to allow rules that cannot be expressed with FDs E.g., conditional FDs only enforce the FD is a condition is met -> finer grained control, e.g., zip -> city only if country is US Constraints that consider master data Master data is highly reliable data such as a government issued zip, city lookup table







































































































































































```
2.3 Entity Resolution – Distance Measures


• Jaccard-Measure


- B_s = Tok(s) = token set of string s


- Jaccard measures relative overlap of tokens in two strings


• Number of common tokens divided by total number of tokens


d_{jacc}(s,s') = \frac{\|B_s \cap B_{s'}\|}{\|B_s \cup B_{s'}\|}
```














































































































































































Describing mappings as inclusion relationships between views:
 Global as View (GAV)
 Local as View (LAV)
 Global and Local as View (GLAV)


 Terminology stems from virtual integration
 Given a global (or mediated, or virtual) schema
 A set of data sources (local schemas)
 Compute answers to queries written against the global schema using the local data sources














































































Clio Algorithm: 2) Generate Candidate Mappings For each pair of logical association A_S in the source and A_T in the target produced in step 1 Find the matches that are covered by A_S and A_T Matches that lead from an element of A_S to an element from A_T - If there is at least one such match then create mapping by equating variables as indicated by the matches and create st-tgd with A_S in LHS and A_T in RHS





















































Algorithms for answering queries using views

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE

- Step 1: we'll bound the space of possible query rewritings we need to consider (no comparisons)
- Step 2: we'll find efficient methods for searching the space of rewritings
 - Bucket Algorithm, MiniCon Algorithm
- Step 2b: we consider "logical approaches" to the problem:
 - The Inverse-Rules Algorithm



Bounding the Rewriting Length ILLINOIS INSTITUTE

Theorem: if there is an equivalent rewriting, there is one with at most *n* subgoals.

 $Q(\overline{X}):-p_1(\overline{X_1}),...,p_n(\overline{X_n})$ Query:

Rewriting: $Q'(\overline{X}):-V_1(\overline{X_1}),...,V_m(\overline{X_m})$

 $Q''(\overline{X}): -g_1^1,...,g_k^1,...,g_1^m,...,g_j^m$ Expansion:

Proof: Only *n* subgoals in Q can contribute to the image of the containment mapping φ



Complexity Result [LMSS, 1995]

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE

- · Applies to queries with no interpreted predicates.
- · Finding an equivalent rewriting of a query using views is NP-complete
 - Need only consider rewritings of query length or
- · Maximally-contained rewriting:
 - Union of all conjunctive rewritings of length n or



The Bucket Algorithm

ILLINOIS INSTITU

Key idea:

- Create a bucket for each subgoal g in the query.
- The bucket contains views that contribute to g.
- Create rewritings from the Cartesian product of the buckets (select one view for each goal)
- Step 1: assign views with renamed vars to buckets
- Step 2: create rewritings, refine them, until equivalent/all contained rewriting(s) are found



The Bucket Algorithm

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE

Step 1:

- We want to construct buckets with views that have partially mapped variables
- For each goal g = R in query
- For each view V
- For each goal v = R in V
 - If the goal has head variables in the same places as g
 - rename the view head variables to match the query goal vars
 - choose a new unique name for each other var
 - add the resulting view atom to the bucket





The Bucket Algorithm


ILLINOIS INSTITUTE


- Step 1 Intuition
 - A view can only be used to provide information about a goal R(X) if it has a goal R(Y)
 - Q(X) :- R(X,Y)
 - V(X) :- S(X,Y)
 - If the query goal contains variables that are in the head of the guery, then the view is only useful if it gives access to these values (they are in the head)
 - Q(X) :- R(X,Y)
 - V(X) :- S(X,Y), R(Y,Z)












Cuts down the number of rewriting that need to be considered, especially if views apply many interpreted predicates. The search space can still be large because the algorithm does not consider the interactions between different subgoals. See next example.



MinCon Algorithm Steps

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE

- 1) Create MiniCon descriptions (MCDs):
 - Homomorphism on view heads
 - Each MCD covers a set of subgoals in the query with a set of subgoals in a view
- 2) Combination step:
 - Any set of MCDs that covers the query subgoals (without overlap) is a rewriting
 - No need for an additional containment check!



MiniCon Descriptions (MCDs)

An atomic fragment of the ultimate containment mappin

OIS INSTITUTE

Q(title, act, dir): -Movie(ID, title, year, genre),

Director(ID,dir),Actor(ID,act)

V(I,D,A): -Director(I,D),Actor(I,A)

MCD: $ID \rightarrow I$ mapping: $dir \rightarrow D$

 $act \rightarrow A$

covered subgoals of Q: {2,3}



MCDs: Detail 1

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE

Q(title, year, dir): -Movie(ID, title, year, genre),

V(I,D,A): - Director(I,D), Actor(I,A)

Director(ID,dir),Actor(ID,dir)

Need to specialize the view first:

V'(I,D,D): - Director(I,D), Actor(I,D)

MCD: $ID \rightarrow I$ mapping:

 $dir \rightarrow D$

covered subgoals of Q: {2,3}



MCDs: Detail 2

LINOIS INSTITUTE

Q(title, year, dir): -Movie(ID, title, year, genre),

Director(ID, dir), Actor(ID, dir)

V(I,D,D): -Director(I,D), Actor(I,D),

Movie(I,T,Y,G)

Note: the third subgoal of the view is *not* included

in the MCD.

MCD: $ID \rightarrow I$


mapping: $dir \rightarrow D$

covered subgoals of Q still: {2,3}



Inverse-Rules Algorithm

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOG



- Produces maximally-contained rewriting in polynomial time
 - To check whether the rewriting is equivalent to the query, you still need a containment check.
- · Conceptually simple and elegant
 - Depending on your comfort with Skolem functions...



Inverse Rules by Example

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOG

Given the following view:

 $V_7(I,T,Y,G)$: - Movie(I,T,Y,G), Director(I,D), Actor(I,D)

And the following tuple in V_7 :

V₇(79,Manhattan,1979,Comedy)

Then we can infer the tuple:

Movie(79, Manhattan, 1979, Comedy)

Hence, the following 'rule' is sound:

 IN_1 : Movie(I,T,Y,G) :- V_7 (I,T,Y,G)



Skolem Functions

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE

 $V_7(I,T,Y,G)$: - Movie(I,T,Y,G), Director(I,D), Actor(I,D)

Now suppose we have the tuple $V_7(79,Manhattan,1979,Comedy)$

Then we can infer that there exists *some* director. Hence, the following rules hold (note that they both use the same Skolem function):

IN₂: $Director(I, f_1(I, T, Y, G)):=V_7(I, T, Y, G)$ IN₃: $Actor(I, f_1(I, T, Y, G)):=V_7(I, T, Y, G)$



Inverse Rules in General Rewriting = Inverse Rules + Query

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE

 $Q_2(title, year, genre) : -Movie(ID, title, year, genre)$

Given Q2, the rewriting would include:

IN₁, IN₂, IN₃, Q₂.

Given input: V₇(79,Manhattan,1979,Comedy) Inverse rules produce:

Movie(79,Manhattan,1979,Comedy)
Director(79, f_1 (79,Manhattan,1979,Comedy))
Actor(79, f_1 (79,Manhattan,1979,Comedy))
Movie(Manhattan,1979,Comedy)
(the last tuple is produced by applying Q_2).



Comparing Algorithms

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE

- · Bucket algorithm:
 - Good if there are many interpreted predicates
 - Requires containment check. Cartesian product can be big
- MiniCon:
 - Good at detecting interactions between subgoals



Algorithm Comparison (Continued)

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE

- Inverse-rules algorithm:
 - Conceptually clean
 - Can be used in other contexts (see later)
 - But may produce inefficient rewritings because it "undoes" the joins in the views (see next slide)
- Experiments show MiniCon is most efficient.
- Even faster:

Konstantinidis, G. and Ambite, J.L., Scalable query rewriting: a graph-based approach. SIGMOD '11



Inverse Rules Inefficiency Example

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE V

Query and view:

 $Q(X,Y):-e_1(X,Z),e_2(Z,Y)$

 $V(A,B): -e_1(A,C), e_2(C,B)$

Inverse rules:

 $e_1(A, f_1(A, B)) : -V(A, B)$

 $e_2(f_1(A,B),B):-V(A,B)$

Now we need to re-compute the join...





View-Based Query Answering


LINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOG


- Maximally-contained rewritings are parameterized by query language.
- More general question:
 - Given a set of view definitions, view instances and a query, what are all the answers we can find?
- We introduce certain answers as a mechanism for providing a formal answer.





























































































































































6. Multidimensional Datamodel ILLINOIS INSTITUTE

- · Analysis queries are typically aggregating lower level facts about a business
 - The revenue of Walmart in each state (country,
 - The amount of toy products in a warehouse of a company per week
 - The call volume per zip code for the Sprint network



6. Multidimensional Datamodel ILLINOIS INSTITUTE

- · Commonality among these queries:
 - At the core are facts: a sale in a Walmart store, a toy stored in a warehouse, a call made by a certain phone
 - Data is aggregated across one or more dimensions
 - These dimensions are typically organized hierarchically. year - month - day - hour, country - state - zip
- - The revenue (sum of sale amounts) of Walmart in each state



6. Example 2D puppet Fishing rod Moby Dick Mobile devel. King Lear

6. Generalization to multiple

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE

- Given a fixed number of dimensions
 - E.g., product type, location, time
- Given some measure
 - E.g., number of sales, items in stock, ...
- In the multidimensional datamodel we store facts: the values of measures for a combination of values for the dimensions

6. Data cubes


- Given **n** dimensions
 - E.g., product type, location, time
- Given m measures
 - E.g., number of sales, items in stock, ...
- A datacube (datahypercube) is an **n**dimensional datastructure that maps values in the dimensions to values for the m measures
 - Schema: $D_1, ..., D_n, M_1, ..., M_m$
 - Instance: a function


 $dom(D_1) \times ... \times dom(D_n) \rightarrow dom(M_1) \times ... \times dom(M_m)$


6. Dimensions


- Purpose
 - Selection of descriptive data
 - Grouping with desired level of granularity
- A dimension is define through a containmenthierarchy
- Hierarchies typically have several levels
- The root level represents the whole dimensions
- We may associate additional descriptive information with a elements in the hierarchy (e.g., number of residents in a city)









































































































































```
6. GROUPING SETS

Combining GROUPING SETS

GROUP BY A, B

GROUP BY GROUPING SETS ((A,B))

GROUP BY GROUPING SETS ((A,B), (A,C), (A))

GROUP BY A, GROUPING SETS ((B), (C), ())

GROUP BY GROUPING SETS ((A,B), (B,C), (B,C), (B,C), (B,C), (B,C), (B,C), (B,C,D)

GROUP BY GROUPING SETS ((A,B), (B,C), (B,C,D))

GROUP BY GROUPING SETS ((A,B), (B,C,D))

(A,B,D,E), (A,B,D), (B,C,D,E), (B,C,D)

)
```


```
6. CUBE


• GROUP BY CUBE (set)


• Group by all 2<sup>n</sup> subsets of set


GROUP BY CUBE (A,B,C)


= GROUP BY GROUPING SETS (
(),
(A), (B), (C),
(A,B), (A,C), (B,C),
(A,B,C)
)
```



































































































3. Big Data Overview ILLINOIS INSTITUTE • 3) New approach towards integration - Large clusters enable directly running queries over semi-structured data (within feasible time) · Take a click-stream log and run a query - One of the reasons why pay-as-you-go is now feasible

- Previously: designing a database schema upfront and designing a process (e.g., ETL) for cleaning and
- transforming data to match this schema, then query · Now: start analysis directly, clean and transform data if

needed for the analysis

3. Big Data Overview

ILLINOIS INSTITUTI

- 3) New approach towards integration
 - Advantage of pay-as-you-go
 - More timely data (direct access)
 - · More applicable if characteristics of data change dramatically (e.g., yesterdays ETL process no longer applicable)
 - Disadvantages of pay-as-you-go
 - · Potentially repeated efforts (everybody cleans the clicklog before running the analysis)
 - · Lack of meta-data may make it hard to
 - Determine what data to use for analysis
 - Hard to understand semantics of data



3. Big Data Overview

ILLINOIS INSTITUTI

Scalable systems

- Performance of the system scales in the number of
 - Ideally the per node performance is constant independent of how many nodes there are in the system
 - · This means: having twice the number of nodes would give us twice the performance
- Why scaling is important?
 - · If a system scales well we can "throw" more resources at it to improve performance and this is cost effective

3. Big Data Overview

ILLINOIS INSTITU

What impacts scaling?

- Basically how parallelizable is my algorithm
 - Positive example: problem can be divided into subproblems that can be solved independently without requiring communication
 - E.g., array of 1-billion integers [i₁, ..., i_{1,000,000,000}] add 3 to each integer. Compute on n nodes, split input into n equally sized chunks and let each node process one chunk
 - · Negative example: problem where subproblems are strongly intercorrelated
 - E.g., Context Free Grammar Membership: given a string and a context free grammar, does the string belong to the language defined by the grammar.

3. Big Data – Processing at Scale ILLINOIS INSTITUTE



- DBMS
 - running on 1 or 10's of machines
 - running on 1000's of machines
- · Each machine has low probability of failure
 - If you have many machines, failures are the norm
 - Need mechanisms for the system to cope with failures


 - · Do not use progress of computation when node fails
 - This is called fault-tolerance





3. Big Data – Processing at Scale ILLINOIS INSTITUTE


- New problems at scale
 - DBMS
 - running on 1 or 10's of machines
 - · running on 1000's of machines
- · Each machine has limited storage and computational capabilities
 - Need to evenly distribute data and computation across nodes
 - Often most overloaded node determine processing speed
 - This is called load-balancing








































3. Frameworks for Distributed Computations • Problems - Not all algorithms do parallelize well - How to simplify distributed programming? • Solution - Fix a reasonable powerful, but simple enough model of computation for which scalable algorithms are known - Implement distributed execution engine for this model and make it fault tolerant and load-balanced












































Certain reduce functions lend themselves to pre-aggregation
 E.g., SUM(revenue) group by state
 Can compute partial sums over incomplete groups and then sum up the pre-aggregated results
 This can be done at the mappers to reduce amount of data send to the reducers
 Supported in Hadoop through a user provided combiner function
 The combiner function is applied before writing the mapper results to local disk


Certain reduce functions lend themselves to pre-aggregation
 E.g., SUM(revenue) group by state
 Can compute partial sums over incomplete groups and then sum up the pre-aggregated results
 This can be done at the mappers to reduce amount of data send to the reducers
 Supported in Hadoop through a user provided combiner function
 The combiner function is applied before writing the mapper results to local disk


























• MR uses heavy materialization to achieve fault tolerance

- A lot of I/O

• Spark

- Works in main memory (where possible)

- Inputs and final outputs stored in HDFS

- Recomputes partial results instead of materializing them - resilient distributed datasets (RDD)

• Lineage: Need to know from which chunk a chunk was derived from and by which computation

