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Why is anti-caching necessary?
MySQL + memcached

With an IMDB, fetching could simply be

```
function get_foo(int userid) {
    data = db_select("SELECT * FROM users WHERE userid = ?", userid);
    return data;
}
```

But now has to be

```
function get_foo(int userid) {
    /* first try the cache */
    data = memcached_fetch("userrow:" + userid);
    if (!data) {
        /* not found : request database */
        data = db_select("SELECT * FROM users WHERE userid = ?", userid);
        /* then store in cache until next get */
        memcached_add("userrow:" + userid, data);
    }
    return data;
}
```

MySQL + memcached

With an IMDB, updating could simply be

```php
function update_foo( string dbUpdateString) {
    result = db_execute(dbUpdateString);
}
```

But now has to be be

```php
function update_foo(int userid, string dbUpdateString) {
    /* first update database */
    result = db_execute(dbUpdateString);
    if (result) {
        /* database update successful : fetch data to be stored in cache */
        data = db_select("SELECT * FROM users WHERE userid = ?", userid);
        /* the previous line could also look like data = createDataFromDBString(dbUpdateString); */
        /* then store in cache until next get */
        memcached_set("userrow:" + userid, data);
    }
}
```

This shouldn’t be a job for the developer.
Mission:

Keep **hot** data in main memory

Store **cold** data on disk

Eliminate manual labor
The answer:
An IMDB with anti-caching
High-level architectural differences

(a) Disk-oriented DBMS
(b) Disk-oriented DBMS with a Distributed Cache
(c) Main Memory DBMS with Anti-Caching
Anti-caching system model

• Extends H-store, an IMDB
• Uses an LRU scheme to evict cold data from Main Memory
• Transactions involving tuples stored on disk are stalled and restarted after involved data is copied back to MM
Anti-caching storage model

3 components:
Anti-caching storage model

- Block table resides on disk and contains evicted tuple data
- Evicted table resides in memory and maps evicted tuples to Block table
Anti-caching storage model

- Doubly-Linked List data structure in tuple header
- To avoid CPU overhead, only a certain fraction ($\alpha$) of transactions are used to update the LRU chain
- Data tables are marked as evictable/non-evictable
How is data evicted?

1. Evict Least Recently Used tuple
2. Write to temporary Block table
3. Has enough memory been freed up?
   - No!
   - Yes!
   - Write temporary Block table to disk
How is data retrieved?

1. Remove from Evicted Table and update references
2. Retrieve affected blocks from disk
3. Merge data back to MM tables
4. Store in temporary buffer
How is data retrieved?

2 ways of doing this:

Load **entire** Block back
- or -

Only load back **affected tuples** from Block
Finally, the over-all transaction execution diagram.
So how well does it work?
Datasets

• **Yahoo! Cloud Serving Benchmark (YCSB)**
  – Simulates data from large-scale services created by Internet-based companies
  – 20 GB single table, 7 columns of random string data for each tuple

• **TPC-C**
  – Current industry standard for evaluating OLTP systems
  – 10GB containing 100 warehouses and 100,000 items
System Configurations

• **MySQL**
  – The world’s most popular disk-based DBMS

• **MySQL + memcached**
  – Popular tool to speed up MySQL’s performance by storing hot data in MM

• **H-Store with Anti-caching**
  – No further introduction necessary
aLRU represents a low LRU transaction sample rate (alpha = 0.01)

Higher values of workload skew means that older items are accessed much less frequently than newer items

(a) $\frac{\text{data\_size}}{\text{mem\_size}} = 1$, read-only
Look what happens, when we have twice as much data as we have memory.

\[ \frac{\text{data\_size}}{\text{mem\_size}} = 2, \text{ read-only} \]
\[
\frac{\text{data}_\text{size}}{\text{mem}_\text{size}} = 8, \text{ write-heavy}
\]
TPC-C experiments

![Graph showing TPC-C experiments]

- **anti-cache (LRU)**
- **anti-cache (aLRU)**
- **MySQL**
- **MySQL + Memcached**

The graph compares the performance of different cache mechanisms and database solutions in terms of transactions per second across varying data sizes.
Figure 8: Merge Strategy Analysis – YCSB read-only, 2× memory, 1MB evict blocks.
Conclusion

• Anti-caching offers an excellent and clean solution to one of the shortcomings of IMDBs

• From the benchmark experiments conducted, H-Store with Anti-caching performs significantly better than MySQL (8x-17x performance advantage)

• This is true - even with memcached enabled (2x-9x performance advantage)