ABSTRACT
NoSQL databases like key-value stores achieve fast write throughput and fast lookups on the primary key. However, many applications also require queries on non-primary attributes. For that, several NoSQL databases have added support for secondary indexes. To our best knowledge, little work has studied how to support secondary indexing on pure key-value stores, which are a fundamental and popular category within the NoSQL databases range.

We propose a novel lightweight secondary indexing technique on log-structure merge-tree (LSM tree)-based key-value stores, which we refer as “embedded index”. The embedded index, which utilizes Bloom filters, is very space-efficient, and achieves very high write-throughput rates, comparable to non-indexed key-value stores. It is embedded inside the data files, that is, no separate index table is maintained. To our best knowledge, this is the first work to use Bloom filters for secondary indexing. The embedded index also simplifies the transaction management, compared to alternative stand-alone secondary indexing schemes. For the cases when range query on secondary attributes in embedded index is required, we also propose to apply a modified version of interval tree to keep track of the attribute value range in each data block to support that.

As a second contribution, we have defined and implemented two “stand-alone indexing” techniques (i.e. separate data structures maintained for secondary indexes) on key-value stores that borrow ideas from the secondary indexing strategies used in column-based NoSQL and traditional relational (SQL) databases.

We implemented all indexing schemes on Google’s popular open-source LevelDB key-value store. Our comprehensive experimental and theoretical evaluation reveals interesting trade-offs between the indexing strategies in terms of read and write throughputs. A key result is that the embedded index is superior for high write-throughput requirements. We created and published a realistic Twitter-style read/write workload generator to facilitate our experiments. We also published our index implementations on LevelDB as open source.

1. INTRODUCTION
In the age of big data, more and more services are required to ingest high volume, velocity and variety data, such as social net-working data, smartphone Apps usage data and click through data in large search/recommendation systems. NoSQL databases were developed as a more scalable and flexible alternative to relational databases. NoSQL databases, such as BigTable [13], HBase [18], Cassandra [20], Voldemort [17], MongoDB [6] and LevelDB [4] to name a few, have attracted huge attention from industry and research communities and are widely used in products.

NoSQL systems like key-value stores are particularly good at supporting two capabilities: (a) fast write throughput and (b) fast lookups on the primary key of a data entry. However, many applications also require queries on non-key attributes which is a functionality commonly supported in RDBMs. For instance, if a tweet has attributes tweet id, user id and text, then it would be useful to be able to return all (or more commonly the most recent) tweets of a user. However, supporting secondary indexes in NoSQL databases is challenging because secondary indexing structures must be maintained during writes, while also managing the consistency between secondary indexes and data tables. This significantly slows down writes, and thus hurts the system’s capability to handle high write throughput which is one of the most important reasons why NoSQL databases are used. Secondary indexes also complicate the transaction management.

Table 1 shows the operations that we want to support. The first three are already supported by existing key-value stores like LevelDB. Note that the secondary attributes and their values are stored inside the value of an entry, which may be in JSON format: \( v = \{A_1: \text{val}(A_1), \ldots, A_i: \text{val}(A_i)\}\), where \(\text{val}(A_i)\) is the value for the secondary attribute \(A_i\). For example, a data entry that consists of tweet id \(t3\), user id \(u1\) and text \(t3\) can be written using \(\text{PUT}(t3, [u1, \text{text3}])\). Then, entry \((u1, \{11\})\) should be added to the secondary index table for the user id attribute. However, there could be an existing posting list of \(u1\), e.g., \((u1, \{21, 31\})\). Thus the new update should be merged with the existing posting list at some point, so it eventually becomes \((u1, \{13, 21, 31\})\).

Current NoSQL systems have adopted different strategies to support secondary indexes (e.g., on the user id of a tweet). For instance, MongoDB uses B-tree for secondary index, which follows the same way of maintaining secondary indexes as traditional RDBMs.

On the other hand, several log-structure merge-tree (LSM tree) [22] based NoSQL systems (e.g., Cassandra) store a secondary index as an LSM table (column family) similarly to how the data table is stored, and perform append-only updates (which we refer as “lazy” updates) instead of in-place updates. In particular, going back to the example operation \(\text{PUT}(t3, [u1, \text{text3}])\), recent versions of Cassandra have adopted a lazy update strategy: it issues a \(\text{PUT}(u1, \{11\})\) in the user id index table without retrieving the existing postings list for \(u1\). The old postings list of \(u1\) is merged with \((u1, \{11\})\) at a
In addition to implementing and evaluating such stand-alone indexes for key-value stores, we propose a novel lightweight secondary indexing technique to support secondary attribute lookups in LSM-based key-value stores (Section 3).

We implemented the proposed indexing techniques on top of LevelDB [4], which to date does not offer secondary indexing support. Over other candidates such as RocksDB [8] we chose LevelDB because it is a single-threaded pure single-node key value store, so we can more easily isolate and explain the performance differences of the various indexing methods.

We make following contributions in this paper:

- We propose a novel lightweight embedded indexing technique to support secondary attribute lookups in LSM-based key-value stores (Section 3).
- We propose a variation of interval tree data structure to support efficient secondary attribute range lookups in embedded index (Section 3).
- We propose and implement lazy and eager update variants of stand-alone indexing on LSM-based key-value stores, inspired by state-of-the-art NoSQL and relational databases (Section 4).
- We create and publish an open-source realistic Twitter workload generator of a mixture of reads (on primary key), lookups

\footnote{Earlier versions of Cassandra handled this by first accessing the index table to retrieve the existing postings list of u1, then writing back a merged posting list to the index table. Then the old posting list is obsolete. Such “eager” updates degrade the write performance.

Figure 1 captures the differences between the three indexing strategies (eager and lazy updates on stand-alone index, and embedded index) on LSM-based key-value stores. In an LSM-style storage structure, data are normally organized as levels (three levels shown in Figure 1 where the top is in-memory and the bottom two on disk) with older data in lower levels, which are larger than recent (upper) levels. Each orange rectangle in Figure 1 represents a data file. The state shown is right after the following sequence of operations \( PUT(t1, \{u1, text1\}),...,PUT(t2, \{u1, text2\}),...,PUT(t3, \{u1, text3\}) \). We use the notation \( key \rightarrow value \). For simplicity, we do not show the text attribute.

In addition to implementing and evaluating such stand-alone indexes for key-value stores, we propose a novel lightweight secondary indexing approach, which we refer to as “embedded index.” In contrast to stand-alone indexes, the embedded index does not create any specialized index structure. Instead, it attaches a memory-resident Bloom filter [12] signature on each data block for each indexed secondary attribute. Note that Bloom filters are already popular in NoSQL systems to accelerate the lookup on the primary key, but we propose for the first time also using them for secondary attributes. In order to support range query on secondary attribute, embedded index also maintains an in-memory data structure per indexed attribute: a modified version of interval tree storing the range of secondary attribute values in each data block in SSTable.

Table 1: Set of operations in a key-value store.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GET((k))</td>
<td>Retrieve value identified by primary key (k).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUT((k, v))</td>
<td>Write a new entry ((k, v)) (or overwrite if (k) already exists), where (k) is the primary key.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEL((k))</td>
<td>Delete the entry identified by primary key (k) if any.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOOKUP((A, a))</td>
<td>Retrieve the entries with (val(A) = a), where (A) is a secondary attribute and (a) is a value for this attribute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOOKUP((A, a, K))</td>
<td>Retrieve the (K) most recent entries with (val(A) = a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANGELOOKUP((A, a, b, K))</td>
<td>Retrieve the (K) most recent entries with (a \leq val(A) \leq b).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We will show that the embedded index has much lower maintenance cost compared with stand-alone index techniques. In terms of implementation, the embedded index is also easy to be adopted as the original basic operations (GET, PUT and DEL) on the primary key remain unchanged. The embedded index also simplifies the transaction management as we do not have to synchronize separate data structures.
(on secondary attributes) and writes. We also publish open-source versions of our indexes’ implementation on LevelDB (Section 5).

- We conduct extensive experiments to study the trade-offs between the indexing techniques on various workloads. We also theoretically study these trade-offs (Section 5).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the related work and background. We discuss on the lessons learned and also on transactional management issues in Section 6. We conclude and present future directions in Section 7. The workload generator and the source code of our indexes are available at [7].

2. RELATED WORK AND BACKGROUND

2.1 Secondary Index in NoSQL databases

Cassandra [20] is a column store NoSQL database where attributes can be defined in the schema but the schema is dynamic (record may contain new attributes not predefined in the schema). Cassandra supports secondary index. For this, Cassandra populates a separate table (column family in Cassandra’s terminology) to store the secondary index for each indexed attribute, where the row key of an index table is a secondary attribute value, and each row contains a set of columns with primary keys as column names. Upon deletes and updates in data table, instead of deleting the out-of-date column names from index table, Cassandra uses a “read-repair” strategy where the invalidation of these column names is postponed to when a read on them occurs. Compared with Cassandra, pure key-value stores do not have schema or column support and thus pose more challenges in supporting secondary index. In [23], the authors show how to support secondary indexes on HBase. Index structures are not their focus, instead they aim to offer different levels of consistency between data tables and indexes upon the writes in data tables. In contrast, in this paper we compare different secondary index structures.

Document-oriented NoSQL databases like CouchDB [2] and MongoDB [6] support storing JSON-style documents. Similarly to RDBMs, they employ B-tree variation to support secondary indexes. In this paper our focus is on LSM-style storage.

HyperDex [16] proposes a distributed key-value store supporting search on secondary attributes. They partition the data across the cluster by taking the secondary attribute values into consideration. Each attribute is viewed as dimension (e.g., a tweet may have two dimension tweet id and user id), and each server takes charge of a “subspace” of entries (e.g., any tweet with tweet id in [tid1, tid2] and user id in [uid1, uid2]). Innesto [21] applies a similar idea of partition and adds ACID features in a distributed key-value store. It claims to perform better on high dimension data than HyperDex. In this paper, our focus is on a single-machine key-value store. The distribution techniques of HyperDex and Innesto can be viewed as complementary if we want to move to a distributed setting.

AsterixDB [10] introduces an interesting framework to convert an in-place update index like B+ tree and R-tree to an LSM-style index, in order to efficiently handle high throughput workloads. Again, this can be viewed as complementary to our work as we work directly on LSM-friendly indexes (set of keys with flat postings lists).

2.2 Background

2.2.1 LSM tree

An LSM tree generally consists of an in-memory component (level in LevelDB terminology) and several immutable on-disk components (levels). Each component consists of several data files and each data file consists of several data blocks. As depicted in Figure 2, all writes go to in-memory component (C0) first and then flush into the first disk component once the in-memory data is over the size limit of C0, and so on. The on disk components normally increase in size as shown in Figure 2 from C1 to CL. A background process (compaction) will periodically merge the smaller components to larger components as the data grows. Delete on LSM is achieved by writing a tombstone periodically merge the smaller components to larger components as the data grows. Delete on LSM is achieved by writing a tombstone periodically merge the smaller components to larger components as the data grows. Hence, reads are slower than writes. The older versions of an entry (either updated or deleted) are obsolete and will be discarded during the merge (compaction) process.

Because of LSM trees’ good performance on handling high write throughput, they are commonly used in NoSQL databases such as BigTable [13], HBase [18], Cassandra [20] and LevelDB [4]. And conventionally, the in-memory component (C0) is referred as Memtable and the on disk components are referred as SSTable in these systems.

2.2.2 SSTable in LevelDB

As we will implement our indexing techniques on top of LevelDB, we present some storage details of LevelDB as background for ease of understanding. Level-(i + 1) is 10 times larger than level-i in LevelDB. Each level (component) consists of a set of disk files (SSTables), each having a size around 2 MBs. The SSTables in the same level may not contain the same key (except level-0\(^2\)). Recent Cassandra versions support this level merging (compaction) option used in LevelDB.

Further, LevelDB partitions its SSTables into data blocks (normally tens of KB in size). The format of an SSTable file in LevelDB is shown in Figure 3. The key-value pairs are stored in the data blocks sorted by their key. Meta blocks contain meta information of data blocks. For example, Stats Meta Blocks contain information such as data size, number of entries and number of data blocks. Filter Meta blocks store a Bloom filter for each block, computed based on the keys of the entries in that block, to speedup GET operations. Then, there are index blocks for both meta blocks and data blocks, which store the addresses of meta blocks and data blocks. In the end of the SSTable file is a fixed length footer that

\(^2\)which is C1 in Figure 2 as LevelDB does not number the memory component
contains the block address of the meta index and data index blocks.

### 3. LIGHTWEIGHT EMBEDDED INDEX IN LSM BASED KEY-VALUE STORE

**Overview** If there is no secondary index, then we perform a sequential scan to answer LOOKUP. If there is no secondary index, then we perform a sequential scan to answer LOOKUP.

**Bloom Filter**

Bloom filter [12] is a hashing technique to efficiently test if an item is included in a set of items. Each item in the set is mapped to several bit positions, which are set to 1, by a hash function. Then, the Bloom filter of a set is the OR-ing of all these bitstrings. To check the membership of an item in the set, we compute the positions using the same hash functions and check if all corresponding bits of the Bloom filter are set to 1. If no, we return false, else we have to check if this items exists due to possible false positives. The false positive rate depends on the number of hash functions \( n \), the number of items in the set \( S \) and the length of the bit arrays \( m \), which can be approximately computed as Equation 1.

\[
\left( 1 - \frac{1}{m} \right)^{nS} \approx \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{ns}{m}} \right)^{n} \tag{1}
\]

Given \( S \) and \( m \), the minimal false positive rate is \( 2^{-\frac{n}{2}ln2} \) by setting \( n = \frac{m}{S}ln2 \).
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To make the interval tree used for range queries consistent with the database, we modified the compaction process. Compaction merges a number of SSTable files to create a new sets of SSTable files. So for each compaction process, we delete all the blocks of the old SSTable files and add all the blocks of the newly created SSTable files. These operations in the compaction process can be summarized in Figure 5.

![Figure 5: Interval Tree maintained in the compaction](image)

To summarize, the embedded index dramatically accelerates LOOKUP queries, while incurring minimal cost on writes and reads on the primary key. Our experiments in Section 5 confirm the effectiveness of this lightweight indexing technique.

### 3.1 Embedded Index Implementation in LevelDB

LevelDB, among NoSQL databases like Cassandra, already employs Bloom filters to accelerate reads on primary keys. Several types of meta blocks are already supported in LevelDB and we highlight the filter meta block, which stores a Bloom filter on the primary keys for each data block. As LevelDB already natively supports filter meta blocks, we just have to modify it to add secondary attribute Bloom filters as shown in Figure 6.

![Figure 6: Filter Meta Block change on LevelDB to support secondary attribute index](image)

**Support top-K retrieval: LOOKUP(A_k, a, K)**

We mentioned above that when performing LOOKUP, we scan one level at a time until K results have been found. A key challenge is that within the same level there may be several entries with the queried secondary attribute value val(A_k) = a, and these entries are not stored ordered by time (but by primary key). Fortunately, LevelDB, as most other NoSQL systems, assigns an auto-increment sequence number to each entry at insertion, which we use to perform time ordering within a level. Hence, we must always scan until the end of level, before termination.

To efficiently compute the top-K entries, we maintain a min-heap ordered by the sequence number. If we find a match (i.e. we find a record that has secondary attribute value val(A_k) = a, then if the heap size is equal to K, we first check whether it is an older record than the root of the min heap. If it is a newer match or the heap size is less than K, then we check whether it is a valid record (i.e. whether it is deleted or updated by a new record in data table). We check this by calling a GET(k) for this record in the data table. If it is not a deleted record, we check the secondary attribute value whether it matches with the entry that we found for our result.

We also maintain a hashsset of K keys representing the already fetched results to make sure no duplicate entry is present in the results. If a duplicate entry comes with a greater sequence number, we update the min-heap with this newer entry and delete the old duplicate. Once the scan finishes a whole level with the heap containing K entries, it can safely stop, perform heapsort and return the results in the heap as decreasing order of the sequence number of each entry as the LOOKUP query results. We present the pseudocode of LOOKUP in LevelDB implementation in the Appendix.

**Support top-K retrieval: RANGELOOKUP(A_k, a, b, K)**

Similar to LOOKUP, to efficiently compute the top-K entries, we also maintain a min-heap ordered by the sequence number. So we first search in the in-memory B-Tree for all the records for the given secondary attribute value range [a, b]. If we find the top-K here, we stop and return the results. If not, then we search in the interval tree to find all the blocks that have ranges of secondary attribute values intersected with given range. We iterate through the blocks one by one in sorted order of maximum timestamp, and for each block we linearly search for any records which have a secondary attribute value in the range [a, b]. We keep pushing any successful matched records in our min-heap. We stop when next block in the iterator has a smaller maximum timestamp value than the timestamp value of the min record in the min-heap.

### 3.2 Analysis of Cost for Operations with Embedded Index

**Overhead on GET/PUT/DEL queries.** As discussed above, the embedded index does not incur much overhead on these operations. It only adds very small overhead on the compaction process to build a Bloom filter for each indexed attribute per block (if RANGELOOKUP is supported then there is also small overhead on maintaining the interval tree) and small overhead on updating the B-tree for Memtable.

**LOOKUP query.** A Bloom filter is a probabilistic data structure, i.e., it returns false positives with a probability. This probability is related to the bits array size and the number of entries a bloom filter already mapped. We study more details in experiments. Here we give a general theoretical analysis on the number of SSTable IO during answering LOOKUP query using embedded index.

In LevelDB a level has 10 times the number of SSTable files (and thus blocks) than its upper level. As a consequence, the number of IOs grows exponentially when scanning lower levels. Thus a smaller K in LOOKUP query is faster, because of the higher chance that the LOOKUP query can be satisfied in the first few levels.

Assume the number of blocks in level-0 is b (and thus level-i is approximately b · 10^i). As discussed in Section 2.2 (see Equation 1), the minimal false positive rate of the bloom filter is 2^{-\frac{1}{m}b}, denoted as fp. Thus the approximate number of block accesses on level-0 for LOOKUP due to false positives is fp · b · 10^i. Hence, if a LOOKUP query needs to search on d levels, the expected block accesses are \( \sum_{i=0}^{d} (fp \cdot b \cdot 10^i) = \sum_{i=0}^{d} c_i \). If matched entries are found in H blocks, the total number of block accesses is H +
The embedded index will achieve better LOOKUP query performance on low cardinality data (i.e., an attribute has small number of unique attribute values), because fewer levels must be accessed to retrieve \( K \) matches.

4. **STAND-ALONE INDEX IN LSM BASED KEY-VALUE STORE**

A stand-alone secondary index in a key-value store can be logically created as follows. For each indexed attribute \( A_i \), we build an index table \( T_i \), which stores the mapping from each attribute value to a list of primary keys, similarly to an inverted index in Information Retrieval. That is, for each key-value pair \((k, v)\) in data table with \( \text{val}(A_i) \) not null, \( k \) is added to the postings list of \( \text{val}(A_i) \) in \( T_i \). LOOKUPs can then be supported straightforwardly by this stand-alone index.

Compared with embedded index, stand-alone index could have overall better LOOKUP performance, because it can get all candidate primary keys with one read in index table in eager updates (or up to \( L \) reads when there are \( L \) levels in the case of lazy updates as we discuss below). However, stand-alone index is more costly on the maintenance of index table upon writes (PUT\((k, v)\) and DEL\((k)\)) in data table in order to keep the consistency between data and index tables.

**Write Challenges.** Recall that PUT\((k, \{A_i: a_i\})\) may be an insert or update. We assume a single secondary attribute \( A_i \) for presentation simplicity. Given this PUT, to maintain the consistency between \( T_i \) (index table for attribute \( A_i \)) and data table, two steps need to be taken:

1. If the PUT is an update, that is, there was previously a PUT\((k, \{A_i: a_i'\})\), then we must remove \( k \) from the postings list of \( a_i' \).
2. Add \( k \) to the postings list for \( a_i \) in \( T_i \).

Note that for DEL\((k)\) operations only the first step must be taken. The first step requires issuing GET\((k)\) on data table to get \( a_i' \) if it exists. Since the reads on LSM trees are much slower than writes (if not considering cache), this could significantly slow down writes. To avoid this, we can apply three options to postpone the removal of \( k \) from \( a_i' \)'s list in index table \( T_i \). One simple option is that we do not handle this step at all. This one should be used for workloads with very low ratio updates/deletes. For an append-only workload (i.e., no delete or update on existing entries), this strategy performs best. The second one is to do the cleanup of invalid keys during compaction on index table. That is, when a compaction merge an old file to a new file, it checks the validation of each key in the old file and decides whether writes a key to the new file. This process could make the compaction process more IO intensive and thus affects the overall performance of the database. Another option is to do periodic cleanup on SSTables when the system is not busy. In our experiments we implement the first option.

For the second step, we present two options to maintain the consistency between data and index tables, eager updates and lazy updates, discussed in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 respectively. We have implemented both options on LevelDB.

4.1 Stand-alone Index with Eager Updates

**Eager Updates (PUT)** Upon PUT\((k, \{A_i: a_i\})\), a stand-alone index with eager updates first reads the current postings list of \( a_i \) from index table, adds \( k \) to the list and writes back the updated list. This means that, in contrast to the lazy update, only the highest-level posting list of \( a_i \) needs to be retrieved, as all the lower ones are obsolete.

**Example 1.** Assume the current status of a database shown in Table 3. Now suppose PUT\((t_3, \{\text{"UserID"}: u_1, \text{"Text": "t1 text"}\})\) is issued, which updates the UserID attribute of \( t_3 \) from \( u_2 \) to \( u_1 \). Figure 7 depicts a possible initial and final instance of the LSM tree.

![Figure 7: Example of stand-alone index with eager updates and its compaction.](image)

Table 3: TweetsData table storing tweets data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t1</td>
<td>{\text{&quot;UserID&quot;: u1, &quot;text&quot;: &quot;t1 text&quot;}}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t2</td>
<td>{\text{&quot;UserID&quot;: u2, &quot;text&quot;: &quot;t2 text&quot;}}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t3</td>
<td>{\text{&quot;UserID&quot;: u2, &quot;text&quot;: &quot;t3 text&quot;}}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t4</td>
<td>{\text{&quot;UserID&quot;: u2, &quot;text&quot;: &quot;t4 text&quot;}}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the compaction on the index tables works the same as the compaction on the data table. LOOKUP A key advantage of eager updates is that LOOKUP\((A_i, a)\) only needs to read the postings list of \( a \) in the highest level in \( T_i \). However, there could be invalid keys in the postings list of \( a \). Thus, similarly to the embedded index LOOKUP post-processing, for each returned key \( k \), we need to call a GET\((k)\) on data table and make sure \( \text{val}(A_i) = a \). To support top-\( K \) LOOKUPS, we maintain the postings lists ordered by time (sequence number) and then only read a \( K \) prefix of them. The pseudocode of LOOKUP\((A_i, a, K)\) is shown in the appendix.

4.2 Stand-alone Index with Lazy Updates

**Lazy updates (PUT)** The eager update still requires a read operation to update the index table for each PUT, which significantly slows down PUTs. In contrast, the lazy update works as follows. Upon PUT\((k, \{A_i: a_i\})\) (on the data table), it just issues a PUT\((A_i, k)\) to the index table \( T_i \) but nothing else. Thus the postings list for \( a_i \) will be scattered in different levels. Figure 8 depicts the update of index table by the lazy updates strategy upon the PUT in Example 1.
Figure 8: Example of stand-alone index with lazy updates and its compaction.

Support top-K query: \( \text{LOOKUP}(A_i, a, K) \) Since the postings list for \( a \) could be scattered in different levels, a query \( \text{LOOKUP}(A_i, a, K) \) needs to merge them to get a complete list. For this, it checks the MemTable and then the SSTables, and moves down in the storage hierarchy one level at a time. Note that at most one postings list exists per level. The pseudocode of \( \text{LOOKUP} \) is shown in the appendix.

Support top-K range query: \( \text{RANGELOOKUP}(A_i, a, b, K) \) To support range query \( \text{RANGELOOKUP}(A_i, a, b, K) \) on secondary attribute in Stand-alone index, we used range query API in LevelDB on primary key. We issue this range query on our index table for invalid entries.

We also had updates in the workload since we would have to check \( K \) is scattered across all levels. Thus the total cost of \( \text{LOOKUP}(A_i, a, K) \) is \( (K+L) \) disk accesses. Note that this cost would be higher if we also had updates in the workload since we would have to check for invalid entries.

5. EXPERIMENTS

\[ a^3 \]

assuming there is no false positive by the Bloom filter on the primary key in the index table

5.1 Experimental Setting

We run our experiments on machines with Quad Core Intel(R) Xeon(R) E3-1230 v2@3.30GHz CPU and 16GB RAM. The operating system used in these machines is CentOS version 6.4.

We collected 18 millions of tweets with overall size 9.88 GB (in JSON format) which have been posted and geotagged within New York State. Then we ran experiment using different benchmark files having different read write ratio and different read lookup ratio. We selected TweetID as the primary key attribute and UserID as the secondary attribute for indexing.

5.2 Benchmark

We are aware of several public workloads for key-value store databases available online such as YCSB [14]. However, as far as we know there are no workload generator which allows fine-grained control of the ratio of queries on primary to secondary attributes. Thus, to evaluate our secondary indexing performance, we created a realistic Twitter-based workload generator. The generator works on a sample of tweets e.g., 1% sample collected through Twitter Streaming API. Each tweet is a PUT on the database. A user can specify a read-to-write ratio to generate benchmarks with desired Reads/Writes ratio. The primary-to-secondary-reads ratio parameter allows the user to adjust the ratio of primary key reads (GET) to secondary index reads (LOOKUP). In our experiments, we set this parameter to 100. When generating the benchmark file, one read (primary key read and secondary attribute lookup) is generated based on the probability of each candidate in the most recent writes. We have one another integer parameter read buffer size for this: we maintain the frequency of each primary key / secondary attribute values in the most recent read buffer size number of writes in order to probabilistically choose when candidates to read. In our experiments we set it to 50K.

5.3 Experimental Evaluation

In the section we evaluate our secondary indexing techniques. Because the support of RANGELOOKUP requires to maintain extra data structures which incurs overhead, thus we report the performance of versions with and without RANGELOOKUP supported separately. We first report the performance the indexing variants (Stand-alone Index with Eager Updates, Stand-alone Index with Lazy Updates, Embedded Index) without RANGELOOKUP supported in Section 5.3.1. We study factors that could affect the performance in Sections 5.3.2, 5.3.4 and 5.3.5. We show the space efficiency for the indexing variants in Section 5.3.5. We present the performance of variants with RANGELOOKUP supported in Section 5.3.6.

5.3.1 Performance of indexing methods without the support of RANGELOOKUP

We conduct our experiments on workloads with different reads-to-writes ratios which represent different use cases. Figures 9 and 10 show the overall, GET, PUT, and LOOKUP performance of these indexing methods on write heavy \( \frac{\text{Reads}}{\text{Writes}} = \frac{1}{4} \) and read heavy workloads \( \frac{\text{Reads}}{\text{Writes}} = 9 \), respectively. Note here reads include GET and LOOKUP queries. We also measure the performance when no secondary index is built, in which we scan the database sequentially to find the matched entries to for answering LOOKUP queries.

On both workloads, we set primary-to-secondary-ratio to 100 and used a fixed \( \text{fixed bits per key} = 100 \) for Bloom filter. Note that both benchmarks both contain 20 millions operations. Shown in Figures 9 and 10, we record the performance once per 1 millions operation top-\( K = 5 \) in LOOKUP queries.
Table 4: Table accesses for operations. Assume \( l \) attributes are indexed on the primary table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Read Data</th>
<th>Write Data</th>
<th>Read Index</th>
<th>Write Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GET(( k ))</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEL(( k ))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUT(( k, v ))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( l ) (eager), 0 (lazy)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOOKUP(( A, a, K ))</td>
<td>( K )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (eager), ( L ) (lazy)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It shows in Figure 9 that Stand-alone Index with Eager Updates cannot scale for large dataset. Embedded Index achieves very similar GET performance as Stand-alone Index with Lazy Updates but give much better PUT performance. Thus on the Write Heavy benchmark, Embedded Index gives better overall performance than Stand-alone indexes (around 40% better than Lazy Updates).

However, on the Read Heavy workload, the Lazy Updates version gives the best overall performance among these indexing techniques as shown in Figure 10.

5.3.2 Performance of indexing methods varying key-value pair size

We study the effect of the key-value pair size on the performance of these indexing techniques. For that, we only keep two attributes (user id and timestamp) of each tweet in the value. The data contains the same number of tweets but the total size is reduced to 1.24GB in JSON format (vs. 9.88 GB without removing attributes). We generate a new workload using the same parameters as we used in former experiments. We present the performance results on the write heavy workload (\( \frac{\text{Read}}{\text{Write}} = \frac{1}{9} \)) in Figure 11.

We observe that the performance of all variants improve with smaller key-value pairs compared with the results shown in Figure 9. However, we see the advantage of Embedded Index over Lazy Updates in terms of overall performance is larger. Because each data block contains relatively more key-value pairs, Embedded Index has higher chance to check smaller number of SSTables.
files and levels to satisfy a LOOKUP query.
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(a) Overall performance
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(b) PUT performance
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(c) GET performance
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(d) LOOKUP performance (Top-$K = 5$)

Figure 11: Performance for different indexing variants on write heavy benchmark with smaller key-value pairs.

5.3.3 LOOKUP Performance of Embedded Index varying top-$K$s

In this section, we specifically study the LOOKUP performance with different $K$s on Embedded Index with all other database settings unchanged. Figure 12 shows the average running time of LOOKUP queries among the 20 millions of operations in the Write Heavy workload. We can see that as $K$ increases, the LOOKUP performance decreases as expected.

5.3.4 LOOKUP Performance of Embedded Index varying Bloom filter lengths

The length of each Bloom filter used in Embedded Index also has affect on LOOKUP performance in two folds: (1) with larger Bloom filter, the false positive rate will drop thus the number of blocks to be loaded into memory is smaller, and (2) the cost of checking each Bloom filter is higher because more hash functions are applied for each key to check its existence as the Bloom filter length increases.
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Figure 12: LOOKUP performance with different top-$K$ on the write heavy benchmark.
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Figure 13: LOOKUP performance with different bloom filter setting (bits per key) on the write heavy benchmark.

We conducted the experiment by varying the value of bits per key from 20 to 1000. Figure 13 shows the average performance of LOOKUPs in the Write Heavy workload. Here we can see that the LOOKUP performance starts to increase with increasing bits per key setting of Bloom filter (20 to 200) as the false positive rate decreases. But then the performance decreases with larger value of bits per key where the false positive rate is low enough but the cost of checking Bloom filters increases.
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Table 5: Averaged false positive rates of LOOKUP queries and final database sizes running Write Heavy workload under different settings of bits per key for Bloom filter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bits Per Key</th>
<th>Database Size</th>
<th>False Positive Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10,127 MB</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>10,256 MB</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>10,470 MB</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>10,899 MB</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>12,186 MB</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>14,325 MB</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also show the space tradeoffs in Table 5. As the bits per key increases, the bloom filter takes more space. In our experiment we set bits per key as 100, because the LOOKUP performance is very close to setting it as 200 to 300 but with reasonable space overhead.

5.3.5 Space efficiency of indexing methods
Table 6: Database size of different indexing techniques on the two workloads. Small Write Heavy denotes the workload in which each value only contains two attributes. The numbers in parenthesis are the overhead over LevelDB with no secondary index built.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Read Heavy</th>
<th>Write Heavy</th>
<th>Small Write Heavy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LevelDB (no secondary index)</td>
<td>1,569 MB</td>
<td>10,249 MB</td>
<td>1,445 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eager Updates</td>
<td>1,615 MB (2.9%)</td>
<td>10,886 MB (6.2%)</td>
<td>2,702 MB (45.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy Updates</td>
<td>1,608 MB (2.5%)</td>
<td>10,610 MB (3.5%)</td>
<td>1,825 MB (26.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded</td>
<td>1,590 MB (1.3%)</td>
<td>10,470 MB (2.2%)</td>
<td>1,659 MB (14.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the database sizes of different indexing techniques on the workloads. It shows that Embedded Index is more space efficient than Stand-alone indexing techniques. Note that for each indexing variant, its absolute values of the overhead on Small Write Heavy and the overhead on Write Heavy are very close. For instance, the overhead of space in Embedded Index is mainly from Bloom filters which is decided by the number of entries and bits per key setting. Thus as Small Write Heavy and Write Heavy have same number of key-value pairs thus the total space of Bloom filter is unchanged.

5.3.6 Performance of indexing methods with the support of RANGELOOKUP

Through former experiments, we see Eager Updates will not scale for large dataset. Thus, we only implement RANGELOOKUP support on Stand-alone Index with Lazy Updates and Embedded Index.

Because LSM components are time correlated, thus Embedded Index combined with interval tree is efficient for RANGELOOKUPs only when secondary attribute is correlated with time. To test the performance with RANGELOOKUP, we build the secondary index on the CreationTime attribute instead of UserID.

Figure 14 compares the performance of Lazy Updates and Embedded Index on the write heavy workload. It shows that the Embedded Index achieve very close overall performance than Lazy Updates in this workload. In general, Embedded Index gives better RANGELOOKUP and PUT performance while Lazy Updates advantages in GET performance.

5.3.7 Effect for multiple secondary attribute indexes

We have shown experiments on one secondary index. From these results, we can intuitively discuss the performance if we have more indexes on other secondary attributes. Overall performance of Embedded Index will remain similar as we have seen there is very small overhead on PUT and GET by adding bloom filters for secondary attributes. But for Stand-alone indexes, PUT latency will increase linearly with the number of secondary indexes, because we have to write to different index tables every time we issue a PUT in the primary data table. The database size will also increase with the number of indexes for all of them, but we have already seen that Embedded Index is more space efficient than the Stand-alone indexes.

6. DISCUSSION

Lessons learned. The experimental results show the trade-offs between the three indexing strategies. As expected, no solution is best for all workloads.

Since the Embedded Index only incurs very small space overhead compared to the other two, it is a better choice in the cases when space is big concern, e.g., to create a local key-value store on a mobile device. When space consumption is not a major concern, the Embedded Index is still favorable when the query workload contains relatively small (≤ 5%) ratio of LOOKUP queries over GETs but very heavy writes throughput (≥ 50% of all operations).

For instance, in wireless sensor network where a sensor generates data of form (measurement id, temperature, humidity), the database must support some basic querying capabilities in order for the network to support queries [19, 15]. E.g., a monitor dashboard can be used to query the data from certain sensor or lookup the record with temperature in a range (if the sensor is recording temperature). Hence, in these applications reads and lookups are rare but writes have very high rate.

A limitation of Embedded is that it does not support RANGELOOKUP. We facilitate this by extending RANGELOOKUP with interval tree.
Table 7: Use cases for different indexing strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Applications</th>
<th>Primary Key</th>
<th>Secondary Keys</th>
<th>Suggested Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Sensor Network</td>
<td>Record ID</td>
<td>Sensor ID</td>
<td>Embedded Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook or Twitter</td>
<td>Post ID</td>
<td>User ID</td>
<td>Stand-alone Index with Lazy Updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snapchat or Whatsapp</td>
<td>Message ID</td>
<td>User ID</td>
<td>Stand-alone Index with Eager Updates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is efficient for RANGELOOKUP operations when the secondary key is somewhat correlated with the primary key (or by time if records were stored by time in SSTables), but inefficient for uncorrelated attributes.

In other cases, a Stand-alone index is a better choice. The Lazy Updates variant adds more complexity on the cleanup of updated keys but achieves overall better write performance than Eager Updates. Thus, the Lazy Updates variant is preferable over Eager Updates when the workload involves very few updates. For instances, it is reported that there are much more reads than writes in Facebook and Twitter [5, 1].

Otherwise when the workload involves high ratio of updates in value or deletes, the Eager Updates version is a better choice. In the big data era, due to the cheap disk lots of applications do not remove data. However, we can see popular services with high ratio of deletes in database storage. For instance, applications such as Snapchat and WhatsApp have read heavy workloads like Facebook and Twitter. However they involves more deletes. E.g., messages in Snapchat and WhatsApp will be deleted from the server when messages expire [3, 9]. Thus in their databases they should have high ratio of deletes, which makes Eager Updates more favorable than Lazy Updates.

Example use cases for the three index methods are summarized in Table 7. In the work of [11], the authors collected traces from Facebook’s Memcached (a popular in-memory key-value store) deployment which give more examples of practical workloads with high ratio of reads, writes or deletes.

These conclusions are summarized in Figure 15.

Transaction Support. Transaction are commonly supported in all kinds of RDBMS. However, NoSQL systems contain limited support for it. For instance, a recent Cassandra release started to support a “light-weight” transaction which supports the get-update-write process of a single data entry as an atomic operation. Similar functionality is also offered by MongoDB, while systems like HyperDex and AsterixDB offer stonger supports on transactions.

LevelDB implements GET, PUT and DEL as atomic operations, and also supports transactional operation of several writes on a single table, i.e., a write batch consists of several PUT and DEL. As we already explained, the embedded index just writes more filter blocks during PUTs to LevelDB, and hence does not break the atomicity of these basic operations. However, in stand-alone index implementations, PUT and DEL operations introduces multiple reads/writes across index and data tables. To keep them atomic, special transaction management is needed, which we leave as future work.

7. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we study three secondary indexing methods for pure key-value stores, namely Stand-alone Index with Eager Updates, Stand-alone Index with Lazy Updates and Embedded Index. We propose a new version of interval tree combined with Embedded Index to support range queries on secondary attribute.

We implement these indexing methods over LevelDB and conduct extensive experiments to examine their performance. The experimental results show the tradeoffs between the three indexing techniques. We argue the appropriate choice of indexing techniques for different workloads and applications.
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APPENDIX

A. ALGORITHMS FOR LOOKUP IN EMBEDDED INDEX

Algorithm 1 LOOKUP Procedure using Embedded Index

1: Create Min-Heap H;
2: for table in Memtable do
3: for (k,v) in table do
4: if val(Ai) == a then
5: if H.size() == K ∧ H.top.seq < (k,v).seq then
6: H.pop();
7: H.put((k,v));
8: else if H.size() < K then
9: H.put((k,v));
10: if H.size() == K then
11: return List of K pairs in H
12: for v = 0 → L do
13: for sstablej in level-v do
14: for blocks in sstablej do
15: if blocks.bloomfilter(Ai).contains(a) == F then
16: NEXT
17: load blockj of sstablej in memory;
18: for (k,v) in blockj do
19: if val(Ai) == a ∧ (k,v) is valid then
20: if H.size() == K ∧ H.top.seq < (k,v).seq then
21: H.pop();
22: H.put((k,v));
23: else if H.size() < K then
24: H.put((k,v));
25: if H.size() == K then
26: return List of K pairs in H
27: return List of pairs in H

B. ALGORITHMS FOR LOOKUP IN STAND-ALONE INDEX WITH EAGER UPDATES

Algorithm 2 LOOKUP based on Eager Updates

1: H ← ();
2: Primary key list L ← return of GET(a) on index table T_. // Suppose the order is maintained as recent key to older keys
3: for k in L do
4: (k,v) ← return of GET(k) on data table.
5: if val(Ai) == a then
6: H.add((k,v))
7: if H.size() == K then
8: BREAK
9: return H

C. ALGORITHM FOR LOOKUP IN STAND-ALONE INDEX WITH LAZY UPDATES

Algorithm 3 LOOKUP Procedure based on Lazy Updates

1: H ← ()
2: for j from 0 to L do
3: if val(Ai) is not in Cj then
4: NEXT
5: List of primary keys P ← the value of Ai in Cj
6: for k in P do
7: (k,v) ← return of GET(k) on data table.
8: if val(Ai) == a then
9: H.add((k,v))
10: if H.size() == K then
11: return H
12: return H