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Notes

• OpenMP assignment due Wednesday
  • Questions?

• Research project proposal due next Wednesday
  • Minimum group size is 2, with 3 or 4 preferable
  • Make sure to list group members and provide both an idea and a work plan for your project – 1-2 pages should be enough
MapReduce

• Both a programming model and a Google implementation for processing large data sets on clusters of commodity computers w/o a fast network
  • targeted data is mainly Web documents and related data, but has been applied to (many) other domains
• Programming model is functional, and goes back to Lisp (in 1960’s!)
MapReduce (cont.)

• Functional programming model, so processing order does not matter – user writes 2 functions:
  • **Map** takes an input (key, value) pair and produces a set of intermediate (key, value) pairs
  • **Reduce** takes a key, and all the corresponding values for the key from the intermediate pairs, and merges the values into a new set of values (sometimes just 1 value)
    • the intermediate values are given to the function via an iterator (helps when all values for a key don’t fit into memory)

• Main input/output data type is strings, but can work on any type internally
  • Does require type conversion, which can become expensive
MapReduce (cont.)

• Implementation - runtime system does the parallelization onto the cluster
  • master/worker model – 1 master assigns map and reduce tasks to available worker machines
  • relies heavily on GFS – Google distributed file system
  • partition input data – called *splits*
  • schedule execution across cluster – try to have map tasks assigned near (in network terms) where the input data is located, and similarly have reduce tasks assigned near where map task outputs are written
  • deal with machine failures – restart failed tasks on other worker machines, and ensure each task only outputs once
    • if master fails, restart from checkpoint
    • manage communication between machines

• Several refinements/optimizations to give users more control over execution if desired, to provide additional functionality, to improve performance in some cases, to help with debugging, etc.
MapReduce more recently

- Lots of work over last > 15 years on open source implementations (e.g., Hadoop)
  - With many optimizations to improve performance, ease programmability
  - And for reliability – not true that a single master task for a job is adequate
- Relying on distributed file system for storing input and output (and some intermediate results) can be problematic for many applications
  - Locality is important for performance
MapReduce vs. Parallel DBMSs

• A response from the relational DB community to the popularity and claims of MapReduce advocates
  • a shortened version of a SIGMOD 2009 conference paper for a more general audience

• Overall claim is that MR is complementary to pDBMSs, not a replacement

• Advantages of MR include:
  • Extract-Transform-Load applications, including loading data into a DBMS
  • Complex analytics – data mining, data clustering
  • Semi-structured data – no schema, but (key,value) pairs
  • Easy software install, for “quick and dirty analyses”
  • Cost – Hadoop is open source, but no open source pDBMSs
  • MR is a powerful tool for some applications
MR vs. pDBMSs (cont.)

• Advantages of pDBMSs include:
  • Performance, even on tasks that appear well-suited to MR
    • results in paper mitigated by comparing solid commercial pDBMSs against Hadoop, a relatively new open source implementation (at the time)
  • Data parsed when loaded into DBMS, so not parsed again when executing queries
  • Performance gains from compressing data
    • and hard to get those gains with semi-structured MR data in a distributed file system
  • Pipelined execution of compiled SQL operations from streaming of data between operators, instead of writing intermediate data into distributed file system for MR
  • Static query planning vs. MR runtime work scheduling
    • but MR can adapt better to heterogeneous hardware
MR vs. pDBMSs (cont.)

• This is the beginning of the DB research community starting to take noSQL DBs seriously
  • Leading to a proliferation of heavily researched and eventually used DBs beyond relational
    • Mainly for various types of semi-structured data, so no relational DB schema defined
    • E.g., column stores, key/value stores, document stores, graph DBs, data streaming systems, ...