Optimized Union of Non-disjoint Distributed data sets

Itay dar, Tova milo, Elad Verbin
Tel Aviv University

OUTLINE

- Motivation
- (Optimal) Union Plan
- Compact Information Gathering
- Experimental Evaluation
- Related Work & future work

MOTIVATION

- P2P setting
- Download of data items from several sources
  - In MANCOOSI – download packages (info on packages) residing on several sources (peers)
- Sources often overlap and contain common items
- We want to avoid transmission of redundant information

MOTIVATION (cont.)

- Abstractly can be viewed as a union query
- Define the notion of optimal union plan (that minimize redundant data transmission)
- Devise efficient algorithm to compute and execute such plans
- Optimally exploit the network capabilities
- A key challenge is the lack of global map of items distribution

FORMAL PROBLEM DEFINITION

- A Peer To Peer Environment
  - Each peer p_i is holding a set of data items items(p_i)
  - All data items have the same size
  - A Simple network model
    - communication is discreet - Working in rounds
    - Communication is considered Reliable
    - Each peer has a static upload and download rate
      - Download(p_i)
      - Upload(p_i)
    - There are no other networks constraints

Union Plan

- Union plan - a set of tuples of the form (from,to,item,time) s.t
  - No bandwidth constraints are breached
  - All items in items(P) are sent to the target eventually
- Optimal plan - the maximal time point is minimal
- Direct Plan
- Non redundant plan
- Theorem: there always exist a direct non-redundant plan that is optimal

Union Plan (2)

- Proof sketch
  - Each plan can be transformed into a non redundant plan
  - We can remove all the item sent on path which don’t reach the target
  - We can look at the set of items each peer is sending out from his on local items, all the sets are disjoint and cover all the union set.
  - The plan for this sets of items is optimal, we show in the next part we can build an optimal direct plan given a disjoint set of items so both plans are equivalent and we are done.

Optimal Union Plan

- Global Knowledge Solution
  - Oracle knows the items each peer holds
- Assign data algorithm
  - Decide which item will be sent by which peer
- Send data algorithm
  - Create the concrete plan which tells when each peer should send his data items

Assign data algorithm

- Decide which peer send which data items
- Using CheckTime(t) algorithm
  - Which Assigns data to peers given the number of rounds, notify upon failure.
  - Equivalence class is the set of items that resides **only** in a given set of peers.
  - Using max flow Computation the items from each equivalence class will be split among the equivalence class members

CheckTime

- Graph vertex structure
  - Source vertex
  - equivalence class layer
  - Peers layer
  - Target vertex
  - Sink vertex
- Graph edges structure
  - From Source to each equivalence class vertex (equivalence class size as the edge weight)
  - Each equivalence class vertex to all his peer members vertex (equivalence class size as the edge weight)
  - Each peer has an edge to the target vertex (weight equals the amount of data units he can send in t rounds)
  - The target vertex is connected to the sink (weight equals the amount of data the target can possibly receive in t rounds)



Example

- 3 peers p_1,p_2,p_3 each can upload 2 item at each round
- The target p_0 can receive 3 items at each round
- p_1 and p_2 share 100 items
- All three peers share 10 items
- p_1 also holds 150 items
- p_2 also holds 100 items
- p_3 also holds 60 items



Assign data (3)

- Searching for minimum time using check time (search boundaries using send data)
- Complexity
  - Polynomial in the size of the graph which is exponential in the number of peers
- Correctness proof sketch
  - Plan -> flow (trivial)
  - Flow -> plan (needs send data part)

SEND DATA ALGORITHM

- Decide the peers data sending order
- Naïve solution
- Why naïve is not good enough ?
  - 3 peers each can send 2 items each round and get 3 items each round
  - P0 have 300 items
  - P1 and p2 have 50 items
  - Naïve ends after 175 rounds
  - Non naïve ends after 150 rounds
- Time to finish Bottleneck metric

	SendData(input: P, p_0; output: U)
1	$t := 0$; $U := \emptyset$;
2	**for each** $p \in P$
3	$\sharp items(p) := \|items(p)\|$;
4	$time\_to\_finish(p) := \sharp items(p)/upload(p)$;
5	**end for**
6	**while** there exists some peer p with $\sharp items(p) > 0$
7	$t := t + 1$;
8	$\sharp send(p) := 0$ for every $p \in P$;
9	$free := download(p_0)$;
10	**while** $free > 0$
11	choose a peer p, among those with $\sharp send(p) < upload(p)$,
12	where $time\_to\_finish(p)$ is maximal.
13	$\sharp send(p) := \sharp send(p) + 1$;
14	$\sharp items(p) := \sharp items(p) - 1$;
15	$time\_to\_finish(p) := \sharp items(p)/upload(p)$;
16	$\sharp free := free - 1$;
17	**end while**
18	**for each** $p \in P$, with $\sharp send(p) > 0$, add to U instructions
19	to send, at time t, $\sharp send(p)$ new items from p to p_0;
20	**end while**
21	return U;

Figure 3.2: The SendData Algorithm

SEND DATA ALGORITHM (2)

- correctness proof sketch
  - Time to finish invariant
    - If(time_to_finish(pi) > time_to_finish(pj) at any round then time_to_finish(pi) > time_to_finish(pj) – 1
- Assign data correctness
  - Allocating bandwidth according to send data
    - Flow Constraints are not breached due to algorithm nature
    - we shall look at the first non saturated round
      - one of the peer sending data there has been sending data from the start, and will do so till the end (bottleneck)
      - the edge from the peer to the target vertex enforce the plan time.
- Send Data Complexity
  - O(m*n+nlogn)

Send data algorithm

- Optimized version
  - Bandwidth allocation is fixed during consecutive rounds
  - We also need to change the plan format
  - Groups of peer with different time to finish gets the same amount of bandwidth to the group until 2 groups get merged.
  - The bandwidth allocation inside a group during a time interval doesn't matter – so we make it regular (compress plan size)
- Complexity
  - $O(P^2)$

Compact Information Gathering

- Deriving the Plan
- Executing the Plan
- The c-Cluster Algorithm

Deriving the Plan

- Assign data needs
  - The peers upload and download speeds
  - All equivalence class sizes
- Send data needs
  - The peers upload and download speeds
  - Each peer data items AD allocation size

Equivalence class sizes estimation

- Bottom k sketches
  - Computing jaccard distance $\frac{|s_1 \cap \ldots \cap s_j|}{|s_1 \cup \ldots \cup s_j|}$
  - Estimating set size using interpolation

$$v_i = \frac{|s_i|}{|s_1 \cup \ldots \cup s_j|}$$

  - s_i is known, v_i is computed, so we can compute
- By using the Inclusion exclusion formula we can compute $\left|\bigcap_{p\in\hat{P}} items(p) - \bigcup_{p\in P-\hat{P}} items(p)\right|$ as it equals

$$\begin{aligned}
|\textstyle\bigcap_{p\in\hat{P}}| \quad & - \quad \Sigma_{p\in P-\hat{P}} \mid items(p) \mid \\
& + \quad \Sigma_{p,p'\in P-\hat{P}} \mid items(p) \cap items(p') \mid \\
& - \quad \Sigma_{p,p',p''\in P-\hat{P}} \mid items(p) \cap items(p') \cap items(p'') \mid \\
& + \quad \ldots \\
& \ldots \\
& -(+) \quad |\textstyle\bigcap_{p\in P-\hat{P}} items(p)|
\end{aligned}$$

Equivalence class sizes estimation

- Si is choose such it's the biggest group.
- Drawbacks
  - Exponential number of computation in the Inclusion exclusion formula
  - Error builds up during computation.
  - Computing the distance for a high number of groups is inaccurate.

Executing the Plan

- Each peer needs to know which items he needs to send according to the plan
- To Do So we need to identify each item set membership.
- Using Compressed Wrapped bloom filters
  - Bloom filter
  - Compressed Bloom filters
  - Compressed Wrapped bloom filters

The c-Cluster Algorithm

- Scalability problem
  - Exponential number of sets
  - Estimation breaks down with too many sets involved
- c-Cluster Algorithm
  - Estimating Replication level

	c-Cluster(input: P, p_0, $c > 1$, r; output: U)
1	**while** the number of redundant items in P is above the threshold r
2	divide P into pairwise disjoint clusters (subsets of peers) of size c
3	call `AssignData` for each cluster;
4	**for each** $p \in P$, remove from $items(p)$ all the elements that where not assigned to p by the `AssignData`;
5	**end while**
6	call `SendData` to obtain a union plan U for the peers;
7	return U;

Figure 4.1: The `c-Cluster` Algorithm

Experimental Evaluation

- Syntactic results
  - Model settings
    - 3 * 1024 *1024 data items
    - 750k down 75k up adsl cable line
    - Number of peers varied from 2 till 65
- Parameters to tune
  - Cluster size
  - Bloom filter size
  - Replication threshold

Experimental Evaluation

- Comparison Metrics
  - PR
    - Naïve algorithm
      - Send data from the peers in a round robin manner
    - PR = (Plan time + plan creation time)/ naïve time
    - PR-data = (Plan time) / naïve time
  - Error rate
  - Performance vs. optimal where possible

Syntactic results

- C cluster size
  - 2 was chosen due to high bloom filter overhead with larger c sizes
- Bloom filter type and size
  - 25 peers experiment

bloom filter	error rate %	PR
4	3.155	0.15
4 w&c	2.639	0.15
8	0.190	0.20
8 w&c	0.145	0.20
16	0.005	0.28
16 w&c	0.003	0.28

Figure 5.3: Bloom filters of varying sizes

Replication level Threshold



Figure 5.1: PR after each iteration



- 25 peers experiment

Syntactic results



Figure 5.7: Time / optimal plan time

Syntactic results



Figure 5.4: Performance Ratio for growing number of sets

Syntactic results





Syntactic results



Wikipedia results

- Using Wikipedia
  - OR queries over synonyms
  - Same parameters as in the syntactic version



Figure 5.8: PR for varying replication level



Figure 5.9: PR for varying number of synonyms (unioned sets)

WIKIPEDIA RESULTS



Related Work

- Problem Hardness (Yao)
  - Computing set difference requires passing the entire data set
- Practical set reconciliation (Minsky et al)
  - pairwise sets-reconciliation computing a characteristic polynomial
  - Estimating / guessing the set difference size
  - Passing n points, and factorizing and interpolating to find the missing points.
  - Not so practicable in our context (four seconds to compute a 200 object difference)
- Informed content delivery across adaptive overlay networks (byras et al)
  - Creating a tree of bloom filters
  - Solving again the pairwise case mostly
  - Employ erasure codes methods to solve data loss issue.
  - But they have a high error rate.

Future Work

- Pretty vast
  - Real application usage (emule dht?)
  - Dynamic setting
  - Fault tolerance
  - Scalability issues