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## Unit Outline

$\triangleright$ Minimizing disk I/O
$\triangleright \mathrm{B}^{+}$-Tree properties
$\triangleright$ Implementing $\mathrm{B}^{+}$-Tree insert

## Learning Goals

$\triangleright$ Describe the structure, navigation and time complexity of a $B^{+}$-Tree.
$\triangleright$ Insert keys into a $\mathrm{B}^{+}$-Tree.
$\triangleright$ Relate $M, L$, the number of nodes, and the height of a $\mathrm{B}^{+}$-Tree.
$\triangleright$ Compare and contrast $\mathrm{B}^{+}$-Trees with other data structures.
$\triangleright$ Justify why the number of I/Os becomes a more appropriate complexity measure (than the number of CPU operations) when dealing with large datasets and their indexing structures (e.g., $\mathrm{B}^{+}$-Trees).
$\triangleright$ Explain the difference between a B -Tree and a $\mathrm{B}^{+}$-Tree.

## Memory Hierarchy

Why worry about the number of disk I/Os?


## Time Cost: Processor to Disk

## Processor

$\triangleright$ Operates at a few GHz (gigahertz $=$ billion cycles per second).
$\triangleright$ Several instructions per cycle.
$\triangleright$ Average time per instruction $<1$ ns (nanosecond $=10^{-9}$ seconds).

Disk
$\triangleright$ Seek time $\approx 10 \mathrm{~ms}$ ( $\mathrm{ms}=$ millisecond $=10^{-3}$ seconds)
$\triangleright$ (Solid State Drives have "seek time" $\approx 0.1 \mathrm{~ms}$.)
Result: 10 million instructions for each disk read!
Hold on. . . How long does it take to read a 1TB (Terabyte $=10^{12}$
bytes) disk? $1 \mathrm{~TB} \times 10 \mathrm{~ms}=10$ billion seconds $>300$ years?
What's wrong? Each disk read/write moves more than a byte.

## Memory Blocks

Each memory access to a slower level of the hierarchy fetches a block of data.

Block Size


A block is the contents of consecutive memory locations. So random access between levels of the hierarchy is very slow.

## Chopping Trees into Blocks

Idea
Store data for many adjacent nodes in consecutive memory locations.


## Result

One memory block access provides keys to determine many (more than two) search directions.

## $M$-ary Search Tree


$M$-ary tree property
$\triangleright$ Each node has $\leq M$ children
Result: Complete tree with $n$ nodes has height $\Theta\left(\log _{M} n\right)$
Search tree property
$\triangleright$ Each node has $\leq M-1$ search keys: $k_{1}<k_{2}<k_{3} \ldots$
$\triangleright$ All keys $k$ in $i$ th subtree obey $k_{i} \leq k<k_{i+1}$ for $i=0,1, \ldots$.
Disk I/O (runtime) for find:

## $\mathrm{B}^{+}$-Trees

$\mathrm{B}^{+}$-Trees of order $M$ are specialized $M$-ary search trees:
$\triangleright$ ALL leaves are at the same depth!
$\triangleright$ Internal nodes have between $\lceil M / 2\rceil$ and $M$ children.
$\triangleright$ Values are stored only at leaves. Search keys in internal nodes only direct traffic. B-Trees store (key, value) pairs at internal nodes.
$\triangleright$ Leaves hold between $\lceil L / 2\rceil$ and $L$ (key, value) pairs.
$\triangleright$ The root is special. If internal, it has between 2 and $M$ children. If a leaf, it holds at most $L$ (key, value) pairs.

## Result

$\triangleright$ Height is $\Theta\left(\log _{M} n\right)$
$\triangleright$ Insert, delete, find visit $\Theta\left(\log _{M} n\right)$ nodes
$\triangleright M$ and $L$ are chosen so that each node fills one page of memory. Each node visit (disk I/O) retrieves about $M / 2$ to $M$ keys or $L / 2$ to $L$ (key, value) pairs at a time.

## $\mathrm{B}^{+}$-Tree Nodes

Internal node with $i$ search keys

left sibling $\longleftrightarrow$| 1 | 2 | $i$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $k_{1}$ | $k_{2}$ | $\cdots$ | $k_{i}$ | $\emptyset$ | $\cdots$ | $\emptyset$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |$\longrightarrow$ right sibling

$\triangleright i+1$ subtree pointers
$\triangleright$ parent and left \& right sibling pointers
Leaf with $j$ (key, value) pairs

left sibling -|  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $k_{1}$ | $k_{2}$ | $\ldots$ | $k_{j}$ |  |  |  |
| $v_{1}$ | $v_{2}$ | $\cdots$ | $v_{j}$ | $\emptyset$ | $\cdots$ |  |$\rightarrow$ right sibling

$\triangleright$ parent and left \& right sibling pointers
$\triangleright$ values may be pointers to disk records
Each node may hold a different number of items.

## Example $\mathrm{B}^{+}$-Tree with $M=4$ and $L=4$



Values in leaf nodes are not shown.

## Making a $\mathrm{B}^{+}$-Tree



The root is a leaf.
What happens when we now insert(1)?

## Splitting the Root



Too many keys for one leaf!
So, make a new leaf and create a parent (the new root) for both. Why are there duplicate 14 keys?

## Splitting a Leaf



insert(26) causes too many keys for the | 14 | 59 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| leaf. |  |

So, make a new leaf and copy the middle key (the smallest key in the new leaf holding the larger keys) up to the common parent.

## Propagating Splits



Split the internal node Add a new parent Move key 14 up

insert(5) causes too many keys for | 1 | 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | leaf.

Copy up key 5 causes too many keys for 1459 node.
So, make a new internal node and move up the middle key.

## Insertion Algorithm

1. Insert (key, value) pair in its leaf.
2. If the leaf now has $L+1$ pairs: // overflow
$\triangleright$ Split the leaf into two leaves:
$\triangleright$ Original holds the $\lceil(L+1) / 2\rceil$ small key pairs.
$\triangleright$ New one holds the $\lfloor(L+1) / 2\rfloor$ large key pairs.
$\triangleright$ Copy smallest key in new leaf (the middle key) up to parent.
3. If an internal node now has $M$ keys: // overflow
$\triangleright$ Split the node into two nodes:
$\triangleright$ Original holds the $\lceil(M-1) / 2\rceil$ small keys.
$\triangleright$ New one holds the $\lfloor(M-1) / 2\rfloor$ large keys.
$\triangleright$ If root, hang the new nodes under a new root. Done.
$\triangleright$ Move the remaining middle key up to parent \& goto 3.
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