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Motivation

- Filtering engine is the heart of pub-sub systems
  - Used to deliver news, blog updates, stock data, etc
- XML is standard format for data exchange
  - Powerful enough to capture message value as well as its structure using XPath
- Growing volume of information requires exploring massively parallel high-performance approaches for XML filtering
Related work (software)

- **XFilter (VLDB 2000)**
  - Creates separate FSM for each query

- **YFilter (TODS 2003)**
  - Combines individual paths, creates single NFA

- **LazyDFA (TODS 2004)**
  - Uses deterministic FSMs

- **XPush (SIGMOD 2003)**
  - Lazily constructs deterministic pushdown automaton

FSM-based approaches
Related work (software)

- FiST (VLDB 2005)
  - Converts XML document into Prüfer sequences and matches respective sequences

- XTrie (VLDB 2002)
  - Uses Trie-based index to match query prefix

- AFilter (VLDB 2006)
  - Leverages prefix as well as suffix query indexes
Related work (hardware)

- “Accelerating XML query matching through custom stack generation on FPGAs” (HiPEAC 2010)
  - Introduced dynamic-programming XML path filtering approach for FPGAs
- “Massively parallel XML twig filtering using dynamic programming on FPGAs” (ICDE 2011)
  - Extended algorithm to support holistic twig filtering on FPGAs
- “Efficient XML path filtering using GPUs” (ADMS 2011)
  - Modified original approach to perform path filtering on GPUs
Why GPUs

- This work proposes holistic XML twig filtering algorithm, which runs on GPUs
- Why GPUs?
  - Highly scalable, massively parallel architecture
  - Flexibility as for software XML filtering engines
- Why not FPGAs?
  - Limited scalability due to scarce hardware resources available on the chip
  - Lack of query dynamicity - need time to reconfigure FPGA hardware implementation
XML Document Preprocessing

- To be able to run algorithm in streaming mode, XML tree structure needs to be flattened.
- XML document is presented as a stream of open(tag) and close(tag) events.

XML Document

```
open(a) – open(b) –
open(c) – close(c) – ...
close(b) – open(d) – ...
close(d) – close(a)
```

Event Stream
Twig Filtering: approach

- Twig processing contains two steps
  - Matching individual root-to-leaf paths
  - Report matches back to root, while joining them at split nodes
Dynamic programming: algorithm

- Every query is mapped to DP table
- DP table - binary stack
- Each node in query is mapped to stack column
- Every column has prefix pointer
- Open and close events map to push and pop actions on the top-of-the-stack (TOS)
Dynamic programming: stacks

- Two different types of stack are used for different parts of filtering algorithm: push stack (for matching root-to-leaf paths) and pop stack (for propagating leaf matches back to root)
- TOS values of push stack are updated only during open events
- TOS values of pop stack are updated both on open and close events (overwrite existing information)
Push stack: Example

XML Document

- Dummy root node (‘$’) is always matched in the beginning
- ‘1’ is propagated diagonally upwards if
  - Prefix holds ‘1’
  - Relationship with prefix is ‘/’
  - Open event tag matches column tag
Push stack: Example

XML Document

- If query node tag is wildcard (‘*’) then any tag in open event qualifies to be matched.
- Since ‘/*’ is a leaf node matched this fact is saved in special binary array.
Push stack: Example

XML Document

- '1' propagates upwards in prefix column if
  - Prefix holds '1'
  - Relationship with prefix is '//' (prefix holds '1')
  - Tag in open event could be arbitrary

Open(b)

TOS
Push stack: Example

XML Document

If ‘1’ propagated to query leaf node (‘//c’ in example) is saved as matched
Push stack: Example

XML Document

Node ‘/d’ is not updated, since ‘/a’ is a split node, whose children have different relationships (‘//’ with ‘c’ and ‘/’ with ‘d’)

Split node maintain different fields for these two kinds of children
Pop stack: Example

XML Document

- Leaf nodes contain ‘1’ if this node has saved in match node array during 1st algorithm phase
- ‘1’ is propagated diagonally downwards if:
  - Node holds ‘1’ on TOS
  - Relationship with prefix is ‘/’
  - Close event tag matches column tag or column tag is ‘*’ (shown in example)
Pop stack: Example

XML Document

- ‘1’ is propagates downwards in descendant node if
  - Node holds ‘1’ on TOS
  - Relationship with prefix is ‘//’
  - Close event tag matches column tag

Close(c)
Pop stack: Example

XML Document

- Split node (‘/a’ in example) is matched only if all its children propagate ‘1’

- As with push stack split node has two separate fields for children with ‘/’ and ‘//’ relationships

- Final match is obtained by and’ing these fields
Pop stack: Example

XML Document

Full query is matched if dummy root node reports match

Close(a)
GPU Architecture

- SM is a multicore processor, consisting of multiple SPs
- SPs execute the same instructions (kernel)
- SPs within SM communicate through small fast Smem
- Block is a logical set of threads, scheduled on SPs within SM
Filtering Parallelism on GPUs

- **Intra-query parallelism**
  - Each stack column on TOS is independently evaluated in parallel on SP

- **Inter-query parallelism**
  - Queries scheduled parallely on different SMs

- **Inter-document parallelism**
  - Filtering several XML documents as a time using concurrent GPU kernels (co-scheduling kernels with different input parameters)
XML Event & Stack Entry Encoding

- XML document is preprocessed and transferred to the GPU as a stream of byte-long events
- Event streams reside in global memory
GPU Kernel Personality Encoding

- Each GPU kernel maps to one query node.
- Kernel receives the description of this node as an input parameter, called *personality*.
- Query parser creates personalities.
- Once personality is received, it is stored in GPU registers.

**GPU personality**

- **isLeaf**: 1 bit
- **prefix relation**: 1 bit
- **children with ‘/’**: 1 bit
- **children with ‘//’**: 1 bit
- **prefixID**: 10 bits
- **tagID**: 7 bits

24 bits
Stack entry Encoding

- To address semantics of the split node, having children with different types of relationship we need to have 2 fields within stack entry
- Stacks reside in shared memory
GPU Optimizations

- Physically merging push and pop stacks to save shared memory
- Coalescing global memory reads/writes
- Caching XML stream items in shared memory
  - Reading stream in chunks by looping in strided manner, since XML stream cannot be placed in shared memory as a whole
- Avoiding usage of atomic functions
  - Calling non-atomic analogs in separate thread
Experiment Setup

- GPU experiments
  - NVidia Tesla C2075 (Fermi architecture), 448 cores
  - NVidia Tesla K20 (Kepler architecture), 2496 cores

- Software filtering experiments
  - YFilter filtering engine
  - Dual 6-core 2.30GHz Intel Xeon E5 machine with 30 GB of RAM
Experiment Datasets

- DBLP XML dataset
  - Chunks of varied size 32kB-2MB from original dataset
  - Synthetic documents of size 25kB
  - Maximum XML depth - 10

- Queries, generated by YFilter XPath generator with varied parameters
  - Query size: 5, 10 and 15 nodes
  - Number of split points: 1, 3 and 6
  - Probability of ‘*’ node and ‘//’ relation 10%, 30%, 50%
  - Number of queries 32-2k
Experiment Results: Throughput

- GPU throughput (for 1MB document) is constant until “breaking” point – point where all GPU cores are occupied.

- Number of occupied cores depends on number of queries and query length.
**Experiment Results: Speedup**

- GPU speedup depends on XML document size: larger docs incur greater global memory read latency
- Speedup up to 9x
- ‘*’ and ‘//’-probability affects speedup since it increases YFilter NFA size
Batch Experiments

- Batched experiments filter multiple XML documents
  - Shows usage of intra-document parallelism
  - Batches of size 500 and 1000 were used
- It is not fair to compare against single-threaded Yfilter in batch experiments
- “Pseudo”- multicore YFilter version: distributes document load across different copies of program
  - Could not be done for query load, would affect NFA size
Batch Experiments: Throughput

- No breaking point – GPU is always fully occupied by concurrently executing kernels

- Throughput increased up to 16 times in comparison with single-document case

![Graph showing throughput vs number of queries]

- Tesla K20, query length 5
- Tesla C2075, query length 5
- Tesla K20, query length 10
- Tesla C2075, query length 10
- Tesla K20, query length 15
- Tesla C2075, query length 15
Batch Experiments: Speedup

- GPU fully utilized – increase in query length number yields speedup drop by factor of 2
- Achieve up to 16x speedup with slowdown after 512 queries
- Multicore version performs better than ordinary
Conclusions

- Proposed holistic twig filtering using GPUs, effectively leveraging GPU parallelism
- Allowed processing of thousands of queries and dynamic query updates (vs. FPGA)
- Up to 9x speedup over software systems in single-document experiments
- Up to 16x speedup over software systems in batch experiments
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