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ABSTRACT

We aim to improve the accuracy of path selectivity estimation in graph databases by intelligently ordering the domain of a histogram used for estimation. This problem has not, to our knowledge, received adequate attention in the research community. We present a novel framework for the systematic study of path ordering strategies in histogram construction and use. In this framework, we introduce new ordering strategies which we experimentally demonstrate lead to significant improvement of the accuracy of path selectivity estimation over current strategies. These positive results highlight the fundamental role that domain ordering plays in the design of effective histograms for efficient and scalable graph query processing.

1 INTRODUCTION

Analytics on graph-structured data is increasingly important in a variety of domains, e.g., role discovery in social networks, impact analysis in citation networks, functional analysis of biological networks, and querying knowledge graphs. Querying in graph query languages such as openCypher and PGQL is at the heart of these analytics tasks [1, 3, 11]. However, current graph database systems have difficulty in scaling query processing as the size and complexity of graph data collections continue to grow [4, 9].

Towards addressing this challenge, a crucial step in scalability of graph databases is the generation of effective query execution plans. Query optimizers rely on accurate data statistics for cardinality estimation during plan generation. Histograms are among the most widely used data structure for maintaining statistics for cardinality estimation, in particular for relational database systems [5]. However, there has been relatively little work on histograms for graph queries, even for the most basic graph query building block, namely, path queries [6–8, 10].

Our contributions. In this paper, we give an overview of findings in our ongoing investigations into histograms for path selectivity estimation [12]. We focus in particular on ordering strategies for path queries, i.e., how to order the domain over which histograms are built, with the goal of minimizing the variance within histogram buckets (and thereby improving estimation accuracy). We present a novel framework for systematically introducing ordering strategies, showing experimentally that the choice of domain ordering is a fundamental aspect of effective histograms. We introduce new ordering strategies which we demonstrate lead to significant improvement on the accuracy of obtained estimates, over current ordering approaches.

State of the art. The study and efficacy of histogram-based cardinality estimation are well-established [5], e.g., for path and twig query optimization in XML databases [2, 13]. Several studies have also considered path selectivity estimation on graph data with cycles (i.e., beyond trees and DAGs) [6–8, 10]. These works, however, have not investigated histograms or the impact of path ordering on estimation quality. To the best of our knowledge, we present here the first systematic study of this basic aspect of histogram construction and use in graph data management.

2 HISTOGRAMS ON LABEL-PATHS

We investigate selectivity estimation of path queries on graphs. A graph $G$ is composed of a finite set of vertices $V$, a set of edge labels $L$, and a set of directed labeled edges $E \subseteq V \times L \times V$. A $k$-label path is a sequence $\ell = \ell_1/\ldots/\ell_k$, where $\ell_i \in L$, for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. We say $k = |\ell|$ is the length of $\ell$. Viewing $\ell$ as a path query, the evaluation of $\ell$ on $G$ returns the set $\ell(G)$ consisting of all pairs of vertices $(v_1, v_2)$ in $G$ such that there exist vertices $v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_k \in V$ where $v_0 = v$, $v_k = v_2$, and for $0 < i < k$, $(v_{i-1}, v_i) \in E$. The total number of such pairs, i.e., the cardinality of $\ell(G)$, is called the selectivity of $\ell$ on $G$, which we denote by $f(\ell)$.

Let $L^k$ be the set of all label paths over $L$ with length up to $k$.1 An ordering of $L^k$ is a bijection from $L^k$ to integer set $[0, |L^k|)$. Once we establish an ordering on a label path set, a label path can be represented by its positional index in the ordering. For each label path $\ell$, let $\text{index}(\ell)$ denote the index of $\ell$ in the ordering.

A histogram is a mechanism used to provide the approximation of frequency for a given value (point query) or value range (range query) without storing or accessing the complete original data distribution. More precisely, given an attribute $X$, a histogram on this attribute is constructed by partitioning the data distribution of $X$ into $\beta \geq 1$ mutually disjoint subsets called buckets and storing the statistics information and bucket boundaries for each bucket. In this work, attribute $X$, also called the domain of the

1We will let $L$ denote a label path set regardless of $k$ when this does not cause ambiguity.
histogram, is an ordered label path sequence produced by an ordering of $\mathcal{L}^k$. Then, given label path $\ell$ and its index $\text{index}(\ell)$, such a label-path histogram is used to compute an estimate $f(\ell)$ of the selectivity $f(\ell)$. An example of a label-path histogram is shown in Figure 1.

3 ORDERING FRAMEWORK

The purpose of histogram domain reordering is to ensure that label paths with similar cardinality are located close to each other, such that they can be allocated in the same bucket. This leads to lower variance, lower error rates, and overall better quality.

An intuitive and ideal way is to arrange the data distribution such that when $\text{index}(\ell)$ increases, $f(\ell)$ monotonically increases or decreases. The most straightforward, yet not feasible, approach is to sort the label paths by their selectivity and assign the index of each label path as its position in this sequence. This idea is not practical, however, as it requires extra memory to store $|\mathcal{L}|$ index values. The exact amount of memory can also be used to store the cardinality for each label path, such that instead of returning $|\ell|$, we have:

$$\text{dist}(srm, m, \mathcal{L}) = \sum_{j \geq 0} (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} (\text{sr}_{m-j} - \text{sr}_{|\mathcal{L}|-1})$$

In this work, we focus on the approach that takes the edge label set as the base label set, i.e., $B = \mathcal{L}$. We define two bijections: $\text{alph}$ and $\text{card}$. Let $\text{alph}(\ell)$ and $\text{card}(\ell)$ denote the index of edge label $\ell$, which will be referred to as the rank of $\ell$, in the set $\mathcal{L}$ totally ordered by alphabetical order and cardinality, respectively.

3.2 Numerical and Lexicographical Orderings

In numerical ordering, each rank is an integer, and a composition of ranks produces a number in $|B|$-based numeral system. For example, to compare two label paths $\ell_1 = l_1^1/l_1^2/\ldots/l_1^n$ and $\ell_2 = l_2^1/l_2^2/\ldots/l_2^n$, if one is shorter than the other then it has a lower ranking (rule (1) below), otherwise the two paths’ labels are compared pairwise until a pair of different values is found at position $i$ (rule (2) below):

$$\ell_1 < \ell_2 \iff \begin{cases} |\ell_1| < |\ell_2| \quad & |\ell_1| \neq |\ell_2| (1) \\ \text{rank}_{|\mathcal{L}|-i}(\ell_1^i) = \text{rank}_{|\mathcal{L}|-i}(\ell_2^i) \\ (\ell_1^i < \ell_2^i) \quad & |\ell_1| = |\ell_2| (2) \end{cases}$$

Lexicographical ordering is the same as the ordering rule used in dictionaries; it is similar to numerical ordering with the following difference. Instead of comparing lengths of two label paths first, we append $k-|\ell|$ blank symbols (i.e., special symbols for which $\forall \ell \in \mathcal{L}, \text{rank}(\text{blank}) > \text{rank}(\ell)$) to every $\ell$ to form a length-$k$ sequence. We can then apply Formula 2 to compare the resulting label paths. The time complexity of both ranking and unranking functions for numerical and lexicographical orderings is $O(k)$.

3.3 Sum-based Ordering

Given label path $\ell$, the idea of sum-based ordering is to use the sum of ranks of all base labels in $\ell$ to approximate the cardinality of $\ell$. While being conceptually simple, the implementation of this ordering method is not trivial. First, given a path label $\ell$ of length $k$, $\ell$ is split into base labels and an integer rank is computed for each of the base labels to obtain a $k$-length integer permutation. Then, the integer permutation of $\ell$ is mapped to $\text{index}(\ell)$ by performing a three-stage partitioning of a histogram domain as follows.

The first stage partitions the histogram domain according to the length of the integer permutations, with shorter lengths being assigned partitions with lower indexes in the domain. Then, the size of each of the stage-one partitions can be computed by the following formula (where $n$ is the length of the permutation):

$$\text{sum}_n = |\mathcal{L}|^n$$

The second stage performs further division of stage-one partitions by grouping all $m$-length permutations by their summed ranks. Those permutations with lower summed rank will have a lower index within a stage-one partition:

$$\text{sr}_m = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \text{rank}(l_i)$$

To compute the boundaries of each of the stage-two partitions, we need to determine how many label paths are in the group with a certain $m$ and $\text{sr}_m$. This question is the same as how many ways there are to distribute $\text{sr}_m$ indistinguishable balls over $m$ distinguishable bins of finite capacity $|\mathcal{L}|$ with at least one ball in each bin. From combinatorics’ inclusion–exclusion principle we have:

$$\text{dist}(\text{sr}_m, m, \mathcal{L}) = \sum_{j \geq 0} (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} (\text{sr}_m - j - |\mathcal{L}| - 1)$$
The third stage explores combinations inside each of the stage-two partitions marked by length \(m\) and summed rank \(sr_m\). These combinations are all integer partitions of \(sr_m\) into exactly \(m\) parts, where each part is less than \(|L|\). Let integers \(v, b\) represent \(sr_m\) and \(|L|\) respectively. A general formula for integer partition \(ip(v, b, m)\) is as follows:

\[
ip(v, b, m) = \sum_{i=0}^{v/b} ip(v - i \cdot b, m - 1, b - 1, b, \ldots, b)
\]

Based on Formula 4, we present a partitioning algorithm which outputs all combinations in the desired cardinality-based order and has time complexity is \(O(\log(|L|)^2)\) [12].

Finally, to compute the boundaries of each of the stage-three partitions, we need to determine how many permutations we skip when we skip a stage-three partition. This is equivalent to identifying how many permutations can be generated by a certain combination in which there might be duplicates. Let \(C\) denote the combination, \(d_i\) denote the number of times an integer \(i\) occurs in \(C\), then the number of permutations is given by the following formula:

\[
nop(C) = \frac{|C|!}{\prod_{i \in \{0, \ldots, |C|-1\}} d_i!}
\]

Algorithm 1 finds the combination to which the target permutation belongs and has time complexity of \(O(k^2)\).

Algorithm 1 Unranking permutation of combination

1. procedure UNRANKING_PERMUTATION(index, C)
2. if \(i < 0 \lor i \geq \text{nop}(C)\) then
3. return null
4. end if
5. if \(|C| = 1\) then
6. return \([C[0]]\)
7. end if
8. \(i \leftarrow 0\)
9. while \(i < |C|\) do
10. \(S \leftarrow C \cap \{C[i]\}\) \(\triangleright\) subset of \(C\)
11. if \(\text{index} \geq \text{nop}(S)\) then
12. \(\text{index} \leftarrow \text{index} - \text{nop}(S)\)
13. \(i \leftarrow i + \text{count}(C, C[i])\)
14. continue
15. else
16. \(\text{sub} \leftarrow \text{unranking_permutation}(index, S)\)
17. \(\text{sub.add}(0, C[i])\)
18. return \(\text{sub}\)
19. end if
20. end while
21. end procedure

Algorithm 2 illustrates the complete version of unranking permutation in sum-based order and has time complexity of \(O(\log(|L|)^2)\).

### 3.4 Ordering Example

We illustrate the proposed ordering methods with examples on an artificial dataset which has 3 unique edge labels and its label paths set with \(k\) up to 2. Consider the cardinalities 20, 100, and 80 for edge labels “1”, “2”, and “3”, respectively. Then, for the summed ranks shown in Table 1, label paths arranged in the corresponding orderings are shown in Table 2. Respectively, numerical ordering associated with alphabetical ranking, numerical ordering with cardinality ranking, lexicographical ordering with numerical ranking, lexicographical ordering with cardinality ranking, sum-based ordering with cardinality ranking are referred to as num-alph, num-card, lex-alph, lex-card and sum-based.

### 4 EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

We implemented a \(k\)-path histogram construction and path selectivity estimation in Java. All experiments are conducted on a Ubuntu 16.04 machine equipped with an Intel i5 CPU with 4GB of RAM. We use the datasets shown in Table 3. The goal of our experiments is two-fold. First, we verify the impact of different domain ordering techniques on the estimation time. Second, we showcase the gains in estimation accuracy which can be obtained by using sum-based histogram domain ordering.

![Table 1: Summed ranks](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label Path</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>1.3</th>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>3.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summed Ranks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>num-alph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>num-card</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lex-alph</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lex-card</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sum-based</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Table 2: Ordered label paths according to different ordering methods O](image)
Figure 2: Mean error rate of estimation for different domain ordering techniques on V-Optimal $k$-path histogram

Table 3: Datasets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>#Edge Labels</th>
<th>#Vertices</th>
<th>#Edges</th>
<th>Real world data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moreno health$^3$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25379</td>
<td>12969</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBpedia (subgraph)$^4$</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37374</td>
<td>209068</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNAP ER$^5$</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12333</td>
<td>147996</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNAP-FF</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>90002</td>
<td>142073</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Average estimation execution time in V-optimal histogram with different ordering methods (in ms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>Average Estimation Running Time (in ms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>num-alph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27993</td>
<td>9.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15996</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6998</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3499</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>874</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance. We study the execution time of estimation associated with different ordering methods as follows. For $k = 6$, five V-optimal histograms are built, each of which is associated with an ordering method: num-alph, num-card, lex-alph, lex-card, and sum-based. The total number of label paths is 55996. We run 7 experiments by varying the number of buckets ($\beta$) in each histogram. All experiments are executed 100 times and the average estimation time is taken. The results (Table 4) demonstrate that sum-based ordering is approximately 20% slower in estimation than native ordering methods. This is explained by the higher complexity of the sum-based (un)ranking function.

Accuracy. We measure the average estimation accuracy by constructing a V-optimal histogram for each ordering method for varying $k$ and $\beta$ (Figure 2). We use the following $err(f)$ metric to measure the error of an estimation:

$$err(f) = \begin{cases} 0 & e(f) - f(t) \\ \frac{e(f) - f(t)}{max(e(f), f(t))} & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

We observe that, for the synthetic datasets, sum-based ordering provides accuracy which is far superior to other ordering methods, especially, for histograms with a low number of buckets. For the real-life datasets, the performance difference is not as significant, but still observable. This can be explained by the presence of edge-label cardinality correlations in real-life data.

5 CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have reported on initial findings in our ongoing study of domain ordering for improving histogram-based path selectivity estimation. Experimental study has demonstrated the promise of our framework, which facilitates the further systematic study of effective histogram design for graph databases. A primary future research direction is to expand the framework with additional ordering strategies, e.g., those built over richer base sets such as $\mathcal{L}^2$, towards capturing correlations between label paths.
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