## Data Modeling in NoSQL (C\*) -Advanced Big Data Systems

Dr. Rubi Boim

## Happens to the best

- single photo
- world record
- More than 7m follower (24 hours)
- More than 9m likes for that photo (24 hours)

Instagram crashed temporarily



#### In 2019 Jennifer Aniston joined Instagram and posted a

1m followers after 5 hour and 16 minutes from registering







 Each query should be satisfied by one partition denormalization...

videos_by_genre	
genre	K
release_date	▼
video_id	▼

videos_by_id	
video_id	K
release_date	
title	
rating	
duration	
{genres}	



 Each query should be satisfied by one partition denormalization...

videos_by_genre	
genre	K
release_date	▼
video_id	▼

videos_by_id	
video_id	K
release_date	
title	
rating	
duration	
{genres}	

SELECT video id FROM videos by genre WHERE genre = "action" for (video : result) { SELECT \* FROM videos by id WHERE video id = video How many queries can this generate?



 Each query should be satisfied by one partition denormalization...

videos_by_genre	
genre	K
release_date	▼
video_id	▼

videos_by_id	
video_id	K
release_date	
title	
rating	
duration	
{genres}	



videos_by_genre	
genre	K
release_date	▼
video_id	▼
title	
rating	
duration	

 Each query should be satisfied by one partition denormalization...

videos_by_genre	
genre	K
release_date	▼
video_id	▼

videos_by_id	
video_id	K
release_date	
title	
rating	
duration	
{genres}	





videos_by_genre	
genre	K
release_date	▼
video_id	▼
title	
rating	
duration	

## But what happens if the partition is "large"

#### There can be more than 10m rows in this partition

views	_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	▼
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	









\* images by Wikipedia



# But what happens if the partition is "large"

#### There can be more than 10m rows in this partition

views	_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	▼
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	













\* images by Wikipedia

## Large partitions

- Cause performance issues:
  - compactions are slower
  - queries are slower
  - repairs can fail
  - adding more nodes won't help
- Can cause hotspots more on this later
- Data is not distributed evenly throughout the cluster

We need to model differently to avoid

## Large partitions in Cassandra

You can go higher with newer Cassandra versions

 You would need to <u>estimate</u> the size in advance Unless you learn the hard way you have a problem



# Rule of thumb: partition size < 100MB size / 100k rows</li>

#### How to avoid large partitions?

What do you think?

## How to avoid large partitions?

- The solution is easy: split the data into more partitions
- single call

The driver automatically breaks the result into "pages" (default = 5000) even for a single partition



#### When querying, the data is too big anyway for a

## How to avoid large partitions?

- The solution is easy: split the data into more partitions
- single call

The driver automatically breaks the result into "pages" (default = 5000) even for a single partition

## How to split is the name of the game



#### When querying, the data is too big anyway for a

# "Choosing how to partition the data is not trivial,

# it is hard."

views	s_by_user	
user_id	BIGINT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	▼
device	TEXT	
video_id	BIGINT	



views	_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	▼
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	





views	_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	▼
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	







	•	
views	_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	▼
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	



#### It depends on the query we need to answer **AND the data distribution**





- Size limit large partitions causes performance issues
- Over shrinking when querying, it is better to contact 1 partition with 10k rows vs 10k partitions with 1 row
- "Known" partition keys when querying, the values of the partition keys are needed
- Hot spots undistributed writes/reads causes performance issues
- Tombstones too much deletes within a partition causes performance issues

• Size limit large partitions causes performance issues



• Size limit large partitions causes performance issues

views	s_by_video			
video_id	BIGINT	K		
view_id	TIMEUUID		10m \	/Iew
device	TEXT			

single video

#### Over shrinking when querying, it is better to contact 1 partition with 10k rows vs 10k partitions with 1 row



#### Over shrinking <u>when querying</u>, it is better to contact 1 partition with 10k rows vs 10k partitions with 1 row

view	s_by_time	
year	INT	K
month	INT	K
day	INT	K
hour	INT	K
minute	INT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	▼
video_id	BIGINT	
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	





#### <u>NOTE</u>

It does not mean you should always partition by day and not by minute.

Sometimes you would need to partition by 12 seconds

remember: AND the data distribution



#### "Known" partition keys when querying, the values of the partition keys are needed



#### "Known" partition keys when querying, the values of the partition keys are needed

view	s_by_view	
iew_id	TIMEUUID	K
video_id	BIGINT	
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	

now the view\_id values?

#### Hot spots undistributed writes/reads causes performance issues

view	s_by_time		
year	INT	K	During each d
nonth	INT	K	
day	INT	K	• Assuming a 10
/iew_id	TIMEUUID	▼	
ideo_id	BIGINT		
device	TEXT		
user_id	BIGINT		

• Hot spots undistributed writes/reads causes performance issues

- y only 1 node handles all the writes
- node cluster, 9999 server are unused (CPU & Storage)





#### Tombstones

too much deletes within a partition causes performance issues

-	eues		A queue f
queue_name	TEXT	K	Once a ta
task_id	TIMEUUID		
task_desc	TEXT		Recall - d

#### Tombstones too much deletes within a partition causes performance issues

naging tasks (FIFO) done, it is deleted from the queue

gc\_grace\_seconds (10 days):

er 1k tombstones sh after 100k tombstones

## Again - this is important!

- Size limit large partitions causes performance issues
- Over shrinking when querying, it is better to contact 1 partition with 10k rows vs 10k partitions with 1 row
- "Known" partition keys when querying, the values of the partition keys are needed
- Hot spots undistributed writes/reads causes performance issues
- Tombstones too much deletes within a partition causes performance issues



#### **Splitting strategies**

 One is not better or worse than the other only more suitable to a specific example and data distribution

model to each different problem

#### You can NOT satisfy all requirements for any strategy

# Goal: learn different strategies and match the best

views	5_K
video_id	
view_id	Τ
device	
user_id	

y_video	
BIGINT	K
IMEUUID	
TEXT	
BIGINT	

Note - the query needed is "by video" although we add more partition keys

views	_k
video_id	
view_id	Τ
device	
user_id	

y_video	
BIGINT	K
IMEUUID	
TEXT	
BIGINT	

video_id	BIGINT	
view_id	TIMEUUID 🔻	7
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	
	$\mathbf{I}$	
views	by video	
views	_by_video	
<b>views</b> video_id	<b>by_video</b> BIGINT	K
<b>views</b> video_id view_id	<b>by_video</b> BIGINT TIMEUUID	K
video_id view_id device	<b>by_video</b> BIGINT TIMEUUID TEXT	K

views_	_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
user_id	BIGINT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	▼
device	TEXT	



VS

views	_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
device	TEXT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	
user_id	BIGINT	

BIGINT	K
TIMEUUID	
TEXT	
BIGINT	
$\mathbf{I}$	
_by_video	
<b>by_video</b> BIGINT	K
<b>by_video</b> BIGINT TIMEUUID	K
<b>by_video</b> BIGINT TIMEUUID TEXT	K
	BIGINT TIMEUUID TEXT BIGINT

VS

views	_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
user_id	BIGINT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	
device	TEXT	
size li over s know hot sp tombs	mit shrinking n partitions oots stones	



VS

views	s_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
device	TEXT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	▼
user_id	BIGINT	
video_id	BIGINT	K
-------------------------------------	---	------------
view_id	TIMEUUID	
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	
	$\mathbf{I}$	
views	_by_video	
<b>views</b> video_id	<b>_by_video</b> BIGINT	ı <b>k</b>
<b>views</b> video_id view_id	_ <b>by_video</b> BIGINT TIMEUUID	) <b>k</b>
video_id view_id device	_by_video BIGINT TIMEUUIC TEXT	. <b>k</b>

VS

views	_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
user_id	BIGINT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	
device	TEXT	
<ul> <li>size li</li> <li>over s</li> <li>know</li> <li>hot s</li> <li>tomb</li> </ul>	imit shrinking n partitions pots stones	



views	s_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
device	TEXT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	▼
user_id	BIGINT	



VS

views	_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
user_id	BIGINT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	▼
device	TEXT	
<ul> <li>size limit</li> <li>over shrinking</li> <li>known partitions</li> <li>hot spots</li> <li>tombstones</li> </ul>		

y_video	
BIGINT	K
IMEUUID	K
TEXT	
BIGINT	

views	s_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
device	TEXT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	
user_id	BIGINT	



VS

views	_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
user_id	BIGINT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	
device	TEXT	
<ul> <li>size I</li> <li>over</li> <li>know</li> <li>hot s</li> <li>tomb</li> </ul>	imit shrinking n partitions pots stones	

y_video	
BIGINT	Κ
IMEUUID	K
TEXT	
BIGINT	

views	s_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
device	TEXT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	
user_id	BIGINT	



VS

views	_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
user_id	BIGINT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	
device	TEXT	
<ul> <li>size I</li> <li>over</li> <li>know</li> <li>hot s</li> <li>tomb</li> </ul>	imit shrinking n partitions pots stones	

y_video	
BIGINT	K
IMEUUID	K
TEXT	
BIGINT	

views	s_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
device	TEXT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	
user_id	BIGINT	
size over knov hot s tomb	limit shrinking vn partitions spots ostones	



VS

views	_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
user_id	BIGINT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	
device	TEXT	
<ul> <li>size I</li> <li>over</li> <li>know</li> <li>hot s</li> <li>tomb</li> </ul>	imit shrinking n partitions pots stones	

y_video	
BIGINT	K
IMEUUID	K
TEXT	
BIGINT	

views	_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
device	TEXT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	▼
user_id	BIGINT	
		_
<ul> <li>size li</li> <li>over si</li> <li>know</li> <li>hot si</li> <li>tomb</li> </ul>	imit shrinking n partitions pots stones	

views	s_k
video_id	
view_id	Τ
device	
user_id	

y_video	
BIGINT	K
IMEUUID	
TEXT	
BIGINT	

\ \	/Iews_	_k
videc	_id	
view_	_id	Τ
devic	e	
user_	id	

views	_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
year	INT	K
month	INT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	

y_video	
BIGINT	K
IMEUUID	
TEXT	
BIGINT	

V	iews_l
video_	_id
view_	id I
device	Э
user_i	d

views_by_video		
video_id	BIGINT	K
year	INT	K
month	INT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	





_by_video	
BIGINT <mark>k</mark>	
TIMEUUID 🔻	
TEXT	
BIGINT	
_by_video	
BIGINT	K
INT	K
INT	K
INT	K
TIMEUUID	▼
TEXT	
BIGINT	
	BIGINT K TIMEUUID ▼ TEXT BIGINT BIGINT BIGINT BIGINT INT INT INT TIMEUUID TEXT BIGINT

-		
views_	_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
year	INT	K
month	INT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	▼
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	

views	_by_video
video_id	BIGINI
view_id	TIMEUUII
device	TEXI
user_id	BIGINI
views	_by_vide
video_id	BIGI
video_id year	BIGI
video_id year month	BIGI
video_id year month day	BIGI
video_id year month day view_id	BIGI
video_id year month day view_id device	BIGI I I TIMEUU TE

views_by_video		
video_id	BIGINT	K
year	INT	K
month	INT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	▼
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	



We can have the same problem. How can we solve it <u>without the</u> need to change the <u>schema each time?</u>

### **Option 2 - split with artifi**

	video_id	
	view_id	Τ
	device	
	user_id	
	-	
	VIEWS	_K
vi	deo_id	
ye	ear	
m	onth	
da	ау	
vi	ew_id	ſ
de	evice	
us	ser id	

views_by_video		
video_id	BIGINT	K
year	INT	K
month	INT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	▼
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	



video_id	BIGINT K	
view_id	TIMEUUID 🔻	
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	
	$\mathbf{I}$	
views	_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
year	INT	K
month	INT	K
day	INT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	

views_by_video		
video_id	BIGINT	K
year	INT	K
month	INT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	▼
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	



views	_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
ts_partition	TIMESTAMP	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	
size limit over shrinking known partitions hot spots tombstones		

BIGINT K	
TIMEUUID 🔻	
TEXT	
BIGINT	
$\mathbf{I}$	
_by_video	
BIGINT	k
INT	k
INT	k
INT	k
TIMEUUID	
TEXT	
	BIGINT K TIMEUUID V TEXT BIGINT <b>by_video</b> BIGINT BIGINT INT INT INT TIMEUUID TEXT

views_by_video		
video_id	BIGINT	K
year	INT	K
month	INT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	▼
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	





For most days ok, except aired date of new episodes





views	_by_video	
video_id	BIGINT	K
year	INT	K
month	INT	K
view_id	TIMEUUID	
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	

	y_video
K	BIGINT
K	INT
K	INT
K	INT
	TIMEUUID
	TEXT
	BIGINT

For most days ok, except aired date of new episodes



views	_b
video_id	
view_id	T
device	
user_id	

y_video	
BIGINT	K
IMEUUID	
TEXT	
BIGINT	

views_	_b
video_id	
view_id	Τ
device	
user_id	

- Start with bucket 0.
- If more than X (50k?) views, advance to bucket 1

. . .

y_video	
BIGINT	K
IMEUUID	
TEXT	
BIGINT	

video\_id

view\_id

device

user\_id

Start with bucket 0.

• If more than X (50k?) views, advance to bucket 1

. . .

views_	b
video_id	
bucket	
view_id	Γ
device	
user_id	

views_by_v	/[
video_id	
buckets	
views	

This table will help us "count" the number of view per bucket



video\_id

view\_id

device

user\_id

Start with bucket 0.

• If more than X (50k?) views, advance to bucket 1

. . .

views_	b
video_id	
bucket	
view_id	Γ
device	
user_id	

views_by_v	/[
video_id	
buckets	
views	

This table will help us "count" the number of view per bucket



size limit over shrinking known partitions hot spots tombstones

video\_id

view\_id

device

user\_id

Start with bucket 0.

• If more than X (50k?) views, advance to bucket 1

. . .

views_	b
video_id	
bucket	
view_id	Γ
device	
user_id	

views_by_v	/[
video_id	
buckets	
views	

This table will help us "count" the number of view per bucket



Pros

- Guaranteed max size
- Can grow without a limit
- When queuing optimized for the number of calls
  we do not have "small" partitions
- Ordered by TS across all partitions (only if we always add "new" data)

### Cons

- If we add "old" data, the TS is NOT ordered across all partitions
- We can NOT "find" a specific event as we do not know on which partition the data is saved in the example - we can NOT know if a specific view\_id exists without reading all partitions

τ		IJ

V	L	e	V	V	S
W	•	$\mathbf{}$	•	•	$\mathbf{}$



	viev	vs_b
vide	o_id	
view	_id	ΤI
devi	се	
user	_id	

y_video	
BIGINT	K
IMEUUID	
TEXT	
BIGINT	

views_	_K
video_id	
view_id	Τ
device	
user_id	
L	

- Decide on max partition size (1000?)
- •Use a "hash function" to distribute the data evenly across the partition

y_video	
BIGINT	Κ
IMEUUID	
TEXT	
BIGINT	

views\_

video\_id

view\_id

device

user\_id

- Decide on max partition size (1000?)
- •Use a "hash function" to distribute the data evenly across the partition

views	_b
video_id	
partition	
view_id	-
device	
user_id	

oy_video
BIGINT <mark>k</mark>
IMEUUID 🔻
TEXT
BIGINT
y_video
BIGINT
INT
TIMEUUID
TEXT
BIGINT

- Decide on max partition size (1000?)
- •Use a "hash function" to distribute the data evenly across the partition
- •For example modulo: partition = user\_id % 1000

views_by_video		
video_id	BIGINT K	
view_id	TIMEUUID 🔻	
device	TEXT	
user_id	BIGINT	
	$\mathbf{\downarrow}$	
views	_by_video	
<b>views</b> video_id	<b>by_video</b> BIGINT	K
<b>views</b> video_id partition	<b>by_video</b> BIGINT INT	K
<b>views</b> video_id partition view_id	<b>by_video</b> BIGINT INT TIMEUUID	K K
<b>views</b> video_id partition view_id device	<b>by_video</b> BIGINT INT TIMEUUID TEXT	K K

views

video\_id

view\_id

device

user\_id

- Decide on max partition size (1000?)
- •Use a "hash function" to distribute the data evenly across the partition
- •For example modulo: partition = user\_id % 1000



oy_video	
BIGINT <mark>K</mark>	
IMEUUID 🔻	
TEXT	
BIGINT	
	-
oy_video	
BIGINT	K
INT	K
TIMEUUID	▼
TEXT	
BIGINT	

### Data is distributed evenly

- Decide on max partition size (1000?)
- •Use a "hash function" to distribute the data evenly across the partition
- •For example modulo: partition = user id % 1000

views_	_b
video_id	
partition	
view_id	-
device	
user_id	

video\_id

view\_id

device

user\_id



- Decide on max partition size (1000?)
- •Use a "hash function" to distribute the data evenly across the partition
- •For example modulo: partition = user id % 1000

views_	_b
video_id	
partition	
view_id	-
device	
user_id	

video\_id

view\_id

device

user\_id







size limit over shrinking known partitions hot spots tombstones

Not all videos need the same partition size

- Decide on max partition size (1000?)
- •Use a "hash function" to distribute the data evenly across the partition
- •For example modulo: partition = user id % 1000

views_	_b
video_id	
partition	
view_id	-
device	
user_id	

video\_id

view\_id

device

user\_id



- Decide on max partition size (1000?)
- •Use a "hash function" to distribute the data evenly across the partition
- •For example modulo: partition = user id % 1000

views_	_b
video_id	
partition	
view_id	-
device	
user_id	

video\_id

view\_id

device

user\_id



video\_id view\_id T device user\_id

y_video	
BIGINT	K
IMEUUID	
TEXT	
BIGINT	

views_l
video_id
view_id T
device
user_id

- •Variable max partition size per video
- •Use a "hash function" to distribute the data evenly across the partition (with special logic)

y_video	
BIGINT	K
IMEUUID	
TEXT	
BIGINT	

 Variable max partition size per video

•Use a "hash function" to distribute the data evenly across the partition (with special logic)

views_	b
video_id	
partition	
view_id	]
device	
user_id	

video\_id

view\_id

device

user\_id





 Variable max partition size per video

•Use a "hash function" to distribute the data evenly across the partition (with special logic)

views_	b
video_id	
partition	
view_id	]
device	
user_id	



 Variable max partition size per video

•Use a "hash function" to distribute the data evenly across the partition (with special logic)

views_	b
video_id	
partition	
view_id	]
device	
user_id	



![](_page_69_Picture_6.jpeg)

 Variable max partition size per video

•Use a "hash function" to distribute the data evenly across the partition (with special logic)

views_	b
video_id	
partition	
view_id	]
device	
user_id	

![](_page_70_Picture_4.jpeg)

```
We want to support the option to "transition" state
from "normal" to "poplar"
-> we need to use "different" partitions for each state
in order to "reinsert" the data on "transition"
"Normal" videos:
   partition total = -1
"Popular" videos:
   partition total = user id % 1000
"Super popular" videos:
   partition total = 10000 + (user id % 10000)
```

distribute the data evening across the partition (with special logic)

video\_id partitions\_total

![](_page_71_Figure_3.jpeg)
We want to support the option to "transition" state from "normal" to "poplar"

—> we need to use "different" partitions for each state in order to "reinsert" the data on "transition"

"Normal" videos: partition total = -1"Popular" videos: partition total = user id % 1000 "Super popular" videos: partition total = 10000 + (user id % 10000)

distribute the data evening across the partition (with special logic)





# Why did Instagram crushed?

- Instagram has different write paths for "top users" that is, different data models and different app logic
- There is an application logic that transition a user from a "regular" user to a "top user"
- The (regular) data model used did not scaled

- speculation
- \*2 more info on "data modeling examples"



## **Splitting strategies - reminder**

 One is not better or worse than the other only more suitable to a specific example and data distribution



## When sharing is not enough...



Q Search Sharding the Shards: Managing Datastore Locality at Scale with Akkio Paper #371 in this paper. This is because cross-datacenter communi-Akkio is a locality management service layered between cation latencies are an order of magnitude higher than client applications and distributed datastore systems. It intra-datacenter communication latencies; e.g. 100ms determines how and when to migrate data to reduce re- vs. Ims. Moreover, the amount of communication bandsponse times and resource usage. Akkio primarily tar- width available between datacenters is often limited, gets multi-datacenter geo-distributed datastore systems. which can lead to communication bottlenecks if band-Its design was motivated by the observation that many of width is not used judiciously. Locality management can Facebook's frequently accessed datasets have low R/W also play an important role in reducing cross-datacenter ratios and not well served by distributed caches or full bandwidth and storage infrastructure needs. replication. Akkio's unit of migration is called a p-shard. In this paper, we present Akkio, a locality manage-Each µ-shard is designed to contain related data with ment service for distributed datastore systems whose aim some degree of access locality. At Facebook, µ-shards is to improve data access response times and to reduce resource requirements. Akkio decides where to place Akkio went into production at Facebook in 2014, and how and when to migrate data within operating enviand it currently manages ~100PB of data. Measure- ronments involving geographically distributed datacenments from Facebook's production environment show ters.<sup>1</sup> It migrates data at relatively fine granularity (in that Akkio reduces read and write latencies by up to 50%, units sized between 100 bytes to a few megabytes), and cross-datacenter traffic by up to 50% and storage foot- it can operate at scale. Akkio has been in production print by upto 40% in several scenarios. Akkio is scal- use at Facebook since 2014, where it currently manages able: many 10's of millions of data access requests per ~100PB of data and processes many tens of millions of second can be processed. Akkio is portable: it currently data accesses per second. Some distinguishing features of Akkio are as follows. 💠 🖬 🗖 🚼 CC Cassandra solves Optimal Data Placement for Instagram's Global Scale | DataStax Accelerate 2019

Only if you are a "data nerd"...

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Sr0sX-Tld-g

