Wormhole: A Fast Ordered Index for In-memory Data Management

Xingbo Wu
University of Illinois at Chicago
wuxb@uic.edu

Fan Ni
University of Texas at Arlington
fan.ni@mavs.uta.edu

Song Jiang
University of Texas at Arlington
song.jiang@uta.edu

ABSTRACT

In-memory data management systems, such as key-value stores, have become an essential infrastructure in today's big-data processing and cloud computing. They rely on efficient index structures to access data. While unordered indexes, such as hash tables, can perform point search with $O(1)$ time, they cannot be used in many scenarios where range queries must be supported. Many ordered indexes, such as B+ tree and skip list, have a $O(\log N)$ lookup cost, where N is number of keys in an index. For an ordered index hosting billions of keys, it may take more than 30 key-comparisons in a lookup, which is an order of magnitude more expensive than that on a hash table. With availability of large memory and fast network in today's data centers, this $O(\log N)$ time is taking a heavy toll on applications that rely on ordered indexes.

In this paper we introduce a new ordered index structure, named *Wormhole*, that takes $O(\log L)$ worst-case time for looking up a key with a length of L. The low cost is achieved by simultaneously leveraging strengths of three indexing structures, namely hash table, prefix tree, and B+ tree, to orchestrate a single fast ordered index. Wormhole's range operations can be performed by a linear scan of a list after an initial lookup. This improvement of access efficiency does not come at a price of compromised space efficiency. Instead, Wormhole's index space is comparable to those of B+ tree and skip list. Experiment results show that Wormhole outperforms skip list, B+ tree, ART, and Masstree by up to 8.4×, 4.9×, 4.3×, and 6.6× in terms of key lookup throughput, respectively.

1 INTRODUCTION

A common approach to building a high-performance data management system is to host all of its data and metadata in the main memory [25, 32, 39, 43]. However, when expensive I/O operations are removed (at least from the critical path), index operations become a major source of the system's cost, reportedly consuming 14–94% of query execution time in today's in-memory databases [17]. Recent studies have proposed many optimizations to improve them with a major focus on hash-table-based key-value (KV) systems, including efforts on avoiding chaining in hash tables, improving memory access through cache prefetching, and exploiting parallelism with fine-grained locking [10, 21, 35]. With these efforts the performance of index lookup can be pushed close to the hardware's limit, where each lookup needs only one or two memory accesses to reach the requested data [21].

Unfortunately, the $O(1)$ lookup performance and benefits of the optimizations are not available to ordered indexes used in important applications, such as B+ tree in LMDB [25], and skip list in LevelDB [20]. Ordered indexes are required to support range operations, though the indexes can be (much) more expensive than hash tables supporting only point operations. Example range operations include searching for all keys in a given key range or for keys of a common prefix. It has been proved that lookup cost in a comparison-based ordered index is $O(\log N)$ key comparisons, where N is the number of keys in the index [9]. As an example, in a B+ tree of one million keys a lookup requires about 20 key comparisons on average. When the B+ tree grows to billions of keys, which is not rare with small KV items managed in today's large memory of hundreds of GBs, on average 30 or more key-comparisons are required for a lookup. Lookup in both examples can be an order of magnitude slower than that in hash tables. Furthermore, searching in a big index with large footprints increases working set size and makes CPU cache less effective. While nodes in the index are usually linked

by pointers, pointer chasing is a common access pattern in the search operations. Therefore, excessive cache and TLB misses may incur tens of DRAM accesses in a lookup operation [46]. The performance gap between ordered and unordered indexes has been significantly widened. As a result, improving ordered indexes to support efficient search operations has become increasingly important.

As a potential solution to reduce the search overhead, prefix tree, also known as trie, may be adopted as an ordered index, where a key's location is solely determined by the key's content (a string of *tokens*, e.g., a byte string), rather than by the key's relative order in the entire keyset. Accordingly, trie's search cost is determined by the number of tokens in the search key (L), instead of the number of keys (N) in the index. This unique feature makes it possible for tries to perform search faster than the comparison-based ordered indexes, such as B+ tree and skip list. As an example, for a trie where keys are 4-byte integers and each byte is a token, the search cost is upper-bounded by a constant (4) regardless of the number of keys in the index. This makes trie favorable in workloads dominated by short keys, such as searching in IPv4 routing tables where all of the keys are 32-bit integers. However, if keys are long (e.g., URLs of tens of bytes long), even with a small set of keys in the trie, the search cost can be consistently high (possibly substantially higher than the $O(\log N)$ cost in other indexes). As reported in a study of Facebook's KV cache workloads on its production Memcached system, most keys have a size between 20 to 40 bytes [1], which makes trie an undesirable choice. It is noted that the *path compression* technique may help to reduce a trie's search cost [18]. However, its efficacy highly depends on the key contents, and there is no assurance that its $O(L)$ cost can always be reduced. Together with its issues of inflated index size and fragmented memory usage [18], trie has not been an index structure of choice in general-purpose in-memory data management systems.

In this paper we propose a new ordered index structure, named *Wormhole*, to bridge the performance gap between hash tables and ordered indexes for high-performance in-memory data management. Wormhole efficiently supports all common index operations, including lookup, insertion, deletion, and range query. Wormhole has a lookup cost of $O(\log L)$ memory accesses, where L is the length of search key (actual number of accesses can be (much) smaller than $\log_2 L$). With a reasonably bounded key length (e.g., 1000 bytes), the cost can be considered as $O(1)$, much lower than that of other ordered indexes, especially for a very-large-scale KV store. In addition to lookup, other operations, such as insertion, deletion, and range query, are also efficiently supported. In the meantime, Wormhole has a space cost comparable to B+ tree, and often much lower than trie.

This improvement is achieved by leveraging strengths of three data structures, namely, space efficiency of B+ tree (by storing multiple items in a tree node), trie's search time independent of store size, and hash-table's $O(1)$ search time, to orchestrate a single efficient index. Specifically, we first use a trie structure to replace the non-leaf section of a B+ tree structure in order to remove the N factor in the B+ tree's $O(\log N)$ search time. We then use a hash table to reduce the lookup cost on the trie structure to $O(\log L)$, where L is the search key length. We further apply various optimizations in the new structure to realize its full performance potential and maximize its measurable performance. The proposed ordered index is named *Wormhole* for its capability of jumping on the search path from the tree root to a leaf node.

We design and implement an in-memory Wormhole index and extensively evaluate it in comparison with several representative indexes, including B+ tree, skip list, Adaptive Radix Tree (ART) [18], and Masstree (a highly optimized trie-like index) [26]. Experiment results show that Wormhole outperforms these indexes by up to 8.4×, 4.9×, 4.3×, and 6.6×, in terms of key lookup throughput, respectively. We also compare Wormhole with a highly optimized Cuckoo hash table when range queries are not required. The results show that Wormhole achieves point-lookup throughput 30–92% of the hash-table's throughput.

The rest of this paper is organized as below. Section 2 introduces design of Wormhole's core data structure. Section 3 describes techniques for efficient implementation of the Wormhole index. Section 4 presents experiment setup, workloads, and evaluation results. Section 5 discusses the related work, and Section 6 concludes.

2 THE WORMHOLE DATA STRUCTURE

In this section we introduce the Wormhole index structure, which has significantly lower asymptotic lookup time than existing ordered indexes, without increasing demand on space and cost of other modification operations, such as insertion. To help understand how Wormhole achieves this improvement, we start from B+ tree and progressively evolve it to the structure of Wormhole.

2.1 Background: Lookup in the B+ Tree

Figure 1 shows a small set of 12 keys indexed in an example B+ tree, where each character is a token. While a key in the index is usually associated with a value, we omit the values in the discussion and only use keys to represent KV items to focus on time and space costs of index operations. The example B+ tree has one internal node (the root node) and four leaf nodes. In the B+ tree all keys are placed in leaf nodes while internal nodes store a subset of the keys to facilitate locating search keys at leaf nodes. Keys in a leaf node are

Figure 1: An example B+ tree containing 12 keys

Figure 2: Replacing B+ tree's *MetaTree* with hash table

Figure 3: Replacing B+ tree's *MetaTree* with *MetaTrie*

usually sorted and all leaf nodes are often linked into a fully sorted list to support range operations with a linear scan on it. We name the sorted list *LeafList*, and the remaining structure of the index as *MetaTree*, as shown in Figure 1.

MetaTree is used to accelerate the process of locating a leaf node that potentially stores a given search key. A search within the leaf node is conducted thereafter. Because a leaf node's size, or number of keys held in the node, is bounded in a predefined range $[\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil, k]$ (k is a predefined constant integer), the search with a leaf node takes $O(1)$ time. Accordingly, the major search cost is incurred in the MetaTree, which is $\log_2 \frac{N}{k}$ or $O(\log N)$ (N is the number of indexed keys). As the B+ tree grows, the MetaTree will contain more levels of internal nodes, and the search cost will increase at a rate of $O(\log N)$. Our first design effort is to replace the MetaTree with a structure whose search cost is not tied to N.

2.2 Replacing the MetaTree with a Trie

An intuitive idea on B+ tree's improvement is to replace its MetaTree structure with a hash table, as illustrated in Figure 2. This can reduce the search cost to $O(1)$. However, this use of hash table does not support inserting a new key at the correct position in the sorted LeafList. It also does not support range queries whose search identifiers are not existent in the index, such as search for keys between "Brown" and "John" or search for keys with a prefix of "J" in the example index shown in Figure 2, where "Brown" and "J" are not in the index. Therefore, the MetaTree itself must organize keys in an ordered fashion. Another issue is that the hash table requires an entry (or pointer) for every key in the index, demanding a space cost higher than MetaTree.

To address the issues, trie can be a better replacement as it is an ordered index and its lookup cost ($O(L)$, where L is the search key length) is not tied to N, the number of keys in the index. Figure 3 illustrates the index evolved from B+ tree with its MetaTree structure replaced by a trie structure named *MetaTrie*. For each node in the LeafList we create a key as its *anchor* and insert it into MetaTrie. A node's anchor key is to serve as a borderline between this node and the node immediately on its left, assuming the sorted LeafList is laid out horizontally in an ascending order as shown in Figure 3. Specifically, the anchor key (*anchor-key*) of a node (Node$_b$), must meet the following two conditions:

- **The Ordering Condition**: *left-key* < *anchor-key* ≤ *node-key*, where *left-key* represents any key in the node (Node$_a$) immediately left to Node$_b$, and *node-key* represents any key in Node$_b$. If Node$_b$ is the left-most node in the LeafList, the condition is *anchor-key* ≤ *node-key*.
- **The Prefix Condition**: An anchor key cannot be a prefix of another anchor key.

When an anchor key is inserted into the MetaTrie, one new leaf node corresponding to the key is created in the trie. In addition, any prefix of the key is inserted to the trie as its internal node, assuming it is not yet in the trie. We use the prefix condition to make sure every anchor key has a corresponding leaf node in the MetaTrie.

In the formation of an anchor key, we aim to minimize the key length to reduce the MetaTrie size. To this end we design a method to form an anchor key for the aforementioned Node$_b$ in compliance with the two conditions, assuming the smallest token, denoted by ⊥, does not appear in regular keys (other than the anchor keys) on the LeafList. We will remove the restriction on use of the smallest token later. We denote the smallest key in Node$_b$ as $\langle P_1 P_2 ... P_k B_1 B_2 ... B_m \rangle$ and the largest key in Node$_a$ as $\langle P_1 P_2 ... P_k A_1 A_2 ... A_n \rangle$, and $A_1 < B_1$, where P_i ($1 \le i \le k$), A_i ($1 \le i \le m$), and B_i ($1 \le i \le n$) represent the keys' tokens. If k or n is 0, it represents the corresponding key segment does not exist. Accordingly, $\langle P_1 P_2 ... P_k \rangle$ is the longest common prefix of the two keys. Assuming Node$_b$ is a new leaf node whose anchor key has not been determined, we form its anchor key as follows:

- If Node_b is not the left-most node on the LeafList ($m > 0$), we will check whether $\langle P_1 P_2 ... P_k B_1 \rangle$ is a prefix of the anchor key of the node immediately after Node_b on the LeafList, denoted Node_c.[1] If not (including the case where Node_c does not exist), Node_b's anchor is $\langle P_1 P_2 ... P_k B_1 \rangle$. Otherwise, Node_b's anchor is $\langle P_1 P_2 ... P_k B_1 \bot \rangle$, which cannot be a prefix of Node_c's anchor. This is because a $(k + 2)^{\text{th}}$ token of Node_c's anchor key must be larger than $\bot$. We then check whether Node_a's anchor is a prefix of Node_b's anchor (Node_a is $\langle P_1 P_2 ... P_j \rangle$, where $j \leq k$). If so, Node_a's anchor will be changed to $\langle P_1 P_2 ... P_j \bot \rangle$. Note that by appending the $\bot$ token to meet the anchor key's prefix condition, its ordering condition can be violated. To accommodate the situation, the $\bot$ is ignored in the ordering condition test without compromising the correctness.
- Otherwise (Node_b is the left-most node), its anchor is $\bot$, which is not any other anchor's prefix.

Using the method the four leaf nodes in Figure 3, starting from the left-most one, have their respective anchors as "$\bot$", "*Au*", "*Jam*", and "*Jos*". All the anchors and their prefixes are inserted into the MetaTrie.

2.3 Performing Search on MetaTrie

The basic lookup operation on the MetaTrie with a search key is similar to that in a conventional trie structure, which is to match tokens in the key to those in the trie one at a time and walk down the trie level by level accordingly. If the search key is "Joseph" in the example index shown in Figure 3, it will match the anchor key "Jos", which leads the lookup to the last leaf node in the LeafList. The search key is the first one in the node. However, unlike lookup in a regular trie, when matching of the search key with an anchor key fails before a leaf node is reached, there is still a chance that the key is in the index. This is because the keys are stored only at the LeafList and are not directly indexed by the trie structure. One example is to look up "Denice" in the index, where matching of the first token 'D' fails, though the search key is in a leaf node. Furthermore, when a search key is matched with a prefix of an anchor key, there is still a chance the search key is not in the index. An example is to look up "A" in the index.

To address the issue, we introduce the concept of *target node* for a search key K. A target node for K is such a leaf node whose anchor key K_1 and immediately next anchor key K_2 satisfy $K_1 \leq K < K_2$, if the anchor key K_2 exists. Otherwise, the last leaf node on the LeafList is the search-key's target node. If a search key is in the index, it must be in its target node. The target nodes of "A", "Denice", and

"Joseph" are the first, second, and fourth leaf nodes in Figure 3, respectively. The question is how to identify the target node for a search key.

Looking for a search-key's target node is a process of finding its longest prefix matching an anchor's prefix. A (short) prefix of the search key can be a prefix of multiple anchors. However, if its (long) prefix is found to be equal to a unique anchor key, the prefix cannot be another anchor's prefix due to the prefix condition for being an anchor. Apparently this unique anchor key is not larger than the search key. Furthermore, if the anchor's next anchor exists, according to anchor's definition this anchor is smaller than its next anchor and it is not its prefix. However, this anchor is the search-key's prefix. Therefore, the search key is smaller than the next anchor. Accordingly, the anchor's leaf node is the target node of the search key. In the example, the unique anchor of search key "Joseph" is "Jos", which can be found by walking down the MetaTrie with the search key.

If there is not such an anchor that is the prefix of a search key, such as "Denice" in Figure 3, we cannot reach a leaf node by matching token string of the key with anchor(s) one token at a time starting at the first token. The matching process breaks in one of two situations. The first one is that a token in the key is found to be non-existent at the corresponding level of the trie. For example, there isn't an internal node 'D' at Level 1 (beneath the root at Level 0) of the trie to match the first token of the search key "Denice". The second one is that tokens of the search key run out during the matching before a leaf node is reached. An example is with the search key "A".

For the first situation, we assume that a search key's first k tokens ($\langle T_1 T_2 ... T_k \rangle$) are matched and T_{k+1} at Level $k+1$ of the trie is the first unmatched token. Because $\langle T_1 T_2 ... T_k \rangle$ is not an anchor, there must exist a node matching $\langle T_1 T_2 ... T_k L \rangle$, a node matching $\langle T_1 T_2 ... T_k R \rangle$, or both, where tokens $L < T_{k+1} < R$. In other words, the two nodes are siblings of the hypothetical node matching $\langle T_1 T_2 ... T_{k+1} \rangle$. Accordingly these two nodes are its left and right siblings, respectively. We further assume that they are immediate left and right siblings, respectively. Rooted at left or right sibling nodes there is a subtree, named left or right subtrees, respectively. If the left sibling exists, the search key's target node is the right-most leaf node of the left subtree. If the right sibling exists, the left-most leaf node of the right subtree is the target node's immediate next node on the LeafList. As all leaf nodes are doubly linked, the target node can be reached by walking backward on the LeafList by one node. For search key "Denice" in the example, both subtrees exist, which are rooted at internal nodes "A" and "J", respectively, and the target node (the second leaf node) can be reached by either of the two search paths, as depicted in Figure 4. For search key "Julian", only the left subtree (rooted at internal node "O") is available and only one search path

---

[1]Note that if $\langle P_1 P_2 ... P_k B_1 \rangle$ is a prefix of any other anchor, it must be a prefix of Node_c's anchor.

Figure 4: Example lookups on a *MetaTrie* with search keys "A", "Denice", and "Julian".

down to the right-most leaf node exists to reach the target node (the fourth leaf node).

For the second situation, we can append the smallest token ⊥ on the search key. As we assume the token is not used in the regular key, ⊥ becomes the first unmatched key and we can follow the procedure described for the first situation to find the search-key's target node. Note that in this case only the right subtree exists. Figure 4 shows the path to reach the target node of the search key "A", which is the first leaf node.

Once a target node for a search key is identified, further actions for lookup, insertion, and deletion operations are straightforward. For lookup, we will search in the target node for the key. In Section 3 we will present an optimization technique to accelerate the process. Similar to those in the B+ tree, insertion and deletion of a key may lead to splitting of a leaf node and merging of adjacent leaf nodes to ensure that a node does not grow over its predetermined capacity and does not shrink below a minimum size. The difference is that the splitting and merging operations are not (recursively) propagated onto the parent nodes in Wormhole, as it does in B+ tree, to balance leaf node heights. The only operations in the MetaTrie are removing anchors for merged nodes or adding new anchors for split nodes. To remove an anchor, only the trie nodes exclusively used by the anchor are to be removed.

This composite index structure is more space efficient than a conventional trie index by storing multiple keys in a leaf node and inserting anchors usually (much) shorter than keys in the trie. Its search time is practically independent of number of keys in the index, and is only proportional to anchor lengths, which can be further reduced by intelligently choose the location where a leaf node is split (we leave this optimization as future work). However, in the worst case the search time can still be $O(L)$, where L is the length of a search key. With a long key, the search time can still be substantial. In the following we will present a technique to further reduce the search cost to $O(\log L)$.

2.4 Accelerating Search with a Hash Table

In the walk from the root of a MetaTrie to a search-key's target leaf node, there are two phases. The first one is actually to conduct the longest prefix match (LPM) between the search key and the anchors in the trie. If the longest prefix is not equal to an anchor, the second phase is to walk on a subtree rooted at a sibling of the token next to the matched prefix of the search key. The $O(L)$ cost of each of the phases can be significantly reduced.

For the first phase, to obtain the LPM we do not have to walk on the trie along a path from the root token by token. Waldvogel et al. proposed to use *binary search on prefix lengths* to accelerate the match for routing table lookups [45]. To apply the approach, we insert all prefixes of each anchor into a hash table. In Figure 4's index, "Jam" is an anchor, and accordingly its prefixes ("", "J", "Ja", "Jam") are inserted in the hash table. We also track the MetaTrie's height, or the length of the longest anchor key, denoted L_{anc}. Algorithm 1 depicts how a binary search for a search key of length L_{key} is carried out. As we can see the longest prefix can be found in $O(\log(\min(L_{anc}, L_{key})))$ time. In the example index for search key "James" it takes two hash-table lookups (for "Ja" and "Jam") to find its longest common prefix ("Jam").

The hash table is named *MetaTrieHT*, which is to replace the MetaTrie to index the leaf nodes on the LeafList. The *MetaTrieHT* for the MetaTrie in Figure 3 is illustrated in Figure 5. Each node in MetaTrie corresponds to an item in the hash table. If the node represents an anchor, or a leaf node, the hash item is a leaf item, denoted 'L' in Figure 5. Otherwise, the node is an internal node and the corresponding hash item is an internal item, denoted 'I'. Using this hash table, pointers in the MetaTrie facilitating the walk from node to node in the trie are not necessary in the MetaTrieHT, as every prefix can be hashed into the index structure to know whether it exists.

Each hash item has two fields supporting efficient walk in the second search phase on a path to a leaf node. The first field is a bitmap. It is meaningful only for internal items. It has a bit for every possible child of the corresponding internal node in the trie. The bit is set when the corresponding child exists. With the bitmap, sibling(s) of an unmatched token can be located in $O(1)$ time. Trie node corresponding to a hash item can be considered as root of a subtree. In the second

Figure 5: The structure of Wormhole. For clarity the bitmap is depicted by directly listing child tokens.

phase it is required to know the right-most leaf node or the left-most leaf node of the subtree. The second field of a hash item contains two pointers, each pointing to one of the leaf nodes. Accordingly, the second phase takes a constant time.

The index consisting of a LeafList and a MetaTrieHT represents Wormhole's core data structure. Its operations, including lookup (GET), insertion (SET), deletion (DEL), and range search (RangeSearchAscending) are formally depicted in Algorithms 2, 3, and 4. The $O(\log L)$ time cost of Wormhole is asymptotically lower than $O(\log N)$ for B+ tree and $O(L)$ for trie, where L is the search key's length and N is number of keys in the index.

Regarding space efficiency, Wormhole is (much) better than trie by indexing multiple keys in a leaf node, rather than individual keys in the trie. When compared to the B+ tree, it has the same number of leaf nodes. Therefore, their relative space cost is determined by amount of space held by their respective internal nodes. Wormhole's MetaTrieHT is essentially organized as a trie, whose number of nodes highly depends on its key contents. While it is hard to quantitatively evaluate its space cost and compare it to that of the B+ tree without assuming a particular workload, we analyze factors impacting the number. Generally speaking, if the keys often share common prefixes, many anchors will also share common prefixes, or nodes on the trie, which reduces the trie size. On the other hand, if the keys are highly diverse it's less likely to have long common prefixes between adjacent keys in the LeafList. According to the rule of forming anchors, short common prefixes lead to short anchors. Because it is anchors, instead of user keys, that are inserted into the trie, short anchors lead to fewer internal nodes. We will quantitatively measure and compare the space costs of Wormhole and B+ tree with real-world keys in Section 4.

Algorithm 2 Index Operations

```
 1: function GET(wh, key)
 2:     leaf ← searchTrieHT(wh, key);       i ← pointSearchLeaf(leaf, key)
 3:     if (i < leaf.size) and (key = leaf.hashArray[i].key) then
 4:         return leaf.hashArray[i]
 5:     else return NULL
 6: function SET(wh, key, value)
 7:     leaf ← searchTrieHT(wh, key);       i ← pointSearchLeaf(leaf, key)
 8:     if (i < leaf.size) and (key = leaf.hashArray[i].key) then
 9:         leaf.hashArray[i].value ← value
10:     else
11:         if leaf.size = MaxLeafSize then
12:             left, right ← split(wh, leaf)
13:             if key < right.anchor then
14:                 leaf ← left
15:             else leaf ← right
16:         leafInsert(leaf, key, value)
17: function DEL(wh, key)
18:     leaf ← searchTrieHT(wh, key);       i ← pointSearchLeaf(leaf, key)
19:     if (i < leaf.size) and (key = leaf.hashArray[i].key) then
20:         leafDelete(leaf, i)
21:         if (leaf.size + leaf.left.size) < MergeSize then
22:             merge(wh, leaf.left, leaf)
23:         else if (leaf.size + leaf.right.size) < MergeSize then
24:             merge(wh, leaf, leaf.right)
25: function RangeSearchAscending(wh, key, count)
26:     leaf ← searchTrieHT(wh, key);
27:     incSort(leaf.keyArray);       out ← []
28:     i ← binarySearchGreaterEqual(leaf.keyArray, key)
29:     while (count > 0) and (leaf ≠ NULL) do
30:         nr ← min(leaf.size - i, count);       count ← count - nr
31:         out.append(leaf.keyArray[i : (i + nr - 1)])
32:         leaf ← leaf.right;       i ← 0
33:         if leaf ≠ NULL then incSort(leaf.keyArray);
34:     return out
```

Algorithm 3 Ancillary Functions

```
 1: function searchTrieHT(wh, key)
 2:     node ← searchLPM(wh.ht, key, min(key.len, wh.maxLen))
 3:     if node.type = LEAF then return node
 4:     else if node.key.len = key.len then
 5:         leaf ← node.leftmost
 6:         if key < leaf.anchor then leaf ← leaf.left
 7:         return leaf
 8:     missing ← key.tokens[node.key.len]
 9:     sibling ← findOneSibling(node.bitmap, missing)
10:     child ← htGet(wh.ht, concat(node.key, sibling))
11:     if child.type = LEAF then
12:         if sibling > missing then child ← child.left
13:         return child
14:     else
15:         if sibling > missing then return child.leftmost.left
16:         else return child.rightmost
17: function pointSearchLeaf(leaf, key)
18:     i ← key.hash × leaf.size / (MAXHASH + 1);       array ← leaf.hashArray
19:     while (i > 0) and (key.hash ≤ array[i - 1].hash) do i ← i - 1
20:     while (i < leaf.size) and (key.hash > array[i].hash) do i ← i + 1
21:     while (i < leaf.size) and (key.hash = array[i].hash) do
22:         if key = leaf.array[i].key then return i
23:         i ← i + 1
24:     return i
25: function allocInternalNode(initBitID, leftmost, rightmost, key)
26:     node ← malloc();       node.type ← INTERNAL
27:     node.leftmost ← leftmost;       node.rightmost ← rightmost
28:     node.key ← key;       node.bitmap[initBitID] ← 1
29:     return node
30: function incSort(array)
31:     if array.sorted.size < THRESHOLD then array ← qsort(array)
32:     else array ← twoWayMerge(array.sorted, qsort(array.unsorted))
```

Algorithm 4 Split and Merge Functions

```
 1: function split(wh, leaf)
 2:     incSort(leaf.keyArray);      i ← leaf.size / 2
 3:     while Cannot split between [i−1] and [i] in leaf.keyArray do
 4:         Try another i in range [1, leaf.size −1]
 5:         Abort the split if none can satisfy the criterion
 6:     alen ← commonPrefixSize(leaf.keyArray[i−1], leaf.keyArray[i])+1
 7:     newL ← malloc();      newL.anchor ← leaf.keyArray[i].key.prefix(alen)
 8:     key ← newL.anchor;      Append 0s to key when necessary
 9:     wh.maxLen ← max(wh.maxLen, key.len)
10:     Move items at [i to leaf.size−1] of leaf.keyArray to newL
11:     Insert newL at the right of leaf on the leaf list
12:     htSet(wh.ht, key, newL)
13:     for plen : 0 to key.len−1 do
14:         prf ← key.prefix(plen);      node ← htGet(wh.ht, prf)
15:         if node.type = LEAF then
16:             parent ← allocInternalNode(0, node, node, prf)
17:             htSet(wh.ht, prf, parent);      prf.append(0); node.key ← prf
18:             htSet(wh.ht, prf, node);      node ← parent
19:         if node = NULL then
20:             node ← allocInternalNode(key[plen], newL, newL, prf);
21:             htSet(wh.ht, prf, node)
22:         else
23:             if node.leftmost = leaf.right then node.leftmost ← leaf
24:             if node.rightmost = leaf.left then node.rightmost ← leaf
25: function merge(wh, left, victim)
26:     Move all items from victim to the left node
27:     key ← victim.key;      htRemove(wh.ht, key)
28:     for plen : key.len−1 to 0 do
29:         prefix ← key.prefix(plen);      node ← htGet(wh.ht, prefix)
30:         node.bitmap[key[plen]] ← 0
31:         if node.bitmap.isEmpty() then htRemove(wh.ht, prefix)
32:         else
33:             if node.leftmost = victim then node.leftmost ← victim.right
34:             if node.rightmost = victim then node.rightmost ← victim.left
```

2.5 Concurrency Support

To provide strong support of concurrent operations for high scalability, Wormhole aims to minimize its use of locks, especially big locks, and minimize impact of a lock on concurrency. There are three groups of operations that require different levels of access exclusiveness. The first group includes point and range lookups that do not modify the index and do not demand any access exclusiveness among themselves. The second group includes insertions and deletions whose required modifications are limited on one or multiple leaf nodes on the LeafList. They demand access exclusiveness only at the leaf nodes. The third group includes insertions and deletions that incur split and merge of leaf nodes and modifications of the MetaTrieHT by adding or removing anchors and their prefixes in it. They demand exclusiveness at the relevant leaf nodes and at the MetaTrieHT.

A design goal of Wormhole's concurrency control is to minimize the limit imposed by insertions/deletions on the concurrency of lookup operations. To this end, we employ two types of locks. One is a reader-writer lock for each leaf node on the LeafList. For the second group of operations, insertion/deletion of a key modifies only one leaf node, and accordingly only one node is locked and becomes unavailable for lookup. For the third group of the operations with one

key, only one or two leaf nodes have to be locked for split or merge, respectively. However, for addition or removal of prefixes of an anchor in the MetaTrieHT structure, we may have to simultaneously acquire multiple locks to have exclusive access of (many) hash items (equivalently trie nodes). To this end the second type of lock is a single mutex lock on the entire MetaTrieHT to grant exclusive access to an addition or removal operation of an anchor and its prefixes, instead of fine-grained locks with much higher complexity and uncertain performance benefits.

However, as every key lookup requires access of the MetaTrieHT table, a big lock imposed on the entire MetaTrieHT can substantially compromise performance of the first two groups of operations that perform read-only access on the MetaTrieHT. To address this issue, we employ the QSBR RCU mechanism [30, 44] to enable lock-free access on MetaTrieHT for its readers (the first two groups of operations). Accordingly, only the writers of MetaTrieHT need to acquire the mutex lock. To perform a split/merge operation, a writer first acquires the lock. It then applies the changes to a second hash table (*T2*), an identical copy of the current MetaTrieHT (*T1*). Meanwhile, T1 is still accessed by readers. Once the changes have been fully applied to T2, T2 will be made visible for readers to access by atomically updating the pointer to the current MetaTrieHT through RCU, which simultaneously hides T1 from new readers. After waiting for an RCU grace period which guarantees T1 is no longer accessed by any readers, the same set of changes is then safely applied to T1. Now T1 is again identical to T2 and it will be reused as the second hash table for the next writer. The extra space used by the second MetaTrieHT is negligible because a MetaTrieHT, containing only the anchor keys, is consistently small in size compared with the size of the entire index structure. As an example, for the eight keysets used in our evaluation (see Table 1), the extra space consumed by the second table is only 0.34% to 3.7% of the whole index size.

When a lookup reaches a leaf node on the LeafList after searching on a MetaTrieHT, it needs to make sure that the hash table it used is consistent with the leaf node. For an insertion/deletion in the third group, it first acquires lock(s) for relevant leaf node(s), from left to right if two or more leaf nodes are to be locked, and then acquires the mutex lock for the MetaTrieHT. With the locks both the leaf node(s) and the table can be updated. To minimize readers' wait time on the critical section we release the locks on the leaf nodes right after they have been updated. To prevent lookups via an old MetaTrieHT from accessing updated leaf nodes, including nodes being split or deleted, we use version numbers to check their consistency. Each MetaTrieHT is assigned a version number. The number is incremented by one for each split/merge operation where a new version of MetaTrieHT is

made visible. Each leaf node is assigned an expected version number, initialized as 0. When a leaf node is locked for split/merge operation, we record the current MetaTrieHT's version number plus 1 as the leaf node's expected version number. A lookup remembers the MetaTrieHT's version number when it starts to access the MetaTrieHT, and then compares the number with the expected number of the target leaf node it reaches. If the expected number is greater, this lookup shall abort and start over.

The penalty of the start-overs is limited. First, for a split/merge operation, only one or two leaf nodes have their version numbers updated. Lookups targeting any other leaf nodes don't need to start over. Second, the rate of split/merge is much lower than that of insert/delete operations. Third, a start-over only needs to perform a second lookup on a newer version of MetaTrieHT, which is read-only and much faster than an insert/delete operation.

3 OPTIMIZATION AND ENHANCEMENT

While Wormhole's design provides significantly improved asymptotic lookup time, we apply several optimization techniques to maximize the efficiency of Wormhole's operations on MetaTrieHT and LeafList. We will also discuss how the assumption on a reserved ⊥ token not allowed in user keys can be removed. All the techniques described in this section are also covered in Algorithms 2, 3, and 4.

3.1 Improving Operations in MetaTrieHT

There are two major operations in MetaTrieHT for a lookup involving a sequence of prefixes of a search key. They can be CPU-intensive or memory-intensive. The first operation is to compute a prefix's hash value as an index in the MetaTrieHT hash table. The second one is to read the prefix in the table and compare it with the search-key's corresponding prefix. Wormhole conducts these operations for each of its selected prefixes during its binary search for the longest prefix match. However, a hash-table-based index requires them only once for a search key. We aim to reduce their CPU and memory access costs, respectively, and make them comparable with those of the hash-table-based indexes.

Regarding the first operation, the cost of some commonly used hash functions, such as that for CRC [36] and xxHash [47], is approximately proportional to their input lengths. By reducing the lengths, we can reduce the hashing cost. Fortunately, there exist incremental hash functions, including both CRC and xxHash. Such a function can leverage previously hashed value of an input string when it computes hash value for an extended string composed of the string appended with an increment. In this case it does not need to recompute the longer string from scratch. Taking advantage of the above properties, Wormhole uses


Figure 6: Structure of Wormhole's hash table

incremental hashing whenever a prefix match is found and the prefix is extended during its binary common-prefix search.[2] In this way, the average number of tokens used for hashing in a lookup of a search key of length L is reduced from $\frac{L}{2} \log_2 L$ to only L, comparable to that of a hash table lookup.

Regarding the second operation, each prefix match operation may involve multiple prefixes stored in a hash bucket. In the process many memory accesses may occur, including dereferencing pointers for prefixes and accessing potentially long prefixes of several cache-lines long. These accesses are likely cache misses. To reduce the cache misses, we organize 8 prefixes in an array of a cache-line size (64 bytes), named hash slot (see Figure 6). Each element in the array consists of a 16-bit tag hashed from the prefix and a 48-bit pointer to the original prefix.[3] In a lookup, key-comparisons are performed only for prefixes having a matched tag, which effectively reduces average number of key-comparisons to almost one per lookup. Similar approaches have been widely used in high-performance hash tables [6, 10, 22].

However, it takes multiple hash-table lookups to find an LPM, which still leads to multiple key-comparisons for a lookup on Wormhole. To further reduce this overhead, we first optimistically trust all tag-matches and omit key-comparisons in every hash-table lookup until finding a seemingly correct LPM. Tag comparisons may produce false-positive matches, which can lead the binary search to a wrong prefix that is longer than the correct one. To detect this error, a full key comparison is performed at the last prefix after the binary search. If it is a mismatch, the search will start over with full prefix comparisons. Note that there are no false-negative matches in this approach. Accordingly, it always produces the correct longest prefixes if false-positive matches do not occur. With the 16-bit tags produced by a well-designed hash function, the probability of error occurrence is only 0.0153% for keys of 1024-bytes long $(1 - (\frac{2^{16}-1}{2^{16}})^{10})$.

---

[2]CRC-32c is used in our implementation.

[3]On x86-64 only the low-order 48 bits are used in virtual memory address.

Figure 7: Wormhole's leaf node

Figure 8: Introducing a fat leaf node

3.2 Improving Operations in Leaf Node

Once a target leaf node is identified, a search of a key within the node is carried out. As keys in the node are sorted, a binary search may be used during the search. Similar to the issue of many memory accesses in the MetaTrieHT, accessing a number of original (long) keys for comparison can be very expensive. Accordingly, we also calculate a 16-bit hash tag for each key and place the tags in a tag array in the ascending hash order. A search is then conducted on the compact tag array. Only when a tag is matched will its corresponding key be read and compared, which substantially reduces the number of memory references.

We then further reduce number of comparisons on the tag array using a direct speculative positioning approach. If a hash function that uniformly hashes keys into the tag space is employed, the tag values themselves are well indicative of their positions in the array. Specifically, with a tag of value T computed from a search key we will first compare it with a tag at position $\frac{k \times T}{T_{\max}+1}$ in the key array, where k is number of keys in the array and $T_{\max}$ is the largest possible tag value. If there isn't a match at the position, we will compare it with its neighboring tags. Using the lower 16-bits of a (CRC-32c) hash value as the tag, it usually takes only 1 to 3 tag comparisons to complete the search in a node of 128 keys.

Another benefit of having the compact tag array is that the original key array does not have to always stay sorted. For efficiency, we may append newly inserted keys after the keys in the key array without immediate sorting, as illustrated in Figure 7. The sorting on the key array can be indefinitely delayed until a range search or split reaches the node. Further, the batched sorting amortizes the cost of ordered insertions when multiple unsorted keys are appended.

3.3 Wormhole with Any Key Tokens

We have assumed existence of a token value that never appears in regular keys, similar to an assumption in the design of Masstree [26]. With this assumption, we had designated an unused value, denoted '⊥', as the smallest value and used it to extend prefix so as to form an anchor satisfying the rule that no anchor can be a prefix of another anchor. By removing the assumption, we have to allow the minimal token value, say binary zero, to appear in the keys.

This is not an issue for printable keys where 0 is not used. However, a difficult situation arises for binary keys when a potential anchor (generated due to node split) becomes a prefix of another anchor that consists of the prefix and trailing zeroes.

One example is that we cannot identify any position in the first leaf node in Figure 8 to split it and produce a legitimate anchor. Suppose we split the node in the middle and select binary "100" as the anchor. Apparently it is a prefix of the next anchor "10000" and it violates the prefix condition. In this case where all keys in the node are composed of a common prefix "1" and a number of trailing '0's, there is not a position where we can split and form a new anchor. To address this issue, we simply allow the leaf node to grow over the node capacity into a *fat node* without splitting it. Note that the introduction of fat node is mainly for correctness and we believe it has virtually no impact on real systems. For example, with a maximal node size of N, having a fat node requires that there are at least $N + 1$ keys sharing the same prefix but having different numbers of trailing zeroes. In this case the longest key among them must have at least N trailing zeroes. With a moderate N of 64 or 128, the fat node is unlikely to be seen with any real datasets.

4 EVALUATION

In this section we experimentally evaluate Wormhole by comparing it with several commonly used index structures, including B+ tree [8], skip list [37], Adaptive Radix Tree (ART) [18], and Masstree [26].

In the Wormhole prototype we use 128 as the maximum leaf-node size (number of keys in a leaf node). We use an STX B+-tree [4], a highly optimized in-memory B+ tree implementation, to accommodate large datasets. The B+ tree's fanout is set to 128, which yields the best result on our testbed. We use the skip list implementation extracted from LevelDB [20]. ART is a trie-like index with a lookup cost of $O(L)$. To reduce space consumption, ART adaptively selects its node size and employs path compression to reduce number of nodes. We use an ART's implementation available on Github [23]. Masstree is a trie-like index with a very high fanout (up to 2^{64}). With this high fanout it is impractical to

Table 1: Description of Keysets

| Name	Description	Keys ($\times 10^6$)	Size (GB)
Az1	Amazon reviews metadata, avg. length: 40 B, format: *item-user-time*	142	8.5
Az2	Amazon reviews metadata; avg. length: 40 B, format: *user-item-time*	142	8.5
Url	URLs in Memetracker, avg. length: 82 B	192	20.0
K3	Random keys, length: 8 B	500	11.2
K4	Random keys, length: 16 B	300	8.9
K6	Random keys, length: 64 B	120	8.9
K8	Random keys, length: 256 B	40	10.1
K10	Random keys, length: 1024 B	10	9.7

use arrays to hold children pointers in trie nodes. Therefore, at each trie node it employs a B+ tree to index the children. We use the publicly available source code of Masstree from its authors in the evaluation [27].

Among the five indexes, only Wormhole and Masstree employ fine-grained RCU and/or locks, which enables thread-safe access for all of their index operations. The other three indexes are not designed with built-in concurrency control mechanisms. For example, LevelDB needs to use an external mutex lock to synchronize writers on its skip list. For fair comparison, we only compare Wormhole with their thread-unsafe implementations with read-only or single-writer workloads.

Experiments are run on a Dell R630 server with two 16-core Intel Xeon E5-2697A v4 CPUs, each with 40 MB LLC. To minimize the interference between threads or cores, hyper-threading is turned off from BIOS and we use one NUMA node to run the experiments. The server is equipped with 256 GB DDR4-2400 ECC memory (32 GB×8) and runs a 64-bit Linux (v4.15.15). To evaluate Wormhole in a networked environment, we connect two identical servers of the above configuration with a 100 Gb/s Infiniband (Mellanox ConnectX-4). Requests of index operations are generated from one server and are sent to the other for processing.

We use publicly available datasets collected at Amazon.com [28] and MemeTracker.org [31]. The original Amazon dataset contains 142.8 million product reviews with metadata, We extract three fields (Item ID, User ID, and Review time) in the metadata to construct two keysets, named *Az1* and *Az2*, by concatenating them in different orders (see Table 1). Key composition varies with the order, and may impact the index's performance, especially for the trie-based indexes (B+ tree and Wormhole). For the MemeTracker dataset we extract URLs from it and use them as keys in the keyset, named *Url*.

For trie-based indexes a performance-critical factor is key length. We create five synthetic keysets, each with a different fixed key length (from 8 B to 1024 B). Key count is selected

Figure 9: Lookup throughput with different number of threads. The *Az1* keyset is used in this experiment.

to make sure each keyset is of the same size (see Table 1). Key contents are randomly generated.

In the evaluation we are only concerned with performance of index access and skip access of values in the KV items. In the experiments, the search keys are uniformly selected from a keyset to generate a large working set so that an index's performance is not overshadowed by effect of CPU cache. In the experiments we use 16 threads to concurrently access the indexes unless otherwise noted.

4.1 Lookup Performance

In the experiments for measuring lookup throughput we insert each of the keysets to an index, then perform lookups on random keys in the index.

We first measure single-thread throughput of the indexes and see how they scale with number of the threads. The results with *Az1* keyset are shown in Figure 9. With one thread, Wormhole's throughput is 1.266 MOPS (million operations per second), about 52% higher than that of ART (0.834 MOPS), the second-fastest index in this experiment. All of the five indexes exhibit good scalability. As an example, Wormhole's throughput with 16 threads (19.5 MOPS) is 15.4× of that with one thread. In addition, it's 43% higher than that of ART with 16 threads. We also create a thread-unsafe version of wormhole index (namely *Wormhole-unsafe*) by not using of the RCU and the locks. As shown in Figure 9, the thread-unsafe Wormhole reaches 21.2 MOPS, a 7.8% increase of its thread-safe counterpart. Since the results of the other keysets all show a consistent trend as described above, we omit them from this paper.

We then investigate Wormhole's performance with different keysets. We use 16 threads for the following experiments unless otherwise noted. The throughput results with the eight keysets are shown in Figure 10. Wormhole improves the lookup throughput by 1.3× to 4.2× when compared with the best results among the other indexes for each keyset. Compared with throughput of the B+ tree and skip

**Figure 10: Lookup throughput on local CPU**

Figure 11: Throughput with optimizations applied. For an optimization, the ones above it in the legends are also applied. E.g., `+DirectPos` represents all optimizations are applied.


Figure 12: Lookup throughput on a networked key-value store

list, throughput of the other three indexes exhibits higher variations due to their use of trie structure and variable key lengths in different keysets. In the meantime, throughput of Masstree and ART are more tightly correlated to key length than Wormhole. Masstree substantially outperforms B+ tree and skip list with short keys (e.g., *K3* and *K4*). However, its throughput drops quickly with longer keys (e.g., *Url*, *K8*, and *K10*). Wormhole's lookup throughput is much less affected by key-length variation because its throughput is determined by the anchor length (L_{anc}), which is usually (much) smaller than the average key length. Specifically, it is determined by $\log(\min(L_{anc}, L_{key}))$, rather than by L in Masstree and ART (see Algorithm 1). In *Url* the URLs often share long common prefixes, which leads to long anchors (about 40 B in average as measured) in Wormhole. Even though, Wormhole still outperforms the others by at least 1.7×.

Various optimizations are applied in Wormhole's implementation, including tag matching in MetaTrieHT (*Tag-Matching*), incremental hashing (*IncHashing*), sorting by tags at leaf nodes (*SortByTag*), and direct speculative positioning in the leaf nodes (*DirectPos*). To see how much individual optimizations quantitatively contribute to the Wormhole's improvement, we incrementally apply them one at a time to a basic Wormhole version without the optimizations (*Base-Wormhole*). Figure 11 shows the throughput of Wormholes without and with the incrementally added optimizations, as well as that of B+ tree as a baseline on different keysets. As shown, BaseWormhole improves the throughput by 1.26× to 2.25×. After two optimizations (TagMatching and IncHashing) are applied, the improvement increases to 1.4× to 2.6×. The index workloads are memory-intensive, and memory access efficiency plays a larger role than CPU in an index's overall performance. As TagMatching reduces memory accesses, and corresponding cache misses, it contributes more to throughput improvement than IncHashing, which reduces CPU cycles and has a contribution of only about 3%. A more significant improvement is received with SortByTag and DirectPos applied at the leaf nodes. At the leaf nodes SortByTag removes expensive full key comparisons. Its

contribution is bigger with keysets of longer keys. DirectPos can dramatically reduce number of tag comparisons from 6–7 to less than 3 (on average), and also substantially contributes to the throughput improvements (though less significant than SortByTag). Overall with all the optimizations the throughput is improved by up to 4.9× by Wormhole.

Network had often been considered as a major potential bottleneck for client/server applications and a slow connection can overshadow any performance improvement made at the host side. However, today's off-the-shelf network devices are able to offer a high bandwidth close to the speed of main memory. For example, the aggregated bandwidth of three 200 Gb/s Infiniband (IB) links (3×24 GB/s) is close to that of a CPU's memory controller (76.8GB/s for a Xeon E4 v4 CPU). This ever-increasing network bandwidth makes performance of networked applications more sensitive to the efficiency of the host-side CPU/memory usage. To evaluate by how much Wormhole can improve performance of networked data-intensive applications, we port the indexes to HERD, a highly optimized RDMA-enabled key-value store [38], and run the lookup benchmarks over a 100 Gb/s IB link. We use a batch size of 800 (requests per operation) for RDMA sends and receives. The throughput results are shown in

Figure 13: Lookup throughput of Wormhole and Cuckoo hash table

Figure 14: Lookup throughput for keysets of short and long common prefixes

Figure 12. Generally speaking, Wormhole is able to maintain its advantage over the other indexes, which is comparable to the results on a single machine (Figure 10). However, the peak throughput of Wormhole is decreased by 5% to 20% for most datasets. For the *K10* dataset, the large key size (1 KB each) significantly inflates the size of each request. In this setting with one IB link, the network bandwidth becomes the bottleneck that limits the improvement of Wormhole. As a result, with the *K10* dataset Wormhole's throughput is only 37.5% of that without the network, and is only 30% higher than that of B+ tree.

4.2 Comparing with Hash Tables

Wormhole aims to bridge the performance gap between ordered indexes and hash tables. To know how far Wormhole's performance is close to that of hash tables, we compare Wormhole with a highly optimized Cuckoo hash table [24]. The experimental results are shown in Figure 13. For the first seven keysets, Wormhole's throughput is about 31% to 67% of that of the hash table. The *K*10 keyset has very long keys (1024-byte keys). 16 cache-lines need to be accessed in one key comparison. And the key-access cost dominates lookup time in both indexes. By using only tags in the MetaTrieHT and leaf nodes in the comparison in both Wormhole and the optimized hash table, they have similar number of full key accesses. As a result, on this keyset Wormhole's throughput is close to that of the hash table.

Besides key length, another factor affecting Wormhole's lookup efficiency is anchor length, which determines the MetaTrieHT's size and lookup time in MetaTrieHT. With randomly generated key contents, the anchors are likely very short. However, in reality a key's true content may only occupy the last several bytes and fill the leading bytes of a key with the same filler token such as '0'. To simulate this scenario, we form a number of keysets. Each keyset contains 10 million keys of a fixed size (L). Such a keyset, denoted as (K_{short}), contains keys of random contents and is expected to have short anchors. We then fill each-key's first $L - 4$ bytes

with '0', and denote the resulting keyset as K_{long}. Figure 14 shows lookup throughput on the two keysets, K_{short} and K_{long}, at different key lengths.

The Cuckoo hash table shows little throughput difference with the two keysets at various key lengths. However, with longer anchors Wormhole's throughput on K_{long} is lower than that on K_{short}. This throughput reduction becomes larger with long keys. With the longest keys (512 B) the corresponding long anchors lead to more memory accesses (e.g., $\log_2 512 = 9$ for LPM on the MetaTrieHT), reducing its throughput from about 78% of the hash-table's throughput to only 40%.

4.3 Performance of other Operations

In this section we use workloads having insertion operations. Note that several indexes we used (skip list, B+ tree, and ART) cannot safely perform concurrent accesses when a writer is present. If we apply locking or use their lockfree/lockless variants to allow concurrent readers and writers, their performance can be penalized because of the extra overhead. For a more vigorous and fair comparison, we compare Wormhole with their implementations without concurrency control. Accordingly, we use only one thread for insertion-only workloads, and then exclude the three thread-unsafe indexes in the evaluation with multi-threaded read-write workloads.

In insertions-only workloads, keys from a keyset are inserted into an initially empty index, and the insertion throughput is shown in Figure 15. Wormhole's throughput is comparable to that of the skip list on most keysets. With short keys (e.g., *K3* and *K4*), both Masstree and Wormhole show a higher throughput than comparison-based indexes (B+ tree and skip list) as insertion of short keys has a low cost on a trie-like structure. However, with longer keys (e.g., *Url*) throughput of Masstree and Wormhole becomes lower.

When an index for each of the keysets is built, we estimate their memory demands by taking difference of resident

Figure 15: Throughput of continuous insertions

Figure 16: Memory usage of the indexes

Figure 17: Throughput of mixed lookups and insertions

Figure 18: Throughput of range lookups

memory sizes, reported by the `getrusage()` system call, before and after an index is built. Hugepages are disabled for this experiment to minimize memory wastage due to internal fragmentation. In the indexes, space for each KV item is allocated separately and is reached with a pointer in an index node. To establish a *baseline* to represent minimal memory demand of a keyset, we multiply the key count of the set with the sum of key length and a pointer's size. Memory demands of the indexes are shown in Figure 16. As shown, in most cases Wormhole's memory usage is comparable to those of B+ tree and skip list. Wormhole uses a small trie to organize its anchors and places the keys in large leaf nodes. As anchors can be much shorter than keys, the space overhead of the MetaTrieHT can be further reduced, leading to a higher space efficiency than the trie-based Masstree, which places keys in the trie structure. Masstree's memory usage is significantly higher than the other indexes, except for keysets with very short keys (e.g., *K3*) where the entire index is actually managed by a single B+ tree at the root trie node. On the contrary, ART has significantly higher space consumption with short keys (*K3* and *K4*), which is due to its excessive number of trie nodes. With longer keys, the path compression helps to amortize the space cost with relatively reduced numbers of trie nodes.

We now evaluate Wormhole with workloads of mixed lookups and insertions using 16 threads. As shown in Figure 17, we change percentage of insertions from 5%,

50%, to 95% of the total operations to see how Wormhole's performance is affected by operations that may update the MetaTrieHT. In general, the trend of relative throughput between Masstree and Wormhole with insertions on different keysets is similar (compare Figures 10 and 17). With more insertions, the throughput improvements of Wormhole over Masstree become smaller, but still substantial. With a big leaf node most insertions do not update the MetaTrieHT and lookup time still holds a significant portion of the entire operation cost. Furthermore, Wormhole's concurrency control allows updates on the MetaTrieHT to impose minimal constraint on lookups' concurrency.

To compare Wormhole with other indexes on range operations, we randomly select a search key and search for following (up to) 100 keys starting from the search key. As range-scan is not implemented in the ART source code, it is omitted in this experiment. The results for various keysets are shown in Figure 18. In the range search much of the operation time is spent on sequentially scanning of a sorted list. The performance advantage of Wormhole on reaching the first search key is dwarfed. As a result, Wormhole's throughput improvement is reduced (improvement of 1.05× to 1.59× over B+ tree). However, as Masstree stores all keys in a trie structure, range query is much more expensive due to its frequent pointer chasing on the trie, which leads to its much lower throughput than the other indexes.

5 RELATED WORK

Comparison-based ordered indexes are commonly used as in-memory index of popular SQL and NoSQL databases, such as B-tree (or B+ tree) in LMDB [25] and MongoDB [33], and skip list in MemSQL [32] and LevelDB [20]. Because their lookup cost is bounded by $O(\log N)$ the efforts on improving their lookup performance are mainly focused on improvement of parallelism and caching efficiency. For example, Bw-tree enables latch-free operations of B+ tree to improve lookup efficiency on multi-cores [19]. FAST leverages architecture-specific knowledge to optimize B+-tree's layout in the memory to minimize cache and TLB misses [16]. Many studies have proposed to use hardware accelerators, such as GPU, to improve index lookups without changing the underlying data structure [12, 13, 17, 41, 48]. Wormhole takes a new approach to fundamentally reduce its asymptotic cost to $O(\log L)$. In addition to its algorithmic improvement, Wormhole is further strengthened by a series of implementation optimizations.

Trie has been proposed to achieve a lookup cost lower than those of the comparison-based indexes. ART adaptively changes the size of each trie node to minimize the space usage of the trie structure [18]. However with a small fanout (256 in ART) the $O(L)$ lookup cost can be significant for long keys. Masstree enables a very high fanout (2^{64}) by using a B+ tree at each trie node [26]. Accordingly, Masstree's lookup cost on the trie structure is practically reduced to 1/8 of that in ART. However, with the high fanout a trie node may have to be represented by a large B+ tree, which makes access on this trie node slow and offsets the benefit of having reduced trie height. Wormhole's lookup efficiency is less sensitive to key length as it has a $O(\log L)$ lookup cost. Using large leaf nodes to host keys and a small trie to manage the anchors, Wormhole's space efficiency is much better than a trie.

Caching can effectively improve index lookup for workloads of strong locality. For example, SLB uses a small cache to reduce the lookup cost for frequently accessed data [46]. However, caching is not effective for accessing of cold data. Wormhole improves the index structure which can reduce DRAM accesses for workloads of little locality. Bε-Tree is a B-tree-like index which allocates a buffer at each internal node to reduce the high write amplification of B Tree [7]. However the use of buffers incurs an additional overhead for lookups. Similarly, FloDB uses a hash table as a buffer ahead of a skip list in LevelDB to service write requests, which can remove the expensive skip-list insertion out of the critical path [2]. FloDB's hash table needs to be fully flushed upon serving a range operation, which can impose long delays for range queries. Wormhole has a low lookup cost which benefits both read and write operations. By quickly identifying a leaf node

for write operations, and using hashed keys in the sorting, write operations in Wormhole has a consistently low cost.

In addition to using fine-grained locks, many synchronization approaches have been proposed for efficient access of shared data structures. MemC3 [10] and Masstree [26] use version numbers to enable lock-free access for readers. Atomic operations, such as CAS and LL/SC, have been extensively used to implement lock-free lists and trees [3, 5, 11, 34]. RCU has been extensively used for read-dominant data structures [29, 44]. Other approaches, such as transactional memory and delegation techniques, have been extensively studied [14, 15, 40, 42]. We employ fine-grained locking, RCU, and version numbers to enable an efficient thread-safe Wormhole index that is only slightly slower than the thread-unsafe Wormhole. While there could be many other choices for more efficient concurrency control on Wormhole, we leave it for future work.

6 CONCLUSION

To the best of our knowledge, Wormhole is the first ordered key-value index achieving the $O(\log L)$ lookup cost, which is better than the $O(\log N)$ or $O(L)$ cost of other ordered indexes, assuming key length L much smaller than key count N. The reduced asymptotic cost makes Wormhole capable of delivering quick access to KV items, especially in challenging scenarios where the index manages a very large number of items with long keys. Extensive evaluation demonstrates that Wormhole can improve index lookup throughput by up to 8.4×, 4.9×, 4.3×, and 6.6×, compared with skip list, B+ tree, ART, and Masstree, respectively. Meanwhile, Wormhole's performance with other operations, including insertion, deletion, and range query, is also higher than or comparable to other indexes. Its space demand is as low as that of B+ tree. The source code of an implementation of the Wormhole index is publicly available at https://github.com/wuxb45/wormhole.

7 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

[1] Berk Atikoglu, Yuehai Xu, Eitan Frachtenberg, Song Jiang, and Mike Paleczny. 2012. Workload Analysis of a Large-scale Key-value Store. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGMETRICS/PERFORMANCE Joint International Conference on Measurement and Modeling of Computer Systems (SIGMETRICS '12)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 53–64. https://doi.org/10.1145/2254756.2254766

[2] Oana Balmau, Rachid Guerraoui, Vasileios Trigonakis, and Igor Zablotchi. 2017. FloDB: Unlocking Memory in Persistent Key-Value Stores. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys '17)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 80–94. https://doi.org/10.1145/3064176.3064193

[3] Michael A. Bender, Jeremy T. Fineman, Seth Gilbert, and Bradley C. Kuszmaul. 2005. Concurrent Cache-oblivious B-trees. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures (SPAA '05)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 228–237. https://doi.org/10.1145/1073970.1074009

[4] Timo Bingmann. 2013. STX B+ Tree C++ Template Classes. https://panthema.net/2007/stx-btree/.

[5] Anastasia Braginsky and Erez Petrank. 2012. A Lock-free B+Tree. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-fourth Annual ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures (SPAA '12)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 58–67. https://doi.org/10.1145/2312005.2312016

[6] Alex D. Breslow, Dong Ping Zhang, Joseph L. Greathouse, Nuwan Jayasena, and Dean M. Tullsen. 2016. Horton Tables: Fast Hash Tables for In-memory Data-intensive Computing. In *Proceedings of the 2016 USENIX Conference on Usenix Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC '16)*. USENIX Association, Berkeley, CA, USA, 281–294. http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=3026959.3026986

[7] Gerth Stolting Brodal and Rolf Fagerberg. 2003. Lower Bounds for External Memory Dictionaries. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA '03)*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 546–554.

[8] Douglas Comer. 1979. Ubiquitous B-Tree. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 11, 2 (June 1979), 121–137. https://doi.org/10.1145/356770.356776

[9] Thomas H. Cormen, Charles E. Leiserson, Ronald L. Rivest, and Clifford Stein. 2009. *Introduction to Algorithms, Third Edition* (3rd ed.). The MIT Press.

[10] Bin Fan, David G. Andersen, and Michael Kaminsky. 2013. MemC3: Compact and Concurrent MemCache with Dumber Caching and Smarter Hashing. In *Proceedings of the 10th USENIX Conference on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI'13)*. USENIX Association, Berkeley, CA, USA, 371–384.

[11] Mikhail Fomitchev and Eric Ruppert. 2004. Lock-free Linked Lists and Skip Lists. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-third Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC '04)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 50–59. https://doi.org/10.1145/1011767.1011776

[12] Bingsheng He and Jeffrey Xu Yu. 2011. High-throughput Transaction Executions on Graphics Processors. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 4, 5 (Feb. 2011), 314–325. https://doi.org/10.14778/1952376.1952381

[13] Max Heimel, Michael Saecker, Holger Pirk, Stefan Manegold, and Volker Markl. 2013. Hardware-oblivious Parallelism for In-memory Column-stores. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 6, 9 (July 2013), 709–720. https://doi.org/10.14778/2536360.2536370

[14] Danny Hendler, Itai Incze, Nir Shavit, and Moran Tzafrir. 2010. Flat Combining and the Synchronization-parallelism Tradeoff. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-second Annual ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures (SPAA '10)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 355–364. https://doi.org/10.1145/1810479.1810540

[15] Maurice Herlihy and J. Eliot B. Moss. 1993. Transactional Memory: Architectural Support for Lock-free Data Structures. In *Proceedings of the 20th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA '93)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 289–300. https://doi.org/10.1145/165123.165164

[16] Changkyu Kim, Jatin Chhugani, Nadathur Satish, Eric Sedlar, Anthony D. Nguyen, Tim Kaldewey, Victor W. Lee, Scott A. Brandt, and Pradeep Dubey. 2010. FAST: Fast Architecture Sensitive Tree Search on Modern CPUs and GPUs. In *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD '10)*. ACM,

New York, NY, USA, 339–350. https://doi.org/10.1145/1807167.1807206

[17] Onur Kocberber, Boris Grot, Javier Picorel, Babak Falsafi, Kevin Lim, and Parthasarathy Ranganathan. 2013. Meet the Walkers: Accelerating Index Traversals for In-memory Databases. In *Proceedings of the 46th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO-46)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 468–479. https://doi.org/10.1145/2540708.2540748

[18] Viktor Leis, Alfons Kemper, and Thomas Neumann. 2013. The Adaptive Radix Tree: ARTful Indexing for Main-memory Databases. In *Proceedings of the 2013 IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE 2013) (ICDE '13)*. IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA, 38–49. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE.2013.6544812

[19] Justin J. Levandoski, David B. Lomet, and Sudipta Sengupta. 2013. The Bw-Tree: A B-tree for New Hardware Platforms. In *Proceedings of the 2013 IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE 2013) (ICDE '13)*. IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA, 302–313. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE.2013.6544834

[20] Leveldb 2018. LevelDB: A Fast and Lightweight Key/Value Database Library by Google. https://github.com/google/leveldb.

[21] Sheng Li, Hyeontaek Lim, Victor W. Lee, Jung Ho Ahn, Anuj Kalia, Michael Kaminsky, David G. Andersen, Seongil O, Sukhan Lee, and Pradeep Dubey. 2016. Full-Stack Architecting to Achieve a Billion-Requests-Per-Second Throughput on a Single Key-Value Store Server Platform. *ACM Trans. Comput. Syst.* 34, 2, Article 5 (April 2016), 30 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/2897393

[22] Xiaozhou Li, David G Andersen, Michael Kaminsky, and Michael J Freedman. 2014. Algorithmic improvements for fast concurrent cuckoo hashing. In *Proceedings of the Ninth European Conference on Computer Systems*. ACM, 27.

[23] libart 2018. A C99 implementation of the Adaptive Radix Tree. https://github.com/armon/libart.

[24] libcuckoo 2018. A high-performance, concurrent hash table. https://github.com/efficient/libcuckoo.

[25] lmdb 2017. Symas Lightning Memory-mapped Database. http://www.lmdb.tech/doc/.

[26] Yandong Mao, Eddie Kohler, and Robert Tappan Morris. 2012. Cache Craftiness for Fast Multicore Key-value Storage. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys '12)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 183–196. https://doi.org/10.1145/2168836.2168855

[27] Masstree 2018. Beta release of Masstree. https://github.com/kohler/masstree-beta.

[28] Julian McAuley and Alex Yang. 2016. Addressing Complex and Subjective Product-Related Queries with Customer Reviews. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW '16)*. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee, Republic and Canton of Geneva, Switzerland, 625–635. https://doi.org/10.1145/2872427.2883044

[29] Paul E McKenney, Silas Boyd-Wickizer, and Jonathan Walpole. 2013. RCU usage in the Linux kernel: one decade later. (2013).

[30] Paul E. Mckenney and John D. Slingwine. 1998. Read-Copy Update: Using Execution History to Solve Concurrency Problems. In *Parallel and Distributed Computing and Systems*. Las Vegas, NV, 509–518.

[31] Meme9 2009. 96 million memes from Memetracker. https://snap.stanford.edu/data/memetracker9.html.

[32] MemSQL 2017. MemSQL. http://www.memsql.com/.

[33] MongoDB 2017. MongoDB for GIANT Ideas. https://mongodb.com/.

[34] Aravind Natarajan and Neeraj Mittal. 2014. Fast Concurrent Lock-free Binary Search Trees. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming (PPoPP '14)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 317–328. https://doi.org/10.1145/2555243.2555256

[35] Rajesh Nishtala, Hans Fugal, Steven Grimm, Marc Kwiatkowski, Herman Lee, Harry C Li, Ryan McElroy, Mike Paleczny, Daniel Peek, Paul Saab, David Stafford, Tony Tung, and Venkateshwaran Venkataramani. 2013. Scaling Memcache at Facebook. In *Presented as part of the 10th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 13)*. USENIX, Lombard, IL, 385–398.

[36] William Wesley Peterson and Daniel T Brown. 1961. Cyclic codes for error detection. *Proceedings of the IRE* 49, 1 (1961), 228–235.

[37] William Pugh. 1990. Skip Lists: A Probabilistic Alternative to Balanced Trees. *Commun. ACM* 33, 6 (June 1990), 668–676. https://doi.org/10.1145/78973.78977

[38] RDMABENCH 2016. RDMA-bench. https://github.com/efficient/rdma_bench.

[39] Redis 2017. Redis. http://redis.io/.

[40] Sepideh Roghanchi, Jakob Eriksson, and Nilanjana Basu. 2017. Ffwd: Delegation is (Much) Faster Than You Think. In *Proceedings of the 26th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP '17)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 342–358. https://doi.org/10.1145/3132747.3132771

[41] Amirhesam Shahvarani and Hans-Arno Jacobsen. 2016. A Hybrid B+-tree As Solution for In-Memory Indexing on CPU-GPU Heterogeneous Computing Platforms. In *Proceedings of the 2016 International Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD '16)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1523–1538. https://doi.org/10.1145/2882903.2882918

[42] Nir Shavit and Dan Touitou. 1995. Software Transactional Memory. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC '95)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 204–213. https://doi.org/10.1145/224964.224987

[43] SQLite 2017. In-Memory Databases - SQLite. https://sqlite.org/inmemorydb.html.

[44] urcu 2013. User-space RCU. https://lwn.net/Articles/573424/.

[45] Marcel Waldvogel, George Varghese, Jon Turner, and Bernhard Plattner. 1997. Scalable High Speed IP Routing Lookups. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM '97 Conference on Applications, Technologies, Architectures, and Protocols for Computer Communication (SIGCOMM '97)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 25–36. https://doi.org/10.1145/263105.263136

[46] Xingbo Wu, Fan Ni, and Song Jiang. 2017. Search Lookaside Buffer: Efficient Caching for Index Data Structures. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Symposium on Cloud Computing (SoCC '17)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 27–39. https://doi.org/10.1145/3127479.3127483

[47] xxHash 2017. xxHash. http://github.com/Cyan4973/xxHash/.

[48] Kai Zhang, Kaibo Wang, Yuan Yuan, Lei Guo, Rubao Lee, and Xiaodong Zhang. 2015. Mega-KV: A Case for GPUs to Maximize the Throughput of In-memory Key-value Stores. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 8, 11 (July 2015), 1226–1237. https://doi.org/10.14778/2809974.2809984