

Fast Factorized Learning

Powered by In-Memory Database Systems

Bernhard Stöckl

Technical University of Munich
bernhard.stoeckl@tum.de

Maximilian E. Schüle

maximilian.schuele@uni-bamberg.de
University of Bamberg

ABSTRACT

Learning models over factorized joins avoids redundant computations by identifying and pre-computing shared cofactors. Previous work has investigated the performance gain when computing cofactors on traditional disk-based database systems. Due to the absence of published code, the experiments could not be reproduced on in-memory database systems.

This work describes the implementation when using cofactors for in-database factorized learning. We benchmark our open-source implementation for learning linear regression on factorized joins with PostgreSQL—as a disk-based database system—and HyPer—as an in-memory engine. The evaluation shows a performance gain of factorized learning on in-memory database systems by 70% to non-factorized learning and by a factor of 100 compared to disk-based database systems. Thus, modern database engines can contribute to the machine learning pipeline by pre-computing aggregates prior to data extraction to accelerate training.

1 INTRODUCTION

Machine learning models are typically trained on a single, unnormalized data set. Without normalization, functional dependencies between attributes lead to data replication within the final table. This results in redundant computations when training a model.

Identifying a model’s common cofactors reduces redundancy and training time. Cofactors are shared factors between aggregations like sums over grouped data. Cofactors can be precomputed on normalized data if the original query plan is known. Schleich et al. [11–13] use functional dependencies for in-database training of linear regression. They speed up gradient descent on PostgreSQL as a disk-based database system by pre-materializing cofactors.

This study elaborates on the performance gain of in-memory database systems for factorized learning [3]. Due to the lack of original source code, we provide our own open source implementation for computing cofactors for gradient descent on top of database systems¹. We will use this implementation to compare the performance of PostgreSQL and HyPer for in-database factorized learning.

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 explains how calculating aggregates for factorization reduces redundancy. Section 3 combines linear regression with factorization for in-database gradient descent. Section 4 describes the implementation that was created using these concepts along this work. Section 5 then compares the implementation on top of PostgreSQL [14] with HyPer [5]. The last section concludes this study with an outlook on other models that benefit from factorization.




Figure 1: (a) Relations: Sales(Product, Sale), Inventory(Location, Product, Inventory), Competition(Location, Competitor), (b) Hypergraph of the natural join, (c) Variable order of the natural join, (d) Factorized join over the given schema (taken from [11, Figure 1])

2 FACTORIZATION

This section describes the idea behind factorization and how different operations can be computed on a factorized join.

2.1 Concept and Advantages of Factorized Joins

Usually, the result of a join contains some redundancy (cf. Figure 1a). Factorization tries to avoid duplicates by representing the join symbolically. For example the product p_1 combines s_1 and s_2 in Sales with i_1 and i_2 in Inventory, which can be represented as $\{i_1, i_2\} \times \{s_1, s_2\}$. Doing the same for p_2 results in $\{i_3\} \times \{s_3, s_4\}$. Since i_1 is associated both with p_1 and p_2 it can be represented as the union of the two previous results. Doing this for all entries results in the factorized representation shown in Figure 1d.

Since p_2 is always associated with both s_3 and s_4 , independent of the values of location and competitor, the union of those two elements can be cached. These values are shown in red in Figure 1d through which p_2 references $S_{3,4} = \{s_3, s_4\}$. This is possible because S is conditionally independent of L given $P \circ S$ and L do not appear in the same relation [11, Definition 3.2].

In general, a join query Q over a database D results in a flat representation of size $O(|D|^{\rho^*(Q)})$ and a factorized representation of size $O(|D|^{fhtw^*(Q)})$ [11, Theorem 3.4]. The measure $\rho^*(Q)$ represents the fractional edge cover number which is defined as the minimal

¹<https://github.com/tum-db/fastfactorizedlearning>

which is used within linear regression, can be rewritten to support factorized representations.

3.1 Objective Function

The goal of linear regression is to find the parameters θ_j for a linear function

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = y = \theta_1 \cdot x_1 + \dots + \theta_n \cdot x_n + c$$

so that it approximates a given training dataset with m rows determined by a join query over a database:

$$(y^{(1)}, x_1^{(1)}, \dots, x_n^{(1)}), \dots, (y^{(m)}, x_1^{(m)}, \dots, x_n^{(m)}).$$

This dataset therefore consists of n values $x_j^{(i)}$ which are called features and will be used as input for the function and a label $y^{(i)}$ which is approximated by this function. For the constant offset c , we add another feature which always has the value 1 so that we get the function:

$$h_\theta(x) = \theta_0 + \theta_1 \cdot x_1 + \dots + \theta_n \cdot x_n = \sum_{j=0}^n (\theta_j \cdot x_j) \quad [13, \text{p. 4}][8]$$

An objective function $\mathcal{E}(\theta)$ evaluates the quality of the values for θ . A commonly used error function is least squares function:

$$\mathcal{E}(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m \left(h_\theta(x^{(i)}) - y^{(i)} \right)^2 + \lambda R(\theta) \quad [12, \text{p. 3}][11, \text{p. 6}]$$

$R(\theta)$ is called a regularization term weighted with λ and is used to avoid overfitting. Some possible regularization terms are $\lambda \sum_{j=0}^n \theta_j^2$ (Ridge), $\lambda \sum_{j=0}^n |\theta_j|$ (Lasso) and $\lambda_1 \sum_{j=0}^n \theta_j^2 + \lambda_2 \sum_{j=0}^n |\theta_j|$ (Elastic-Net) which basically combines both of the previous ones. [11, Section 4.1]

3.2 Gradient Descent

We use *batch gradient descent* (BGD) to figure out the values for θ . An update to θ_j will therefore be computed by this formula:

$$\forall j \in \{x \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid x \leq n\} : \theta_j := \theta_j - \alpha \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \mathcal{E}(\theta) \quad [12, \text{p. 3}][11, \text{p. 6}][9]$$

Where α is the learning rate that is used to determine the size of each step. The derivative with respect to θ_j of the least squares objective function discussed in Section 3.1 takes this form (for simplicity y is also considered a feature with its corresponding θ fixed to -1):

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \mathcal{E}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^m h_\theta(x^{(i)}) \cdot x_j^{(i)} + \lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} R(\theta) \quad [11, \text{p. 6}]$$

3.3 Feature Scaling

The idea of feature scaling (cf. Figure 4) is to scale all of the features involved before applying BGD. Mean normalization consists of computing the average and maximum values over all m rows for every feature x_j and then computing new values such that all of them are in the interval $[-2, 2]$ (actually $[\frac{\min - \text{avg}}{\max}, \frac{\max - \text{avg}}{\max}]$):

$$\text{avg}_j = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m x_j^{(i)}}{m}, \quad \text{max}_j = \max \left\{ |x_j^{(i)}| \mid i \in [m] \right\}$$

$$\forall i \in [m] : x_{j,\text{conv}}^{(i)} := \frac{x_j^{(i)} - \text{avg}_j}{\text{max}_j} \quad [10]$$




Figure 4: Gradient descent with two variables of varying scales

Table 1: Example data set with $m = 5$ rows and $n = 2$ features (not counting x_0)

| (a) Original values | | | | | (b) Rescaled values | | | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|---------------------|-------|-------|---------------------|---------------------|
| i | y | x_0 | x_1 | x_2 | i | y | x_0 | $x_{1,\text{conv}}$ | $x_{2,\text{conv}}$ |
| 1 | 2004 | 1 | 0.01 | 20000 | 1 | 2004 | 1 | 0.2 | 0.965 |
| 2 | 5 | 1 | 0.03 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0.6 | -0.035 |
| 3 | -1955 | 1 | -0.05 | -19500 | 3 | -1955 | 1 | -1 | -1.01 |
| 4 | 999 | 1 | -0.01 | 10000 | 4 | 999 | 1 | -0.2 | 0.465 |
| 5 | -696 | 1 | 0.02 | -7000 | 5 | -696 | 1 | 0.4 | -0.385 |

Note that since $\forall i \in [m] : x_0^{(i)} = 1$ holds, feature 0, which represents the constant offset, should never be rescaled.

After converting all values and executing gradient descent on the converted data, the computed values for θ_j have to be rescaled as well. This way it is assured that they conform to the original range of values for x_j instead of the rescaled range of $x_{j,\text{conv}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^n \theta_{j,\text{conv}} \cdot x_{j,\text{conv}} &= \theta_{0,\text{conv}} \cdot 1 + \sum_{j=1}^n \theta_{j,\text{conv}} \cdot \frac{x_j - \text{avg}_j}{\text{max}_j} \stackrel{!}{=} \sum_{j=0}^n \theta_j \cdot x_j \\ &\Leftrightarrow \theta_{0,\text{conv}} + \sum_{j=1}^n \theta_{j,\text{conv}} \cdot \left(\frac{x_j}{\text{max}_j} - \frac{\text{avg}_j}{\text{max}_j} \right) \stackrel{!}{=} \sum_{j=0}^n \theta_j \cdot x_j \\ &\Leftrightarrow \theta_{0,\text{conv}} + \sum_{j=1}^n \theta_{j,\text{conv}} \cdot \frac{x_j}{\text{max}_j} - \sum_{j=1}^n \theta_{j,\text{conv}} \cdot \frac{\text{avg}_j}{\text{max}_j} \stackrel{!}{=} \sum_{j=0}^n \theta_j \cdot x_j \\ &\Leftrightarrow \left(\theta_{0,\text{conv}} - \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\theta_{j,\text{conv}}}{\text{max}_j} \cdot \text{avg}_j \right) + \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\theta_{j,\text{conv}}}{\text{max}_j} \cdot x_j \right) \stackrel{!}{=} (\theta_0 \cdot 1) + \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \theta_j \cdot x_j \right) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \forall j \in [n] : \theta_j = \frac{\theta_{j,\text{conv}}}{\text{max}_j} \quad \text{and} \\ \theta_0 &= \theta_{0,\text{conv}} - \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\theta_{j,\text{conv}}}{\text{max}_j} \cdot \text{avg}_j = \theta_{0,\text{conv}} - \sum_{j=1}^n \theta_j \cdot \text{avg}_j \end{aligned}$$

Example (cf. Table 1a): First we compute the average and maximum values for $j \in [2]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{avg}_1 &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^5 x_1^{(i)}}{5} = \frac{0.01 + 0.03 - 0.05 - 0.01 + 0.02}{5} = 0 \\ \text{max}_1 &= \max \left\{ |x_1^{(i)}| \mid i \in [5] \right\} = \max \{0.01, 0.03, 0.05, 0.02\} = 0.05 \\ \text{avg}_2 &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^5 x_2^{(i)}}{5} = \frac{20000 + 0 - 19500 + 10000 - 7000}{5} = 700 \\ \text{max}_2 &= \max \left\{ |x_2^{(i)}| \mid i \in [5] \right\} = 20000 \end{aligned}$$

Using these results to rescale the original data for x_1 and x_2 leads us to the values shown in Table 1b. After applying BGD to those rescaled values, we obtain the following results (rounded, depends on accuracy set for BGD) for θ which we will rescale as well:

$$\theta_{1,conv} = 10 \Rightarrow \theta_1 = \frac{\theta_{1,conv}}{\max_1} = \frac{10}{0.05} = 200$$

$$\theta_{2,conv} = 2000 \Rightarrow \theta_2 = \frac{\theta_{2,conv}}{\max_2} = \frac{2000}{20000} = 0.1$$

$$\theta_{0,conv} = 70 \Rightarrow \theta_0 = \theta_{0,conv} - (\theta_1 \cdot \text{avg}_1 + \theta_2 \cdot \text{avg}_2) = 0$$

Finally, we insert all of the values for θ into $h_\theta(x)$ to obtain the following function:

$$h_\theta(x) = 200 \cdot x_1 + 0.1 \cdot x_2$$

3.4 Separating Aggregates and Convergence of Gradient Descent

Normally, computing the value of $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \mathcal{E}(\theta)$ requires scanning the complete data in every iteration which results in a significant overhead. However, by rewriting the function it is possible to precompute the data dependent part, leaving only less intensive operations for the convergence that will have to be repeated several times. To transform it we only need to look at the part of $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \mathcal{E}(\theta)$ without the regularization term which we will call S_j :

$$\begin{aligned} S_j &= \sum_{i=1}^m h_\theta(x^{(i)}) \cdot x_j^{(i)} = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{k=0}^n (\theta_k \cdot x_k^{(i)}) \cdot x_j^{(i)} = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{k=0}^n (\theta_k \cdot x_k^{(i)}) \cdot x_j^{(i)} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{i=1}^m (\theta_k \cdot x_k^{(i)}) \cdot x_j^{(i)} = \sum_{k=0}^n \theta_k \cdot \sum_{i=1}^m x_k^{(i)} \cdot x_j^{(i)} = \sum_{k=0}^n \theta_k \cdot \text{Cofactor}[k, j] \\ &\text{with } \text{Cofactor}[k, j] = \sum_{i=1}^m x_k^{(i)} \cdot x_j^{(i)} \end{aligned}$$

This allows us to precompute all of the cofactors to obtain a cofactor matrix, which can then be used to update θ during gradient descent without being dependent on the data. This matrix has the following properties, given a database D and a query Q with the schema of the query result $Q(D)$ being $\sigma = (A_i)_{i \in [n]}$:

- symmetry: $\forall k, j \in [n] : \text{Cofactor}[k, j] = \text{Cofactor}[j, k]$ [11, Proposition 4.1] [12, Proposition 3.1]
- commutativity with union: Given a disjoint partitioning $D = \bigcup_{j \in [p]} (D_j)$ and cofactors $(\text{Cofactor}_j)_{j \in [p]}$ over $(Q(D_j))_{j \in [p]}$ with database D and query Q : $\forall k, i \in [n] : \text{Cofactor}[k, i] = \sum_{j=1}^p \text{Cofactor}_j[k, i]$ [11, Proposition 4.1] [12, Proposition 3.1]
- commutativity with projection: feature set $L \subseteq \sigma$ and cofactor matrix Cofactor_L for the training dataset $\pi_L(Q(D))$: $\forall k, j \in [n] : A_k, A_j \in L \rightarrow \text{Cofactor}_L[k, j] = \text{Cofactor}[k, j]$ [11, Proposition 4.1] [12, Proposition 3.1]

Due to the symmetry of Cofactor , only about half of the matrix has to be computed: $\left(\frac{n \cdot (n+1)}{2}\right)$ instead of n^2 . The commutativity with union allows computing cofactors over multiple training data sets and then combining the results by summing up the cofactor matrices [11, p. 7]. Commutativity with projection enables us to simply ignore parameters not required for the regression, which may however be needed for the join computation [11, p. 7].

```
vector<scaleFactors> scaleFeatures(const vector<string>&
    relevantColumns, vector<ExtendedVariableOrder*>& leaves,
    const string& con);
void factorizeSQL(const ExtendedVariableOrder& varOrder, const
    string& con);
vector<double> batchGradientDescent(const vector<string>&
    relevantColumns, pqxx::connection& con);
vector<double> linearRegression(ExtendedVariableOrder& varOrder,
    const vector<string>& relevantColumns, const string& con,
    double& avg);
```

Listing 1: Declarations of functions described in §4.2-4.5.




Figure 5: UML diagram showing the structure of the class *ExtendedVariableOrder*, its inner class *nameKey* and the struct *scaleFactors*

4 IMPLEMENTATION

This section describes the implementation of linear regression in C++ using cofactors and BGD. It uses pqxx [6] to connect to a PostgreSQL [14] database that contains the training data. Most operations discussed in Section 2 and 3 will be computed by SQL queries. Listing 1 shows the declarations of the functions discussed in this section.

4.1 Variable Order

The class *ExtendedVariableOrder* (cf. Figure 5) represents a variable order as described in Section 2.2. It is called *extended* because a complete variable order is assumed to fulfill these additional properties:

- (1) The lowest (greatest distance to the root) variable of a relation R in a variable order Δ has a child representing the relation R . This additional node stores all of its attributes in its corresponding *key*(R). Since all attributes in the same relation appear within a simple path from the root, the variable to which R is appended is unique. Furthermore, every leaf node in some variable order Δ is part of at least one relation and therefore followed by one or multiple new nodes. This leads to the following property: $\forall q : \text{isLeaf}(q) \Leftrightarrow q$ represents a relation.
- (2) The intercept will be represented by an additional node T in the extended variable order. It will be the new root of the variable order and has all of the roots of the original variable order as its children.

Figure 6 shows how the extended variable order corresponding to the variable order shown in Figure 1c can be constructed if

| | |
|--|--|
| <pre> ExtendedVariableOrder t{"T"}; ExtendedVariableOrder l{"Location"}; ExtendedVariableOrder c{"Competitor", {l.getName()}}; ExtendedVariableOrder p{"Product", {l.getName(), true}}; ExtendedVariableOrder i{"Inventory", {l.getName(), p.getName()}}; ExtendedVariableOrder s{"Sale", {p.getName()}}; ExtendedVariableOrder b{"Branch", {l.getName(), p.getName(), l.getName()}}; ExtendedVariableOrder cn{"Competition", {l.getName(), c.getName()}}; ExtendedVariableOrder ss{"Sales", {p.getName(), s.getName()}}; </pre> | <pre> s.addChild(ss); l.addChild(b); c.addChild(cn); p.addChild(s); p.addChild(i); l.addChild(c); l.addChild(p); t.addChild(l); </pre> |
|--|--|

Figure 6: Construction of an extended variable order for the schema given in Figure 1. Lines interacting with the **intercept are marked in **red** while lines referring to **relations** are highlighted in **blue**.**

```

WITH unionOfAllTables AS (SELECT Competitor FROM Competition)
SELECT AVG(COALESCE(Competitor,0)) as avg, MAX(ABS(COALESCE(Competitor,0))) AS max
FROM unionOfAllTables;
WITH unionOfAllTables AS (SELECT Sale FROM Sales)
SELECT AVG(COALESCE(Sale,0)) as avg, MAX(ABS(COALESCE(Sale,0))) AS max
FROM unionOfAllTables;

CREATE VIEW Sales_conv AS
SELECT Product, ((Sale - -11.526316) / 188.000000)::real AS Sale
FROM Sales;
CREATE VIEW Competition_conv AS
SELECT Location, ((Competitor - -22.517241) / 174.000000)::real AS
Competitor
FROM Competition;

```

Listing 2: SQL queries for an input corresponding to the variable order created by Figure 6:

relevantColumns = ("Inventory", "Competitor", "Sale", "T");
leaves = ("Competition", "Sales", "Inventory")

The values highlighted in **red** are the result values of the first two queries and depend on the data

the attribute *Product* is categorical and all other columns are of numerical value.

4.2 Feature Scaling on a Variable Order

The function *scaleFeatures*(...) takes as input a vector of strings *relevantColumns*, a vector of pointers to *ExtendedVariableOrder* nodes *leaves* and a string *con* and returns a vector of *scaleFactors* consisting of an average and a maximum value.

First of all it is identified, which col_i occurs in which leaves. In the second step the *scaleFactors* are computed for all the features by running a SQL query taking the union of all tables containing col_i and computing the average and maximum (absolute values) over this union. This ensures to scale every occurrence of a feature by the same factors even if there might be different values in different relations. Therefore, equijoins will still work even after rescaling since $x = y \Leftrightarrow \frac{x-a}{b} = \frac{y-a}{b}$. Running those queries is parallelised for the different features using OpenMP [1]. This requires a new *pqxx::connection* for every attribute col_i . As a last step, for every relation that has at least one rescaled attribute, a new view will be created. Afterwards, the function terminates and returns the *scaleFactors* vector. An execution of this function on the example schema from Figure 1 with the extended variable order created by Figure 6 results in the SQL queries shown in Listing 2.

4.3 Computing Cofactors over a Factorized Join

The function *factorizeSQL*(...) computes the aggregates required for the cofactor matrix discussed in Section 3.4. It has two parameters:

- *varOrder* is the root/intercept of an *ExtendedVariableOrder* of a factorized representation of some join as explained in Section 4.1.
- *con* is a string containing all necessary information to connect to the database containing the relations occurring in *varOrder* using a *pqxx::connection(con)*.

At first, it establishes a *pqxx::connection con* to the database specified in *con*. Then it iterates over all of its children x to call a helper function with subtree x and the connection *con* as arguments. After all children have been processed, it will run a query to create its own table named " Q " + *varOrder.getName()*, which will combine all of the intermediate results to a final result.

The helper function *factorizeSQL*(*ExtendedVariableOrder x*, *pqxx::connection con*) distinguishes between two cases and is based on the pseudo code described in *Factorized Databases* [11, Figure 5]. For better readability the name of the variable x will be called *xName*.

4.3.1 Leaf Nodes. Nodes without children will first create a table named $xName + _type$ which contains a single row with two columns: The name of this relation ($xName + _n$) and the value 0 ($xName + _d$), since leaf nodes represent only constants and no linear or quadratic terms. Then it will create a new view named " Q " + *xName*. It contains all the columns in its schema, which is given by *x.getKey()*, a lineage column $xName + _lineage$ containing an empty string, a column representing $xName + _d$ called $xName + _deg$ and a column $xName + _agg$ with value 1.

4.3.2 Inner Nodes. Variables with children will also create a table $xName + _type$ first but it contains three rows in total: One for each value in $\{0, 1, 2\}$ as ($xName + _d$) combined with ($xName + _n$) which contains *xName*. Then it will iterate over its children and prepare its own query for its own view " Q " + *xName*:

- The variables it depends on will still be represented in the new view by selecting them from the children in the same relation as this one.
- The column $xName + _agg$ will be filled by a sum aggregate over the multiplication of x^{xName_d} and the *agg* values of its children. If x is categorical x^{xName_d} will be replaced by the value 1.
- $xName + _deg$ will be defined as the sum of the *deg* values of x 's children and $xName_d$.
- Its lineage will consist of the concatenation of x 's children's lineages and will contain $xName_n$ only if $xName_d$ is greater than 0.

All of those values will be determined over the join of its subviews and $xName_type$. Additionally, they will be filtered so that only those with $xName_deg \leq 2$ will be kept.

4.3.3 Example. Listing 3 shows the SQL statements used for the creation of the x_type tables for the path corresponding to the *Competition* relation. The variable order, which this subquery is

```

CREATE TABLE Location_type(Location_n varchar(50),Location_d int);
INSERT INTO Location_type VALUES('Location', 0);
INSERT INTO Location_type VALUES('Location', 1);
INSERT INTO Location_type VALUES('Location', 2);

CREATE TABLE Competitor_type(Competitor_n varchar(50),
    Competitor_d int);
INSERT INTO Competitor_type VALUES('Competitor', 0);
INSERT INTO Competitor_type VALUES('Competitor', 1);
INSERT INTO Competitor_type VALUES('Competitor', 2);

CREATE TABLE Competition_conv_type(Competition_conv_n varchar(50),
    Competition_conv_d int);
INSERT INTO Competition_conv_type VALUES ('Competition_conv', 0);

```

Listing 3: SQL statements created by factorizeSQL for the relation *Competition*

taken from, is the one created in Figure 6 after the data has been rescaled by *scaleFeatures(...)* from Section 4.2.

Listing 4 shows all of the SQL queries that are used to create the *QxName* views as well as the query for the intercept. The variable order is again the same as created in Section 4.1 after it was processed by *scaleFeatures(...)*. Figure 7 shows the parts of the operator tree of *QT* that corresponds to the queries of the root *QT*, the inner node *QL* and the leaf node *QCom_conv*.




Figure 7: Part of the operator tree of *QT* corresponding to *QT*, *QL* and *QCom_conv*

```

CREATE VIEW QCom_conv AS (
SELECT Com_conv.L, Com_conv.C, ''::text AS Com_conv_lineage,
    Com_conv_d AS Com_conv_deg, 1 AS Com_conv_agg
FROM Com_conv, Com_conv_type);

CREATE VIEW QC AS (
SELECT QCom_conv.L,
    QCom_conv.Com_conv_lineage ||
    CASE WHEN C_d > 0 THEN '(' || C_n || ',' || C_d || ')'
    ELSE ''::text END AS C_lineage,
    QCom_conv.Com_conv_deg + C_d AS C_deg,
    SUM(POWER(COALESCE(QCom_conv.C,0),C_d) * QCom_conv.
        Com_conv_agg) AS C_agg
FROM QCom_conv, C_type
WHERE QCom_conv.Com_conv_deg + C_d <= 2
GROUP BY QCom_conv.L, C_lineage, QCom_conv.Com_conv_deg + C_d);

CREATE VIEW QSa_conv AS (
SELECT Sa_conv.P, Sa_conv.S,
    ''::text AS Sa_conv_lineage, Sa_conv_d AS Sa_conv_deg,
    1 AS Sa_conv_agg
FROM Sa_conv, Sa_conv_type);

CREATE VIEW QS AS (
SELECT QSa_conv.P,
    QSa_conv.Sa_conv_lineage ||
    CASE WHEN S_d > 0 THEN '(' || S_n || ',' || S_d || ')'
    ELSE ''::text END AS S_lineage,
    QSa_conv.Sa_conv_deg + S_d AS S_deg,
    SUM(POWER(COALESCE(QSa_conv.S,0),S_d) * QSa_conv.
        Sa_conv_agg) AS S_agg
FROM QSa_conv, S_type
WHERE QSa_conv.Sa_conv_deg + S_d <= 2
GROUP BY QSa_conv.P, S_lineage, QSa_conv.Sa_conv_deg + S_d);

CREATE VIEW QBr AS (
SELECT Br.L, Br.P, Br.I,
    ''::text AS Br_lineage, Br_d AS Br_deg, 1 AS Br_agg
FROM Br, Br_type);

CREATE VIEW QI AS (
SELECT QBr.P, QBr.L,
    QBr.Br_lineage ||
    CASE WHEN I_d > 0 THEN '(' || I_n || ',' || I_d || ')'
    ELSE ''::text END AS I_lineage,
    QBr.Br_deg + I_d AS I_deg,
    SUM(POWER(COALESCE(QBr.I,0),I_d) * QBr.Br_agg) AS I_agg
FROM QBr, I_type
WHERE QBr.Br_deg + I_d <= 2
GROUP BY QBr.P, QBr.L, I_lineage, QBr.Br_deg + I_d);

CREATE VIEW QP AS (
SELECT QI.L,
    QS.S_lineage || QI.I_lineage ||
    CASE WHEN P_d > 0 THEN '(' || P_n || ',' || P_d || ')'
    ELSE ''::text END AS P_lineage,
    QS.S_deg + QI.I_deg + P_d AS P_deg,
    SUM(1 * QS.S_agg * QI.I_agg) AS P_agg
FROM QS JOIN QI ON QS.P=QI.P, P_type
WHERE QS.S_deg + QI.I_deg + P_d <= 2
GROUP BY QS.P, QI.L, P_lineage, QS.S_deg + QI.I_deg + P_d);

CREATE VIEW QL AS (
SELECT QC.C_lineage || QP.P_lineage ||
    CASE WHEN L_d > 0 THEN '(' || L_n || ',' || L_d || ')'
    ELSE ''::text END AS L_lineage,
    QC.C_deg + QP.P_deg + L_d AS L_deg,
    SUM(POWER(COALESCE(QC.L,0),L_d) * QC.C_agg * QP.P_agg) AS
        L_agg
FROM QC JOIN QP ON QC.L=QP.L, L_type
WHERE QC.C_deg + QP.P_deg + L_d <= 2
GROUP BY L_lineage, QC.C_deg + QP.P_deg + L_d);

CREATE TABLE QT AS (
SELECT QL.L_lineage AS lineage,
    QL.L_deg AS deg,
    SUM(QL.L_agg) AS agg
FROM QL
WHERE QL.L_deg <= 2
GROUP BY lineage, QL.L_deg);

```

Listing 4: SQL queries run by factorizeSQL(...) for all of the variables

4.4 Batch Gradient Descent using Cofactors

The function *batchGradientDescent*(...) performs gradient descent on a precomputed cofactor matrix that is stored in a database. At first, this function constructs a cofactor matrix locally by requesting the data from the database. To identify which cofactor represents which feature, the lineage and deg columns are used. For example $\text{cofactor}[0][1] = \text{cofactor}[1][0]$ would be requested by the query:

```
SELECT agg
FROM Qcoln
WHERE lineage LIKE '%(col0,1)%' AND lineage LIKE '%(col1,1)%';
```

And $\text{cofactor}[i][n] = \text{cofactor}[n][i]$ would be requested by this query:

```
SELECT agg
FROM Qcoln
WHERE lineage LIKE '%(coli,1)%' AND deg = 1;
```

After this matrix is constructed, θ will be initialized with $n + 1$ values with $\theta_0 = -1$. Then it will repeat updating θ until the new change to the error is smaller than a threshold ϵ which is currently set to 10^{-6} . It will also abort if it takes more than 100 million iterations or if α is decreased below 10^{-15} . Initially it will start with $\alpha = 0.003$ and divide it by 3 every time the sum of all ϵ_j is greater than it was in the previous iteration. The update for θ_j is computed as discussed in Section 3.2 and 3.4 by this formula:

$$\epsilon_j = \alpha \cdot \left(\sum_{k=0}^n (\theta_k \cdot \text{Cofactor}[k, j]) + 0.006 \cdot \theta_j \right)$$

Where $0.006 \cdot \theta_j$ replaces $\lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} R(\theta)$ for the ridge regularization term used in this implementation.

4.5 Combining Cofactors and Linear Regression

The function *linearRegression* combines all of the previous functions into one. It calls *varOrder.findLeaves(leaves)* to construct a vector with all the relations in the given extended variable order. To convert the data, this vector will then be used to call the function *scaleFeatures(relevantColumns, leaves, con)*. Afterwards, it will compute the cofactors required for gradient descent by calling *factorizeSQL(varOrder, con)*. Once this is completed, a call to *batchGradientDescent()* returns θ . However those values still correspond to the rescaled features, so θ_1 to θ_{n-1} are rescaled as discussed in Section 3.3 by dividing θ_j by *scaleAggs_j.max*. In the same iteration the sum of $\theta_j \cdot \text{scaleAggs}_j.\text{avg}$ is computed and used to update θ_n by subtracting this sum. At last the function returns the adjusted θ and terminates.

5 EVALUATION

This section compares non-factorized learning to different implementations for factorized learning with regard to runtime and accuracy. We further benchmark our implementation on PostgreSQL and HyPer.

The “Favorita” data set [4] is used which represents sales and other information of a grocery chain. Some of the features had to be converted to numerical values to allow a meaningful linear regression. For example, the column *date* has been changed to an integer representing $\text{YYYYMMDD} - \min(\text{YYYYMMDD})$ where




Figure 8: The extended variable order used in this section (keys of each variable within curly brackets).

Table 2: Time taken and average errors produced by different implementations. “Version” also gives a short description with these abbreviations:

fact: uses *factorizeSQL*(...) (§4.3) to precompute cofactors
eps: threshold for gradient descent is set from 10^{-6} to 10^{-8}
 α : is adjusted differently from the description in §4.4
 θ_0 : $\theta_{0,conv} - \sum avg_j$ is used instead of $avg_{label} - \sum avg_j$
noPre: aggregates are not precomputed (opposite of *fact*)

(a) PostgreSQL

| version | runtime | avg. abs. err. | avg. rel. err. |
|---------------------------------------|----------|----------------|-----------------|
| 1 <i>fact</i> | 95m 19s | 8.013579601343 | 2.5518562713374 |
| 2 <i>noPre</i> | 100m 21s | 8.013594277405 | 2.5518638178538 |
| 4 <i>fact</i> , α | 96m 06s | 7.946684605422 | 2.5033955036198 |
| 5 <i>fact</i> , α , θ_0 | 94m 30s | 8.004892391970 | 2.5449049555482 |
| 6 <i>noPre</i> , θ_0 | 101m 46s | 8.054689325103 | 2.5807940338719 |

(b) HyPer

| version | runtime | avg. abs. err. | avg. rel. err. |
|---------------------------------------|---------|------------------|-----------------|
| 1 <i>fact</i> | 1m 38s | 7.90330530017246 | 2.4709516975089 |
| 2 <i>noPre</i> | 5m 41s | 7.90332387409202 | 2.4709646443091 |
| 3 <i>fact</i> , <i>eps</i> | 1m 36s | 7.90330179473297 | 2.4709492573143 |
| 4 <i>fact</i> , α | 1m 38s | 7.76919971905285 | 2.3681165862928 |
| 5 <i>fact</i> , α , θ_0 | 1m 39s | 7.94772901833209 | 2.5010221770641 |
| 6 <i>noPre</i> , θ_0 | 5m 37s | 8.04578631749736 | 2.5726866191708 |

the minimum value is subtracted to produce smaller absolute values. Figure 8 shows the extended variable order used and represents the factorized representation of the natural join of all of relevant relations. The label, which is predicted in these tests, is *unit_sales* and is derived from the features *date*, *store_nbr*, *item_nbr* and *onpromotion*. All the tests are run on a machine with 220 GiB main memory and two Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2660 v2 @ 2.20GHz processors resulting in a total number of 20 cores and 40 threads.

All tests are executed on PostgreSQL [14] v10.10 (Table 2a) and on HyPer [5] (Table 2b). The absolute error is calculated by the formula $\text{absErr}^{(i)} = |\text{unit_sales}^{(i)} - h_\theta(x^{(i)})|$ and the relative error is determined as $\text{relErr}^{(i)} = \frac{\text{absErr}^{(i)}}{\text{unit_sales}^{(i)}}$.

Version 2 and 6 compute gradient descent without factorization, the others with precomputed cofactors. Version 1 uses the




Figure 9: Runtime and average error comparison of PostgreSQL and HyPer

adjustment algorithm for α that leads to less iteration but better accuracy. This version corresponds to the description in Section 4. Version 2 is equivalent to version 1 but without using `factorizeSQL(...)` to precompute cofactors. This leads to an decrease in accuracy while at the same time reducing the performance by a considerable amount. Version 3 equals version 1 but the threshold, which `batchGradientDescent(...)` uses to determine the accuracy, is changed from 10^{-6} to 10^{-8} . As expected, this leads to a slightly improved result without impacting the time requirement. Version 4 differs from version 1 since it uses the alternative mechanism for adjusting α . Therefore, this leads to an even more accurate result without any performance loss. Version 5 and 6 correspond to version 4 and 2 but calculate θ_0 by transforming the value of $\theta_{0,conv}$ instead of using the average value of `unit_sales`. This leads to a huge error without having any advantage concerning the runtime.

Figure 9 visualizes the differences between PostgreSQL [14] and HyPer [5] in terms of their runtime and average absolute error. Factorization increased the runtime by 70% in HyPer and 5% in PostgreSQL. HyPer performed almost 50 times faster for the factorized executions and 20 times faster for non-factorized ones than PostgreSQL. Version 4 produces the most accurate results for both versions but it is also the version where HyPer [5] has the biggest advantage over PostgreSQL [14].

6 CONCLUSION

This paper has presented the implementation of factorized learning on top of in-memory database systems. We first described the concept of factorized learning with the variable order derived from the query plan. We continued with gradient descent for linear regression on factorized joins. The paper then presented the implementation, which emits SQL code for feature scaling, cofactor computation, and gradient descent. We benchmarked our implementation on database systems, with HyPer executing the queries faster than PostgreSQL. HyPer benefits much more from the factorized representation compared to the materialized version.

For future work, it may be interesting to extend the implementation to polynomial regression. The added complexity increases the gain from factorized representations even more. Further tests on different data sets of different sizes might also provide more information about the usefulness of this implementation.

REFERENCES

- [1] Barbara M. Chapman and Piyush Mehrotra. 1998. OpenMP and HPF: Integrating Two Paradigms. In *Euro-Par '98 Parallel Processing, 4th International Euro-Par Conference, Southampton, UK, September 1-4, 1998, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, David J. Pritchard and Jeff Reeve (Eds.), Vol. 1470. Springer, 650–658. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0057912>
- [2] Georg Gottlob, Gianluigi Greco, and Francesco Scarcello. 2014. Treewidth and Hypertree Width. In *Tractability: Practical Approaches to Hard Problems*, Lucas Bordeaux, Youssef Hamadi, and Pushmeet Kohli (Eds.). Cambridge University Press, 3–38. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139177801.002>
- [3] Zezhou Huang, Rathijit Sen, Jiaxiang Liu, and Eugene Wu. 2023. JoinBoost: Grow Trees Over Normalized Data Using Only SQL. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 16, 11 (2023), 3071–3084. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3611479.3611509>
- [4] Kaggle. 2018. *Corporación Favorita Grocery Sales Forecasting*. <https://www.kaggle.com/c/favorita-grocery-sales-forecasting>, Last accessed: 2020-02-04.
- [5] Alfons Kemper and Thomas Neumann. 2010. One Size Fits all, Again! The Architecture of the Hybrid OLTP&OLAP Database Management System HyPer. In *Enabling Real-Time Business Intelligence - 4th International Workshop, BIRTE 2010, Held at the 36th International Conference on Very Large Databases, VLDB 2010, Singapore, September 13, 2010, Revised Selected Papers (Lecture Notes in Business Information Processing)*, Malú Castellanos, Umeshwar Dayal, and Volker Markl (Eds.), Vol. 84. Springer, 7–23. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-22970-1_2
- [6] libpqxx. [n.d.]. *The C++ connector for PostgreSQL*. <http://pqxx.org/development/libpqxx/>.
- [7] Dániel Marx. 2009. Approximating fractional hypertree width. In *Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2009, New York, NY, USA, January 4-6, 2009*, Claire Mathieu (Ed.). SIAM, 902–911. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611973068>
- [8] Andrew Ng. 2016. *Lecture 4.1 - Linear Regression With Multiple Variables - (Multiple Features)*. <https://youtu.be/Q4GNLhRtZNc>.
- [9] Andrew Ng. 2016. *Lecture 4.2 - Linear Regression With Multiple Variables - (Gradient Descent For Multiple Variables)*. <https://youtu.be/pkJjoro-b5c>.
- [10] Andrew Ng. 2016. *Lecture 4.3 - Linear Regression With Multiple Variables | Gradient In Practice Feature Scaling*. <https://youtu.be/r5E2X1JdHAU>.
- [11] Dan Olteanu and Maximilian Schleich. 2016. Factorized Databases. *SIGMOD Record* 45, 2 (2016), 5–16. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3003665.3003667>
- [12] Maximilian Schleich, Dan Olteanu, and Radu Ciucanu. 2016. Learning Linear Regression Models over Factorized Joins. In *Proceedings of the 2016 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD Conference 2016, San Francisco, CA, USA, June 26 - July 01, 2016*, Fatma Özcan, Georgia Koutrika, and Sam Madden (Eds.). ACM, 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2882903.2882939>
- [13] Maximilian Schleich, Dan Olteanu, Mahmoud Abo Khamis, Hung Q. Ngo, and XuanLong Nguyen. 2019. A Layered Aggregate Engine for Analytics Workloads. In *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD Conference 2019, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, June 30 - July 5, 2019*, Peter A. Boncz, Stefan Manegold, Anastasia Ailamaki, Amol Deshpande, and Tim Kraska (Eds.). ACM, 1642–1659. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3299869.3324961>
- [14] Michael Stonebraker and Lawrence A. Rowe. 1986. The Design of Postgres. In *Proceedings of the 1986 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, Washington, DC, USA, May 28-30, 1986*, Carlo Zaniolo (Ed.). ACM Press, 340–355. <https://doi.org/10.1145/16894.16888>