

MCMD L17 : MapReduce | Simulating BSP+PRAM

MapReduce

$N = \text{Massive Data}$

$\text{Mapper}(N) \rightarrow \{(key, value)\}$

$\text{Shuffle}(\{(key, value)\}) \rightarrow \text{group by "key"}$

$\text{Reducer } (\{"key, value_i\}) \rightarrow ("key, f(value_i))$

Can repeat, constant # of rounds

Today: Simulate EREW PRAM in MR

Simulate CRCW PRAM in MR

Simulate BSP in MR

+ algorithms...

MUD (Feldman, Muthukrishnan, Sidiropoulos, Stein, Svitkina 2008)

Reducer size $M = O(\log^c N)$

Linear sketch streaming algorithms can be simulated in MR

Karloff, Suri, Vassilvitskii 2010

For some small constant $\epsilon > 0$ (e.g. 1/4)

Reducer Size = $M = O(N^{1-\epsilon})$

$P = O(N^{2-\epsilon})$

Simulate EREW PRAM with MR

in MR $P = O(N^{1-\epsilon})$

$R = O(\log^c N) = \text{rounds}$

$N = 1 \text{ billion}$

$\log_2(N) \sim 30$

$(\log_2(N))^3 \sim 27,000$

$(\log_2(N))^4 \sim 810,000$

$(\log_2(N))^6 \sim 729 \text{ million}$

```

sqrt(N) ~ 31,000
N^(1/4) ~ 200
N^(0.65) ~ 700,000
N^(3/4) ~ 5.6 million
N^(0.95) ~ 350 million

```

MST in MR

Minimum spanning tree of graph $G=(V,E)$
 works with $E=O(V^2)$

- Partition V into sets V_i s.t. $|V_i| = N/k$
- on each pair $V_i \cup V_j$,
 consider all edges $(v_1, v_2) = e$ in E s.t. v_1, v_2 in $V_i \cup V_j$
- Return MSF on each $V_i \cup V_j$, discard other edges.

"filter" (preview)

 Goodrich, (Sitchinava, Zhang) 2011

Simulate CRCR PRAM and BSP with MR

R = # rounds

```

n_{r,i} size I/O of mapper/reducer i in round r
C_r = sum_i n_{r,i}
C = sum_{r=0}^{R-1} C_r == communication complexity

```

```

t_r = internal running time for round r
  >= max_i {n_{r,i}}
t = sum_{r=0}^{R-1} t_r
  == total running time

```

L = latency of shuffle (number of steps mapper or reducer waits for shuffle)

B = bandwidth of shuffle network
 # elements delivered in unit of time (like block in I/O)

Total time T = $\Omega(t + RL + C/B)$

word count has ($R=1$, $C=\Theta(n)$, $t=\Theta(n)$)
 "the" occurs 7% of time = $\Theta(n)$

M = I/O buffer memory size: require $n_{r,i} \leq M$

If need to roughly fill memory each round, then:

$T = \Omega(R(M+L) + C/B)$

rounds + work in PRAM

Let $M = \Theta(n^\epsilon)$ for $\epsilon > 0$
then algorithms can run in $O(\log_M N) = 1/\epsilon$ rounds, a constant!

Any BSP algorithm in R super-steps, with memory size of N and $P \leq N$ processors

→ simulated in MR in R rounds with $C = O(RN)$ with $M = O(N/P)$

Any CRCW PRAM (including sum on concurrent write)

with T steps w/ P processors, memory size N

→ simulated in MR in R = $O(T \log_M P)$ rounds

$C = O(T(N+P) \log_M (N+P))$ comm.complex.

Key idea: think of computation in the (dynamic) DAG model.
... edges defined based on data.

Prefix sum in $2 \log_M N$ rounds with $N \log_M N$ communication

each element has (a_i, i) a_i =value, i =order

return $(i, \sum_{j=1}^i a_j)$

Just like PRAM/BSP algorithm, but with M-way split tree

stage 1 ($\log_M N$ rounds) : sum of all items

stage 2 ($\log_M N$ rounds) : filter down using partial prefix sums

key trick is to split indexes into chunks of size M each round

Can be extended when index values i are not consecutive and N not known whp.

MultiSearch in $R=O(\log_M N)$ and $CC=O(N \log_M N)$

N searches on N data items

Sorting in $R=O(\log_M N)$ and $CC=O(N \log_M N)$

Minimal MapReduce Algorithms (Tao, Lin, Xiao 2013)

N = massive data

t = # machines

$m = N/t$ = space per machine

1) at all times $O(m)$ data per machine

2) each shuffle phase has $O(m)$ in- + out-traffic per machine

3) constant # rounds

4) $O(T_{\text{seq}} / t)$ total time (over all rounds) where T_{seq} is sequential runtime

- (1) + (2) prevents partition skew
- (3) prevents worrying too much about round overhead,
total $O(N)$ traffic
- (2) prevents curse-of-last-reducer
makes stateless (if one goes down, can be re-routed)
- (4) efficiency + speedup