# Compressed Indexes for Fast Search of Semantic Data

#### **Raffaele Perego**

ISTI-CNR Pisa, Italy

## Giulio Ermanno Pibiri

ISTI-CNR Pisa, Italy

#### **Rossano Venturini**

The University of Pisa Pisa, Italy







The 10-th Italian Information Retrieval Workshop (IIR 2019)

17/09/2019

## **Resource Description Framework (RDF)**

"RDF is a standard model for data interchange on the Web." Source: <u>https://www.w3.org/RDF</u>

> Statements are encoded with **triples**: Subject (**S**) - Predicate (**P**) - Object (**O**)

## **Resource Description Framework (RDF)**

"RDF is a standard model for data interchange on the Web." Source: <u>https://www.w3.org/RDF</u>

> Statements are encoded with **triples**: Subject (**S**) - Predicate (**P**) - Object (**O**)

> > "Bob Smith knows John Doe."

<<u>http://example.name#BobSmith12</u>> <<u>http://xmlns.com/foaf/0.1/knows</u>> <<u>http://example.name#JohnDoe34</u>>

#### The problem

Huge datasets: **billions** of triples.

# Storage space is an issue: **compression is mandatory**.

How to support triple selection patterns (with wildcards) efficiently?

### The problem

Huge datasets: **billions** of triples.

# Storage space is an issue: compression is mandatory.

How to support triple selection patterns (with wildcards) efficiently?

<Bob Smith> <knows> <???>

<???> <???> John Doe

<Bob Smith> <???> <Sara Parker>

### The problem

Huge datasets: **billions** of triples.

# Storage space is an issue: **compression is mandatory**.

How to support triple selection patterns (with wildcards) efficiently?

	3 wildcards: ???	0 wildcard: SPO
<bob smith=""> <???> <sara parker=""></sara></bob>		
?? ?? John Doe	S?O ?PO	?P? ??O
<bob smith=""> <knows> <???></knows></bob>	SP?	S??
	1 wildcard:	2 wildcards:

#### **State-of-the-art solutions**

Too costly in terms of **space**.

- Materialize **all** possible S-P-O permutations (6 separate indexes).
- Do **not** use sophisticated compression techniques.
- Expensive additional indexes to support retrieval.

Map URI strings to integers to reduce space requirements: we deal with datasets of integer triples.

- SPO
- SP?
- S??
- ???
- ? P O
- ?P?
- S?O ??O

Map URI strings to integers to reduce space requirements: we deal with datasets of integer triples.



Map URI strings to integers to reduce space requirements: we deal with datasets of integer triples.



Map URI strings to integers to reduce space requirements: we deal with datasets of integer triples.



Map URI strings to integers to reduce space requirements: we deal with datasets of integer triples.







- Common prefixes are encoded once.
- Two integer **sequences** per level (nodes and pointers).
- Symmetrically support **all** selection patterns with 1 and 2 wildcards.
- Cache-friendly memory layout.



- Common prefixes are encoded once.
- Two integer **sequences** per level (nodes and pointers).

Allows effective compression

- Symmetrically support **all** selection patterns with 1 and 2 wildcards.
- Cache-friendly memory layout.

















### The Permuted Trie Index: refinements

#### **Cross Compression**

1

2

Permutation Elimination

Fact: the **same** triple appears three times, but in **different** permutations.

Fact: the **same** triple appears three times, but in **different** permutations.



We can represent the subjects in trie **1** by using the subjects in trie **2**.

Fact: the **same** triple appears three times, but in **different** permutations.



We can represent the subjects in trie **1** by using the subjects in trie **2**.

Fact: the **same** triple appears three times, but in **different** permutations.



We can represent the subjects in trie **1** by using the subjects in trie **2**.

Represent **S**<sub>j</sub> as its position **p**.





Fact: the **same** triple appears three times, but in **different** permutations.



We can represent the subjects in trie **1** by using the subjects in trie **2**.

Represent **S**<sub>j</sub> as its position **p**.



Trie	Level	Average	Maximum
SPO	1	5.54	52
	2	2.32	8489
POS	1	91,578.32	21,219,244
	2	2.59	10,141,311
OSP	1	2.70	10,141,327
	2	1.13	10

Number of children in Dbpedia.



S<sub>1</sub>



Fact: predicates are **few**, thus **S?O** returns only few matches.

Fact: predicates are **few**, thus **S?O** returns only few matches.

#### We can pattern match S?O on the SPO trie,

instead of the OSP trie.

Given a (s,o) pair: for each child  $p_i$  of s, check is o is a child of  $p_i$ . If so, then (s, $p_i$ ,o) is a match.

Fact: predicates are **few**, thus **S?O** returns only few matches.

We can pattern match S?O on the SPO trie,

instead of the OSP trie.

Given a (s,o) pair: for each child  $p_i$  of s, check is o is a child of  $p_i$ . If so, then (s, $p_i$ ,o) is a match.

Trie	Level	Average	Maximum
SPO	1	5.54	52
51 0	2	2.32	8489
POS	1	91,578.32	21,219,244
	2	2.59	10,141,311
OSD	1	2.70	10,141,327
U3P	2	1.13	10

Less than 6 checks are needed on average!

Number of children in Dbpedia.

SPO trie SPO SP? S?? S?O ???

+ OR



**Object-based retrieval** 





We can eliminate a permutation, thus saving 1/3 of the space of the index.

#### **Experiments: setting**

Datasets		
Dataset	Triples	
DBLP	88,150,324	
Geonames	123,020,821	
DBpedia	351,592,624	
Freebase	2,067,068,154	

#### Machine

i7-7700 CPU (@3.6 GHz), 64 GB of RAM DDR3 (@2.133 GHz) Linux 4.4.0, 64 bits

#### Compiler

gcc 7.2.0 (with all optimizations)

## **Experiments: C++ code**

#### C++ code at https://github.com/jermp/rdf\_indexes

#### E README.md

#### **Indexes for RDF data**

This is the C++ library used for the experiments in the paper *Compressed Indexes for Fast Search of Semantic Data* [1], by Raffaele Perego, Giulio Ermanno Pibiri and Rossano Venturini.

This guide is meant to provide a brief overview of the library and to illustrate its functionalities through some examples.

#### Table of contents

- 1. Compiling the code
- 2. Input data format
- 3. Preparing the data for inedxing
- 4. Building an index
- 5. Querying an index
- 6. Statistics
- 7. Testing
- 8. Extending the software
- 9. Authors
- 10. References

### **Experiments: our solutions**

	Index	DBLP	Geonames	DBpedia	Freebase
		bits/triple	bits/triple	bits/triple	bits/triple
	3T	75.24 (+31%)	71.59 (+32%)	80.64 (+33%)	74.20(+30%)
	CC	63.54 (+18%)	67.04 (+27%)	66.91 (+19%)	70.46(+26%)
	2To	56.46 (+8%)	53.23 (+8%)	57.51 (+6%)	55.72 (+6%)
	2Tp	51.99	48.98	54.14	52.17
		ns/triple	ns/triple	ns/triple	ns/triple
SPO	all	203	221	353	521
SP?	all	197	347	11	3
S??	all	28	40	10	3
???	all	11	13	9	9
<u> </u>	3T,CC	2490 (5.6×)	3767 (7.7×)	1833 (2.6×)	6547 (1.8×)
5:0	2То,2Тр	445	490	692	3736
200	3T,2To,2Tp	5	5	5	5
?PO	CC	12 (2.4×)	15 (3.0×)	16 (3.2×)	14 (2.8×)
	3T,CC	12 (2.4×)	12 (2.4×)	12 (2.4×)	10 (2.0×)
??O	2To	5	5	5	5
	2Tp	5 (1.0×)	5 (1.0×)	6 (1.2×)	10 (2.0×)
	3T,2Tp	9	8	6	6
?P?	CC	21 (2.3×)	36 (4.5×)	30 (5.0×)	29 (4.8×)
	2To	81 (9.0×)	$138(17.2 \times)$	22 (3.7×)	18 (3.0×)

#### **Overall, 2Tp offers the best space/time tradeoff.**

#### **Experiments: overall comparison**

	Index	DBLP	Geonames	DBpedia	Freebase
		bits/triple	bits/triple	bits/triple	bits/triple
	2Tp	51.99	48.98	54.14	52.17
	HDT-FoQ	76.89 (+32%)	88.73 (+45%)	76.66 (+29%)	83.11 (+37%)
	TripleBit	125.10 (+58%)	120.03 (+59%)	130.07 (+58%)	_
		ns/triple	ns/triple	ns/triple	ns/triple
	2Tp	5	5	5	5
?PO	HDT-FoQ	12 (2.4×)	13 (2.6×)	14 (2.8×)	13 (2.6×)
	TripleBit	15 (3.0×)	13 (2.6×)	14 (2.8×)	_
	2Tp	445	490	692	3736
S?O	HDT-FoQ	1789 (4.0×)	2097 (4.3×)	3010 (4.3×)	0.7×10 <sup>7</sup> (2057×)
	TripleBit	$11872(26.7\times)$	13008(26.5×)	18023(26.0×)	_
	2Tp	197	347	11	3
SP?	HDT-FoQ	640 (3.2×)	897 (2.6×)	30 (2.7×)	9 (3.0×)
	TripleBit	1222 (6.2×)	927 (2.7×)	42 (3.8×)	—
	2Tp	28	40	10	3
S??	HDT-FoQ	110 (3.9×)	154 (3.9×)	29 (2.9×)	9 (3.0×)
	TripleBit	$2275(81.2\times)$	3261 (81.5×)	490(49.0×)	—
	2Tp	9	8	6	4
?P?	HDT-FoQ	$108(12.0 \times)$	$173(21.6 \times)$	32 (5.3×)	41 (6.8×)
	TripleBit	28 (3.1×)	28 (3.5×)	40 (6.7×)	_
	2Tp	5	5	6	10
??O	HDT-FoQ	17 (3.4×)	17 (3.4×)	18 (3.0×)	18 (1.8×)
	TripleBit	24 (4.8×)	$60(12.0 \times)$	24 (4.0×)	_

Our selected trade-off configuration substantially outperforms the tested competitors in both space and time.

#### Conclusions

The *triple indexing problem with pattern matching* can be solved efficiently in both time and space regards.

Our solution — the **permuted trie index** — achieves substantial performance improvement against the best previous solutions.

#### Cross-compression Permutation-elimination

Paper available at <u>https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.07619</u>

C++ code available at <a href="https://github.com/jermp/rdf\_indexes">https://github.com/jermp/rdf\_indexes</a>

# Thanks for your attention, time, patience!

Any questions?