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The nature that needs change is vicious; for it is not simple nor good…

Nicomachean Ethics, Book VII, Aristotle
SWEBOK Maintenance

- **Corrective** maintenance: reactive modification (or repairs) of a software product performed after delivery to **correct** discovered problems.

- **Adaptive** maintenance: modification of a software product performed after delivery to **keep a software product usable in a changed or changing environment**.

- **Perfective** maintenance: modification of a software product after delivery to provide enhancements for users, improvement of program documentation, and recoding to **improve software performance, maintainability, or other software attributes**.

- **Preventive** maintenance: modification of a software product after delivery to **detect and correct latent faults** in the software product before they become operational faults.
Database Evolution: why and what

• All software systems and, thus, both the databases themselves and applications built around databases are dynamic environments and can evolve due
  – Changes of requirements
  – Internal restructuring due to performance reasons
  – Migration to / integration with another system
  – ...

• Database evolution further concerns
  – Changes in the operational environment of the database
  – Changes in the content (data) of the databases as time passes by
  – Changes in the internal structure, or schema, of the database
What evolves in DBMS...

• Data

```
UPDATE EMP
SET SALARY = SALARY * 1.10
WHERE...
```

• Metadata – Schemata – Models

```
ALTER TABLE EMP
ADD COLUMN PHONE VARCHAR ...
```
Why is (schema) evolution so important?

- Software and DB **maintenance** makes up for **at least 50% of all resources spent in a project**.
- Changes are more frequent than you think
- Databases are rarely stand-alone: typically, an entire ecosystem of applications is structured around them =>
- Changes in the schema can impact a large (typically, not traced) number of surrounding app’s, without explicit identification of the impact
Embedded queries in the past

[Maule+08] ...
… nowadays, to be complemented with API-based db access (Drupal)

```php
function _profile_get_fields($category, $register = FALSE) {
    $query = db_select('profile_field');
    if ($register) {
        $query->condition('register', 1);
    } else {
        $query->condition('category', db_like($category), 'LIKE');
    }
    if (!user_access('administer users')) {
        $query->condition('visibility', PROFILE_HIDDEN, '<>');
    }
    return $query
        ->fields('profile_field')
        ->orderBy('category', 'ASC')
        ->orderBy('weight', 'ASC')
        ->execute();
}```
Evolution taxonomy

• **Schema evolution**, itself, can be addressed at
  – the **conceptual** level (req’s, goals, conc. models, …. evolve)
  – the **logical** level, where the main constructs of the database structure evolve
    • E.g.,: relations and views in the relational area, classes in the object-oriented database area, or (XML) elements in the XML/semi-structured area),
  – the **physical** level, involving data placement and partitioning, indexing, compression, archiving etc.
Evolution taxonomy: areas

• Relational databases
• Object Oriented db’s
• Conceptual models
• XML
• Ontologies
• ...

• Special case of relational: data warehouses
... To probe further ...


Imagine if we could predict how a schema will evolve over time...

- ... we would be able to “design for evolution” and minimize the impact of evolution to the surrounding applications
  - by applying design patterns
  - by avoiding anti-patterns & complexity increase
  - in both the db and the code
- ... we would be able to plan administration and perfective maintenance tasks and resources, instead of responding to emergencies
WHAT ARE THE “LAWS” OF DATABASE SCHEMA EVOLUTION?
Why aren’t we there yet?

• Historically, nobody from the research community had access + the right to publish to version histories of database schemata

• **Open source tools** internally hosting databases have changed this landscape &

• We are now presented with the opportunity to study the version histories of such “open source databases”

Mind the gap! (15 years)
Our take on the problem

• Collected version histories for the schemata of 8 open-source projects
  – CMS’s: MediaWiki, TYPO3, Coppermine, phpBB, OpenCart
  – Physics: ATLAS Trigger --- Bio: Ensemble, BioSQL

• Preprocessed them to be parsable by our HECATE schema comparison tool and exported the transitions between each two subsequent versions and measures for them (size, growth, changes)

• Exploratory search where we statistically studied / mined these measures, to extract patterns & regularities for the lives of tables

• Web:

• Data available at:
  https://github.com/DAINTINESS-Group/EvolutionDatasets
Scope of the study

- **Scope:**
  - databases being part of open-source software (and not proprietary ones)
  - long history
  - we work only with changes at the logical schema level (and ignore physical-level changes like index creation or change of storage engine)

- We encompass datasets with different domains ([A]: physics, [B]: biomedical, [C]: CMS’s), amount of growth (shade: high, med, low) & schema size

- We should be very careful to not overgeneralize findings to proprietary databases or physical schemata!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FoSS Dataset</th>
<th>Versions</th>
<th>Lifetime</th>
<th>Tables @ Start</th>
<th>Tables @ End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATLAS Trigger [A]</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2 Y, 7 M, 2 D</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BioSQL [B]</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10 Y, 6 M, 19 D</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppermine [C]</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>8 Y, 6 M, 2 D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensembl [B]</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>13 Y, 3 M, 15 D</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MediaWiki [C]</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>8 Y, 10 M, 6 D</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenCart [C]</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>4 Y, 4 M, 3 D</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phpBB [C]</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>6 Y, 7 M, 10 D</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPO3 [C]</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8 Y, 11 M, 0 D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hecate: SQL schema diff extractor

https://github.com/DAINTINESS-Group/Hecate
.. What do we see if we observe the evolution of the entire schema?


• Skoulis, Vassiliadis, Zarras. Open-Source Databases: Within, Outside, or Beyond Lehman's Laws of Software Evolution? CAiSE 2014

SCHEMA EVOLUTION FOR O/S DB’S AT THE “MACRO” LEVEL
Exploratory search of the schema histories for patterns

**Input:** schema histories from github/sourceforge/...

**Raw material:** details and stats on each table's life, as produced by our diff extractor, for all the 8 datasets

**Output:** properties & patterns on schema properties (size, growth, changes, ...) that occur frequently in our data sets

**Highlights**
- Patterns on size and growth
- Compliance to Lehman's laws
Schema Size (relations)
Schema Size

• **Overall increase in size**

• **Periods of increase**, esp. at beginning and after large drops -> positive feedback

• **Drops**: sudden and steep (in short duration) -> negative feedback

• **Large periods of stability!**
  – Unlike traditional S/W, db’s are dependency magnets...
Growth over time

- Coppermine: #Tables over time
  - Increase both slow (mostly) and abrupt
  - Occasional abrupt drops (maintenance)

- Ensembl: #Tables over time

- Mwiki: #Tables over time

- Opencart: #Tables over time
Schema Growth (diff in \#tables)

Schema growth is small!

- Growth is bounded in small values!
- Zipfian distribution of growth values around 0
  - Predominantly: occurrences of zero growth; almost all deltas are bounded between \([-2..2]\) tables
  - \([0..2]\) tables slightly more popular => average value of growth slightly higher than 0
- No periods of continuous change; small spikes instead

- Due to perfective maintenance, we also have negative values of growth (less than the positive ones).
- Oscillations exist too: positive growth is followed with immediate negative growth or stability
Zipfian model in the distribution of growth frequencies

Growth: delta in the schema size for two subsequent versions

Ensemble: frequencies of attribute change (x-axis: size of delta, y-axis: no of occurrences)
What happens after large changes?

1. Typical pattern for conservation of familiarity

2. Large changes, oscillating around zero and close to one another

3. Both (a) oscillation and close big changes, and (b) tail of rather low deltas after these changes

Density: focused maintenance effort

Progressive cooling: early – maintenance density >> later stages

Several spikes, many zero-change periods/versions

[With exceptions]
# tables & heartbeat of changes over time

**Atlas: #tables & heartbeat of changes over time**

**Typo3: #tables and heartbeat over time**

**Biosql #Tables and changes over time**

**phpBB: #tables & heartbeat of changes over time**
Main results

Schema size (#tables, #attributes) supports the assumption of a feedback mechanism
- Schema size grows over time; not continuously, but with bursts of concentrated effort
- Drops in schema size signify the existence of perfective maintenance
- Regressive formula for size estimation holds, with a quite short memory

Schema Growth (diff in size between subsequent versions) is small!!
- Growth is small, smaller than in typical software
- The number of changes for each evolution step follows Zipf’s law around zero
- Average growth is close (slightly higher) to zero

Patterns of change: no consistently constant behavior
- Changes reduce in density as databases age
- Change follows three patterns: Stillness, Abrupt change (up or down), Smooth growth upwards
- Change frequently follows spike patterns
- Complexity does not increase with age

.. What do we see if we observe the evolution of individual tables?


P. Vassiliadis, A. Zarras, I. Skoulis. How is Life for a Table in an Evolving Relational Schema? Birth, Death & Everything in Between. ER 2015
Gravitating to rigidity: Patterns of schema evolution – and its absence – in the lives of tables. Accepted in Information Systems.

OBSERVING THE EVOLUTION OF O/S DB SCHEMATA AT THE MICRO LEVEL
Exploratory search of the schema histories for patterns

**Input:** schema histories from github/sourceforge/...

**Raw material:** details and stats on each table’s life, as produced by our diff extractor, for all the 8 datasets

**Output:** properties & patterns on table properties (birth, duration, amt of change, ...) that occur frequently in our data sets

**Highlights**
- 4 patterns of evolution
- Statistical properties for schema size, change and duration of tables
- How are these measures interrelated?

SCHEMA SIZE, CHANGE AND DURATION
The Gamma $\Gamma$ Pattern: "if you're wide, you survive"

- The Gamma phenomenon:
  - tables with small schema sizes can have arbitrary durations, //small size does not determine duration
  - larger size tables last long

- Observations:
  - whenever a table exceeds the critical value of 10 attributes in its schema, its chances of surviving are high.
  - in most cases, the large tables are created early on and are not deleted afterwards.
Exceptions

- Biosql: nobody exceeds 10 attributes
- Ensembl, mwiki: very few exceed 10 attributes, 3 of them died
- typo: has many late born survivors
The Comet Pattern

“Comet “ for change over schema size with:

- a large, dense, nucleus cluster close to the beginning of the axes, denoting small size and small amount of change,

- medium schema size tables typically demonstrating medium to large change
  - The tables with the largest amount of change are typically tables whose schema is on average one standard deviation above the mean

- wide tables with large schema sizes demonstrating small to medium (typically around the middle of the y-axis) amount of change.
Comets have two tails: White one is made of comet dust particles. Blue one is made of electrically charged gas.

Nucleus is solid, icy heart of comet, inside the cloud of the coma.
The inverse Gamma pattern

- The correlation of change and duration is as follows:
  - small durations come necessarily with small change,
  - large durations come with all kinds of change activity and
  - medium sized durations come mostly with small change activity (Inverse Gamma).
Who are the top changers?
Who are removed at some point of time?
How do removals take place?

BIRTHDAY & SCHEMA SIZE & MATTERS OF LIFE AND DEATH
# Quiet tables rule, esp. for mature db’s

**Table distribution (pct of tables) wrt their activity class**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#tables</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Quiet</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>atlas</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biosql</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phpbb</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typo3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coppermine</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensembl</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwiki</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opencart*</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Quiet</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVIVED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Quiet</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>atlas</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biosql</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phpbb</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typo3</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coppermine</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensembl</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwiki</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opencart*</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Non-survivors
- Sudden deaths mostly
- Quiet come ~ close
- Too few active

## Survivors
- Quiet tables rule
- Rigid and active then
- Active mostly in “new” db’s

**Mature DB’s:** the pct of active tables drops significantly
Longevity and update activity correlate!!

The few top-changers (in terms of avg trans. update – ATU)

• are long lived,
• typically come from the early versions of the database
• due to the combination of high ATU and duration => they have high total amount of updates, and,
• frequently survive!

Too many top changers are born early

Deleted tables are born early & last short

Birth rate drops over time

Empty space: high change rates are only for early born & long lived

Top changers live long
Die young and suddenly

- There is a very large concentration of the deleted tables in a small range of newly born, quickly removed, with few or no updates...

- .... resulting in very low numbers of removed tables with medium or long durations (empty triangle).
Survive long enough & you’re probably safe

It is quite rare to see tables being removed at old age

Typically, the area of high duration is overwhelmingly inhabited by survivors (although each data set comes with a few such cases)!

High durations are overwhelmingly blue!

Only a couple of deletions are seen here!
Die young and suddenly

[Early life of the db] There is a very large concentration of the deleted tables in a small range of newly born, quickly removed, with few or no updates, resulting in very low numbers of removed tables with medium or long durations.

[Mature db] After the early stages of the databases, we see the birth of tables who eventually get deleted, but they mostly come with very small durations and sudden deaths.
Regularities on table change do exist!

If you’re wide, you survive

Top-changers typically live long, are early born, survive ...

... and they are not necessarily the widest ones in terms of schema size

Progressive cooling: most change activity lies at the beginning of the db history

Void triangle: The few dead tables are typically quiet, early born, short lived, and quite often all three of them
Where we stand
Open issues
... and discussions ...

OPEN ISSUES
Where we stand

• We have a first glimpse of the mechanics of schema evolution for FoSS ecosystems
• We have a first understanding of schemata growing, changed in focused periods of maintenance and progressively “cooling” down
• We have a first understanding of patterns relating to how tables change, given their size, update behavior, time of birth, ...

To probe further (code, data, details, presentations, ...)
Are there “laws” of schema evolution?

- Collect more test cases
- Tools for the automation of the process
  - Extract changes & verify their correctness (what happened)
  - Link changes to expressed user req’s / bugs / ... (why it happened & by whom)
  - Extract sub-histories of focused maintenance (how it happened & when)
  - Co-change of schema and code (what is affected in the code)
  - Visualization

- Consolidate the fundamental laws that govern evolution & forecast it (what will change)
Unexplored research territory (risky but possibly rewarding)

- **Weather Forecast**: given the history and the state of a database, predict subsequent events
  - Risky: frequently, changes come due to an external, changing world and have “thematic” affinity.
  - Big & small steps in many directions needed (more data sets, studies with high internal validity to find causations, more events to capture, ...)

- **Engineer for evolution**: To absorb change gracefully we can try to (i) alter db design and DDL; (ii) encapsulate the database via a “stable” API; ...
Management of ecosystems’ evolution

• Can we find these constructs that are most sensitive to evolution?
  – Metrics for sensitivity to evolution?

• Automation of the reaction to changes
  – self-monitoring
  – impact prediction
  – auto-regulation (policy determination)
  – self-repairing

Take Away Message

• Evolution is **viciously omnipresent**; due to its huge impact, **it is leading to non-evolvable (rigid) data & software structures**

• Practically:
  – **Plan for evolution**, well ahead of construction
  – So far, our solutions and **tools help only so much**
  – **Industry not likely to help**

• This is why **we can and have to do research**
  – We can do **pure scientific research** to find laws
  – We can do practical work for **tools and methods** that reduce the pain

... and don’t forget to put everything in the git ...
Thank you!

Q&A

http://www.cs.uoi.gr/~pvassil/

DB Schema Evolution
Papers, Data sets, Code, Results
projects/schemaBiographies/

Architecture Graphs & Hecataeus
projects/hecataeus/

https://github.com/DAINTINESS-Group/
AUXILIARY SLIDES
What are the “laws” of database (schema) evolution?

• How do databases change?
• In particular, how does the schema of a database evolve over time?

• Long term research goals:
  – Are there any “invariant properties” (e.g., patterns of repeating behavior) on the way database (schemata) change?
  – Is there a theory / model to explain them?
  – Can we exploit findings to engineer data-intensive ecosystems that withstand change gracefully?
Why care for the “laws”/patterns of schema evolution?

• Scientific curiosity!
• Practical Impact: DB’s are dependency magnets. Applications have to conform to the structure of the db...
  – typically, development waits till the “db backbone” is stable and applications are build on top of it
  – slight changes to the structure of a db can cause several (parts of) different applications to crash, causing the need for emergency repairing
... nowadays, to be complemented with API-based db access (Drupal)

```php
function _profile_get_fields($category, $register = FALSE) {
    $query = db_select('profile_field');
    if ($register) {
        $query->condition('register', 1);
    } else {
        $query->condition('category', db_like($category), 'LIKE');
    }
    if (!user_access('administer users')) {
        $query->condition('visibility', PROFILE_HIDDEN, '<>);
    }
    return $query
        ->fields('profile_field')
        ->orderBy('category', 'ASC')
        ->orderBy('weight', 'ASC')
        ->execute();
}
```
Abstract coupling example from my SW Dev course

Interface as a contract

Specification ≠ Implementation

Client class

Factory as a bridge

Service providers
Datasets

https://github.com/DAINTINESS-Group/EvolutionDatasets

● Content management Systems
  ● MediaWiki, TYPO3, Coppermine, phpBB, OpenCart

● Medical Databases
  ● Ensemble, BioSQL

● Scientific
  ● ATLAS Trigger
## Data sets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Versions</th>
<th>Lifetime</th>
<th>Table Start</th>
<th>Table End</th>
<th>Attributes Start</th>
<th>Attributes End</th>
<th>Commit per Day</th>
<th>% commits with change</th>
<th>Repository URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATLAS Trigger</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2 Y, 7 M, 2 D</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>0,089</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td><a href="http://atdaq-sw.cern.ch/cgi-bin/viewcvs-atlas.cgi/offline/Trigger/TrigConfiguration/TrigDb/share/sql/combined_schema.sql">http://atdaq-sw.cern.ch/cgi-bin/viewcvs-atlas.cgi/offline/Trigger/TrigConfiguration/TrigDb/share/sql/combined_schema.sql</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BioSQL</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10 Y, 6 M, 19 D</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0,012</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td><a href="https://github.com/biosql/biosql/blob/master/sql/biosqldb-mysql.sql">https://github.com/biosql/biosql/blob/master/sql/biosqldb-mysql.sql</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppermine</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>8 Y, 6 M, 2 D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0,038</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td><a href="http://sourceforge.net/p/coppermine/code/8581/tree/trunk/cpg1.5.x/sql/schema.sql">http://sourceforge.net/p/coppermine/code/8581/tree/trunk/cpg1.5.x/sql/schema.sql</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensembl</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>13 Y, 3 M, 15 D</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>0,109</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td><a href="http://cvs.sanger.ac.uk/cgi-bin/viewvc.cgi/ensembl/sql/table.sql?root=ensembl&amp;view=log">http://cvs.sanger.ac.uk/cgi-bin/viewvc.cgi/ensembl/sql/table.sql?root=ensembl&amp;view=log</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MediaWiki</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>8 Y, 10 M, 6 D</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>0,100</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td><a href="https://svn.wikimedia.org/viewvc/mediawiki/trunk/phase3/mainenance/tables.sql?view=log">https://svn.wikimedia.org/viewvc/mediawiki/trunk/phase3/mainenance/tables.sql?view=log</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenCart</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>4 Y, 4 M, 3 D</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>0,104</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td><a href="https://github.com/opencart/opencart/blob/master/upload/install/opencart.sql">https://github.com/opencart/opencart/blob/master/upload/install/opencart.sql</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phpBB</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>6 Y, 7 M, 10 D</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>0,055</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td><a href="https://github.com/phpbb/phpbb3/blob/develop/phpBB/install/schemas/mysql_41_schema.sql">https://github.com/phpbb/phpbb3/blob/develop/phpBB/install/schemas/mysql_41_schema.sql</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPO3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8 Y, 11 M, 0 D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>0,030</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td><a href="https://git.typo3.org/Packages/TYPO3.CMS.git/history/TYPO3_6-0/t3lib/stdbb/tables.sql">https://git.typo3.org/Packages/TYPO3.CMS.git/history/TYPO3_6-0/t3lib/stdbb/tables.sql</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hecate: SQL schema diff extractor

- Parses DDL files
- Creates a model for the parsed SQL elements
- Compares two versions of the same schema
- Reports on the diff performed with a variety of metrics
- Exports the transitions that occurred in XML format

https://github.com/DAINTINESS-Group/Hecate
To probe further (code, data, details, presentations, ...) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Duration &amp; Birth</strong></th>
<th><strong>Schema size</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity</strong></td>
<td>Top-changers (high ATU) are born early, live long, have large amt of update</td>
<td>Comet: Many updates: typically at medium schema size @ birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inverse $\Gamma$ :</td>
<td>Comet: Large schema at birth: medium amount of updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Top-changers: mostly at long durations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Long duration: all kinds of change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rigidity</strong></td>
<td>Inverse $\Gamma$ :</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- small duration $\rightarrow$ small change</td>
<td>Comet: $\sim$70% of tables $\in$ 10x10 narrow &amp; quiet box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- medium duration $\rightarrow$ small or medium change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survival</strong></td>
<td>$\Gamma$ : the majority of wide tables are created early on and survive</td>
<td>$\Gamma$ : if you 're wide, you survive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heaven can wait for old-timers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Death</strong></td>
<td>Dead tables: quiet, early born, short-lived, and quite often all three of them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCOPE OF THE STUDY & VALIDITY CONSIDERATIONS
## Data sets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Versions</th>
<th>Lifetime</th>
<th>Tables Start</th>
<th>Tables End</th>
<th>Attributes Start</th>
<th>Attributes End</th>
<th>Commits per Day</th>
<th>% commits with change</th>
<th>Repository URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATLAS Trigger</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2 Y, 7 M, 2 D</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>0,089</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td><a href="http://atdaq-sw.cern.ch/cgi-bin/viewcvs-atlas.cgi/offline/Trigger/TrigConfiguration/TrigDb/share/sql/combined_schema.sql">http://atdaq-sw.cern.ch/cgi-bin/viewcvs-atlas.cgi/offline/Trigger/TrigConfiguration/TrigDb/share/sql/combined_schema.sql</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BioSQL</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10 Y, 6 M, 19 D</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0,012</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td><a href="https://github.com/biosql/biosql/blob/master/sql/biosqldb-mysql.sql">https://github.com/biosql/biosql/blob/master/sql/biosqldb-mysql.sql</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppermine</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>8 Y, 6 M, 2 D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0,038</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td><a href="http://sourceforge.net/p/coppermine/code/8581/tree/trunk/cpg1.5.x/sql/schema.sql">http://sourceforge.net/p/coppermine/code/8581/tree/trunk/cpg1.5.x/sql/schema.sql</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensembl</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>13 Y, 3 M, 15 D</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>0,109</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td><a href="http://cvs.sanger.ac.uk/cgi-bin/viewvc.cgi/ensembl/sql/table.sql?root=ensembl&amp;view=log">http://cvs.sanger.ac.uk/cgi-bin/viewvc.cgi/ensembl/sql/table.sql?root=ensembl&amp;view=log</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MediaWiki</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>8 Y, 10 M, 6 D</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>0,100</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td><a href="https://svn.wikimedia.org/viewvc/mediawiki/trunk/phase3/mainenance/tables.sql?view=log">https://svn.wikimedia.org/viewvc/mediawiki/trunk/phase3/mainenance/tables.sql?view=log</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenCart</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>4 Y, 4 M, 3 D</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>0,104</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td><a href="https://github.com/opencart/opencart/blob/master/upload/install/opencart.sql">https://github.com/opencart/opencart/blob/master/upload/install/opencart.sql</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phpBB</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>6 Y, 7 M, 10 D</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>0,055</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td><a href="https://github.com/phpbb/phpbb3/blob/develop/phpBB/INSTALL/schemas/mysql_41_schema.sql">https://github.com/phpbb/phpbb3/blob/develop/phpBB/INSTALL/schemas/mysql_41_schema.sql</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPO3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8 Y, 11 M, 0 D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>0,030</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td><a href="https://git.typo3.org/Packages/TYPO3.CMS.git/history/TYPO3_6-0/t3lib/stdbb/tables.sql">https://git.typo3.org/Packages/TYPO3.CMS.git/history/TYPO3_6-0/t3lib/stdbb/tables.sql</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scope of the study

**Scope:**
- databases being part of open-source software (and not proprietary ones)
- long history
- we work only with changes at the logical schema level (and ignore physical-level changes like index creation or change of storage engine)

We encompass datasets with different domains ([A]: physics, [B]: biomedical, [C]: CMS’s), amount of growth (shade: high, med, low) & schema size

We should be very careful to not overgeneralize findings to proprietary databases or physical schemata!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FoSS Dataset</th>
<th>Versions</th>
<th>Lifetime</th>
<th>Tables @ Start</th>
<th>Tables @ End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATLAS Trigger [A]</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2 Y, 7 M, 2 D</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BioSQL [B]</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10 Y, 6 M, 19 D</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppermine [C]</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>8 Y, 6 M, 2 D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensembl [B]</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>13 Y, 3 M, 15 D</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MediaWiki [C]</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>8 Y, 10 M, 6 D</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenCart [C]</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>4 Y, 4 M, 3 D</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phpBB [C]</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>6 Y, 7 M, 10 D</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPO3 [C]</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8 Y, 11 M, 0 D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External validity

• We perform an exploratory study to observe frequently occurring phenomena within the scope of the aforementioned population

• Are our data sets representative enough? Is it possible that the observed behaviors are caused by sui-generis characteristics of the studied data sets?
  – Yes: we believe we have a good population definition & we abide by it
  – Yes: we believe we have a large number of databases, from a variety of domains with different profiles, that seem to give fairly consistent answers to our research questions (behavior deviations are mostly related to the maturity of the database and not to its application area).
  – Yes: we believe we have a good data extraction and measurement process without interference / selection / ... of the input from our part
  – Maybe: unclear when the number of studied databases is large enough to declare the general application of a pattern as “universal”.
External validity

• Understanding the represented population
  – Precision: all our data sets belong to the specified population
  – Definition Completeness: no missing property that we knowledgably omit to report
  – FoSS has an inherent way of maintenance and evolution

• Representativeness of selected datasets
  – Data sets come from 3 categories of FoSS (CMS / Biomedical / Physics)
  – They have different size and growth volumes
  – Results are fairly consistent both in our ER’15 and our CAiSE’14 papers

• Treatment of data
  – We have tested our “Delta Extractor”, Hecate, to parse the input correctly & adapted it during its development; the parser is not a full-blown SQL parser, but robust to ignore parts unknown to it
  – A handful of cases where adapted in the Coppermine to avoid overcomplicating the parser; not a serious threat to validity; other than that we have not interfered with the input
  – Fully automated counting for the measures via Hecate
To probe further *(code, data, results, ...)*


https://github.com/DAINTINESS-Group

Most importantly: we are happy to invite you to reuse /test /assess /disprove /... all our code, data and results!
Internal validity

• Internal validity concerns the accuracy of cause-effect statements: “change in A => change in B”

• We are very careful to avoid making strong causation statements!
  – In some places, we just hint that we suspect the causes for a particular phenomenon, in some places in the text, but we have no data, yet, to verify our gut-feeling.
  – And yes, it is quite possible that our correlations hide confounding variables.

• Can we confirm statements A=>B? No!
• Are there any spurious relationships? Maybe!
Is there a theory?

- Our study should be regarded as a pattern observer, rather than as a collection of laws, coming with their internal mechanics and architecture.
- It will take too many studies (to enlarge the representativeness even more) and more controlled experiments (in-depth excavation of cause-effect relationships) to produce a solid theory.
- It would be highly desirable if a clear set of requirements on the population definition, the breadth of study and the experimental protocol could be solidified by the scientific community (like e.g., the TREC benchmarks)
- ... and of course, there might be other suggestions on how to proceed...
RELATED WORK
Timeline of empirical studies

- Sjoberg IST 93
- Curino+ ICEIS08
- Univ. Riverside IWPSE09, ICDEW11
- Qiu, Li, Su FSE’13
- Univ. Ioannina CAiSE14, ER15

Timeline of empirical studies

**Sjoberg @ IST 93**: 18 months study of a health system. 139% increase of #tables; 274% increase of the #attributes

Changes in the code (on avg):
- relation addition: 19 changes; attribute additions: 2 changes
- relation deletion: 59.5 changes; attribute deletions: 3.25 changes

An **inflating period** during construction where almost all changes were additions, and a **subsequent period** where additions and deletions were balanced.
Timeline of empirical studies

**Curino+ @ ICEIS08**: Mediawiki for 4.5 years
100% increase in the number of tables
142% in the number of attributes.

45% of changes do not affect the information capacity of the schema (but are rather index adjustments, documentation, etc)

---

Sjoberg
IST 93

Curino+
ICEIS08

Univ. Riverside
IWPSE09, ICDEW11

Qiu,Li,Su
FSE’13

Univ. Ioannina
CAiSE14, ER15

Timeline of empirical studies

**IWPSE09**: Mozilla and Monotone (a version control system)
Many ways to be out of synch between code and evolving db schema

**ICDEW11**: Firefox, Monotone, Biblioteq (catalogue man.), Vienna (RSS)
Similar pct of changes with previous work
Frequency and timing analysis: **db schemata tend to stabilize over time**, as there is more change at the beginning of their history, but seem to converge to a relatively fixed structure later

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sjoberg IST 93</td>
<td>Curino+ ICEIS08</td>
<td><strong>Univ. Riverside IWPSE09, ICDEW11</strong></td>
<td>Qiu,Li,Su FSE’13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Timeline of empirical studies

Qiu,Li,Su @ FSE 2013: 10 (!) database schemata studied. Change is focused both (a) with respect to time and (b) with respect to the tables who change.

**Timing**: 7 out of 10 databases reached 60% of their schema size within 20% of their early lifetime. Change is frequent in the early stages of the databases, with inflationary characteristics; then, the schema evolution process calms down.

**Tables that change**: 40% of tables do not undergo any change at all, and 60%-90% of changes pertain to 20% of the tables (in other words, 80% of the tables live quiet lives). The most frequently modified tables attract 80% of the changes.
Timeline of empirical studies

Qiu, Li, Su @ FSE 2013: Code and db co-evolution, not always in synch.
• Code and db changed in the same revision: 50.67% occasions
• Code change was in a previous/subsequent version than the one where the database schema change: 16.22% of occasions
• database changes not followed by code adaptation: 21.62% of occasions
• 11.49% of code changes were unrelated to the database evolution.

Each atomic change at the schema level is estimated to result in 10 -- 100 lines of application code been updated;
A valid db revision results in 100 -- 1000 lines of application code being updated

Sjoberg
IST 93
1993

Curino+
ICEIS08
2008

Univ. Riverside
IWPSE09, ICDEW11
2009

Qiu, Li, Su
FSE’13
2013

Univ. Ioannina
CAiSE14, ER15
2014

2015
Timeline of empirical studies

- Sjoberg (IST 93)
- Curino+ (ICEIS 08)
- Univ. Riverside (IWPSE 09, ICDEW 11)
- Qiu, Li, Su (FSE’13)
- Univ. Ioannina (CAiSE 14, ER 15)

CAiSE 14: DB level
ER’15: Table level
Statistical study of durations

- Short and long lived tables are practically equally proportioned
- Medium size durations are fewer than the rest!
- Long lived tables are surprisingly too many
  - in half the data sets they are the most populated group
  - in all but one data set they exceed 30%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># tables</th>
<th>Short Lived</th>
<th>Medium Lived</th>
<th>Long Lived</th>
<th>Long, not max</th>
<th>Max Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>atlas</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biosql</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coppermine</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensembl</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwiki</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opencart</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phpBB</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typo3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Way too many long-lived tables live throughout the entire lifespan (Max Duration) of the database
Tables are mostly thin

- On average, **half of the tables** (approx. 47%) are thin tables with less than 5 attributes.

- The tables with 5 to 10 attributes are approximately one third of the tables' population.

- The large tables with more than 10 attributes are approximately 17% of the tables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>&lt;5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>&gt;10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>atlas</td>
<td>10,23%</td>
<td>68,18%</td>
<td>21,59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biosql</td>
<td>75,56%</td>
<td>24,44%</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coppermine</td>
<td>52,17%</td>
<td>30,43%</td>
<td>17,39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensembl</td>
<td>54,84%</td>
<td>38,06%</td>
<td>7,10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mediawiki</td>
<td>61,97%</td>
<td>19,72%</td>
<td>18,31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phpbb</td>
<td>40,00%</td>
<td>44,29%</td>
<td>15,71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typo3</td>
<td>21,88%</td>
<td>31,25%</td>
<td>46,88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opencart</td>
<td>57,20%</td>
<td>33,05%</td>
<td>9,75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,73%</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,18%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,09%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE FOUR PATTERNS
THE GAMMA PATTERN

If you ‘re wide, you survive
a.k.a (only the thin die young, all the wide ones seem to live forever)
Exceptions
- Biosql: nobody exceeds 10 attributes
- Ensembl, mwiki: very few exceed 10 attributes, 3 of them died
- typo: has many late born survivors
Stats on wide tables and their survival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Tables</th>
<th># Wide tables</th>
<th>As pct over #Tables...</th>
<th>As pct over the set of Wide Tables...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...Wide</td>
<td>... Early Born &amp; Survivors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coppermine</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phpBB</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opencart*</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atlas</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typo3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwiki</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensembl</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biosql</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitions:

Wide schema: strictly above 10 attributes.

The top band of durations (the upper part of the Gamma shape): the upper 10% of the values in the y-axis.

Early born table: ts birth version is in the lowest 33% of versions;

Late-comers: born after the 77% of the number of versions.
Whenever a table is wide, its chances of surviving are high

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Tables</th>
<th># Wide tables</th>
<th>As pct over #Tables...</th>
<th>As pct over the set of Wide Tables...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...Wide</td>
<td>...Survivors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coppermine</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phpBB</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opencart*</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atlas</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typo3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwiki</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensembl</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biosql</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apart from mwiki and ensembl, all the rest of the data sets confirm the hypothesis with a percentage higher than 85%.

The two exceptions are as high as 50% for their support to the hypothesis.
Wide tables are frequently created early on and are not deleted afterwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Tables</th>
<th># Wide tables</th>
<th>As pct over # Tables...</th>
<th>As pct over the set of Wide Tables...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...Wide of long duration</td>
<td>... Early Born &amp; Survivors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coppermine</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phpBB</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opencart*</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atlas</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typo3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwiki</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensembl</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biosql</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Early born, wide, survivor tables** (as a percentage over the set of wide tables).
- in half the data sets the percentage is above 70%
- in two of them the percentage of these tables is one third of the wide tables.
Whenever a table is wide, its duration frequently lies within the top-band of durations (upper part of Gamma).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Tables</th>
<th># Wide tables</th>
<th>As pct over #Tables...</th>
<th>As pct over the set of Wide Tables...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wide</td>
<td>... Wide of long duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coppermine</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phpBB</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opencart*</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atlas</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typo3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwiki</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensembl</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biosql</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is probability that a wide table belongs to the upper part of the Gamma?

- there is a very strong correlation between the two last columns: the Pearson correlation is 88% overall; 100% for the datasets with high pct of early born wide tables.
- Bipolarity on this pattern: half the cases support the pattern with support higher than 70%, whereas the rest of the cases clearly disprove it, with very low support values.
In all data sets, if a wide table has a long duration within the upper part of the Gamma, this deterministically (100% of all data sets) signifies that the table was also early born and survivor. If a wide table is in the top of the Gamma line, it is deterministically an early born survivor.
THE COMET PATTERN

Schema size and updates
Statistics of schema size at birth and sum of updates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#tables</th>
<th>Schema size at birth</th>
<th>Sum of updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>max</td>
<td>mean (μ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atlas--</td>
<td>87 / 88</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biosql</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coppermine</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensembl</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwiki</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ocart*</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phpBB</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typo3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/* atlas: excluded table l1_prescale_set from the analysis (266 attributes; second largest value: 24); open cart: after version 22*/
Typically: \( \sim 70\% \) of tables inside the box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#tables</th>
<th>In the box</th>
<th>Out of the box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>count</td>
<td>pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atlas--</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biosql</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coppermine</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensembl</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwiki</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ocart*</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phpBB</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typo3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/* atlas: excluded table l1_prescale_set from the analysis (266 attributes; second largest value: 24); open cart: after version 22*/

Typically, around 70\% of the tables of a database is found within the 10x10 box of `schemaSize@birth \times sumOfUpdates` (10 excluded in both axes).
Top changers tend to have medium schema sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#tables</th>
<th>max</th>
<th>mean (μ)</th>
<th>stdev (σ)</th>
<th>μ+σ</th>
<th>avg sc. size for top 5%</th>
<th>sc. size of top 1</th>
<th>avg top 5%/max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>atlas</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biosql</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coppermine</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensembl</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwiki</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ocart*</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phpBB</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>24.02</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typo3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.69</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>21.95</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson with avg top 5%: 0.96 0.58 0.97 0.87 0.97

/* atlas: excluded table l1_prescale_set from the analysis (266 attributes; second largest value: 24);
open cart: after version 22*/

For every dataset: we selected the top 5% of tables in terms of this sum of updates and we averaged the schema size at birth of these top 5% tables.
Top changers tend to have medium schema sizes.

The average schema size for the top 5% of tables in terms of their update behavior is close to one standard deviation up from the average value of the schema size at birth (i.e., very close to \( \mu + \sigma \)).

// except phpBB
Top changers tend to have medium schema sizes

### Statistics for...  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#tables</th>
<th>max</th>
<th>mean (μ)</th>
<th>stdev (σ)</th>
<th>μ+σ</th>
<th>avg sc. size for top 5%</th>
<th>sc. size of top 1</th>
<th>avg top 5% / max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>atlas</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biosql</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coppermine</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensembl</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwiki</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ocart*</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phpBB</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>24.02</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typo3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.69</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>21.95</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson with avg top 5%

- In 5 out of 8 cases, the average schema size of top-changers within 0.4 and 0.5 of the maximum value (practically the middle of the domain) and never above 0.65 of it.
- Pearson: the maximum value, the standard deviation of the entire data set and the average of the top changers are very strongly correlated.

/* atlas: excluded table l1_preScale_set from the analysis (266 attributes; second largest value: 24); open cart: after version 22*/
Wide tables have a medium number of updates

For each data set, we took the top 5% in terms of schema size at birth (top wide) and contrasted their update behavior wrt the update behavior of the entire data set. Typically, the avg. number of updates of the top wide tables is close to the 50% of the domain of values for the sum of updates (i.e., the middle of the y-axis of the comet figure, measuring the sum of updates for each table).

This is mainly due to the (very) large standard deviation (twice the mean), rather than the --typically low -- mean value (due to the large part of the population living quiet lives).
INVERSE GAMMA
Skyline & Avg for Inverse Gamma
THE EMPTY TRIANGLE PATTERN
Top changers: early born, survivors, often with long durations, and often all the above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>atlas</th>
<th>biosql</th>
<th>coppermine</th>
<th>ensembl</th>
<th>mwiki</th>
<th>ocart*</th>
<th>phpBB</th>
<th>typo3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tables</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active tables(%)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As percentages over active

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Born early</th>
<th>Survivors</th>
<th>Long duration</th>
<th>Born early, survive, live long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>atlas</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biosql</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coppermine</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensembl</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwiki</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ocart*</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phpBB</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typo3</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In all data sets, active tables are **born early** with percentages that exceed **75%**.
- With the exceptions of two data sets, they **survive** with percentage higher than **70%**.
- The probability of having a **long duration** is higher than **50%** in 6 out of 8 data sets.
- Interestingly, **the two last lines are exactly the same sets of tables in all data sets!**
  - An active table with long duration has been born early and survived with prob. **100%**
  - An active, survivor table that has a long duration has been born early with prob. **100%**
Dead are: quiet, early born, short lived, and quite often all three of them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>atlas</th>
<th>biosql</th>
<th>coppermine</th>
<th>ensembl</th>
<th>mwiki</th>
<th>ocart*</th>
<th>phpBB</th>
<th>typo3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tables</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dead</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dead tables(%)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As percentages over # dead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>atlas</th>
<th>biosql</th>
<th>coppermine</th>
<th>ensembl</th>
<th>mwiki</th>
<th>ocart*</th>
<th>phpBB</th>
<th>typo3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Few updates</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early born</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-lived</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few upd’s, early born, short duration</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do tables die of old age?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>atlas</th>
<th>biosql</th>
<th>coppermine</th>
<th>ensembl</th>
<th>mwiki</th>
<th>ocart*</th>
<th>phpBB</th>
<th>typo3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>long durations</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long durations, dead</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead among long-lived (%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most births & deaths occur early (usually)
Longevity and update activity correlate!!

- Remember: top changers are defined as such wrt ATU (AvgTrxnUpdate), not wrt sum(changes)
- Still, they dominate the sum(updates) too! (see top of inverse $\Gamma$)
- See also upper right blue part of diagonal: too many of them are born early and survive => live long!
All in one

• Early stages of the database life are more "active" in terms of births, deaths and updates, and have higher chances of producing deleted tables.

• After the first major restructuring, the database continues to grow; however, we see much less removals, and maintenance activity becomes more concentrated and focused.
Roadmap

- Evolution of views
- Data warehouse Evolution
- A case study (if time)
- Impact assessment in ecosystems
- Empirical studies concerning database evolution
- Open Issues and discussions

... and data intensive ecosystems...

IMPACT ASSESSMENT
Data intensive ecosystems

• Ecosystems of **applications**, built on top of one or more **databases** and strongly dependent upon them

• Like all software systems, they too change...
Evolving data-intensive ecosystem

**View for Courses**

```sql
CREATE VIEW V_COURSE AS
SELECT S.S_ID, S.S_DESCR, C.C_ID, CS.C_NAME, C.C_ID
FROM Semester S ▶◁ CourseStd CS ▶◁ Course C
```

**Report on DBI, DBII Grades**

```sql
FROM V_TR V1 ▶◁ V_TR V2 ON STUDENT_ID
WHERE V1.C_NAME = 'DBI'
AND V2.C_NAME = 'DBII'
```

**View for Student Transcripts**

```sql
CREATE VIEW V_TR AS
SELECT T.*, T.STUDENT_ID, T.GRADE
FROM V_Course V ▶◁ Transcript T
```

**Report on Average Grade**

```sql
SELECT V.STUDENT_ID, S.STUDENT_NAME, AVG(V.GRADE) AS GPA
FROM V_TR V ▶◁ STUDENT S ON STUDENT_ID
GROUP BY V.STUDENT_ID, S.STUDENT_NAME
```
Evolving data-intensive ecosystem

The impact can be syntactical (causing crashes), semantic (causing info loss or inconsistencies) and related to the performance.

```sql
CREATE VIEW V_COURSE AS
SELECT S.S_ID, S.DESCRIPTION, C.ID, CS.C_NAME, C.ID
FROM Semester S ↪ CourseStd CS ↪ Course C
```

```sql
CREATE VIEW V_TR AS
SELECT V.* , T.STUDENT_ID, T.GRADE
FROM V_Course V ↪ Transcript T
```

```sql
FROM V_TR v1 ↪ v_TR v2 ON STUDENT_ID
WHERE v1.C_NAME = 'DBI'
AND v2.C_NAME = 'DBII'
```

```sql
SELECT v.STUDENT_ID, v.S.STUDENT_NAME, AVG(v.GRADE) AS GPA
FROM V_TR v ↪ v_STUDENT s ON STUDENT_ID
GROUP BY v.STUDENT_ID, v.S.STUDENT_NAME
```
The impact of changes & a wish-list

- **Syntactic**: scripts & reports simply crash
- **Semantic**: views and applications can become inconsistent or information losing
- **Performance**: can vary a lot

We would like: **evolution predictability**
i.e., control of **what will be affected**
before changes happen
- Learn what changes & how
- Find ways to quarantine effects
The **Hecataeus** tool & method. Here: a first map of Drupal

What happens if I modify table search_index? Who are the neighbors?
What happens if I modify table search_index? Who are the neighbors?

Tooltips with info on the script & query
In the file structure too...
How to handle evolution?

- **Architecture Graphs**: graph with the data flow between modules (i.e., relations, views or queries) at the detailed (attribute) level; module internals are also modeled as subgraphs of the Architecture Graph.

- **Policies**, that annotate a module with a reaction for each possible event that it can withstand, in one of two possible modes:
  - (a) **block**, to veto the event and demand that the module retains its previous structure and semantics, or,
  - (b) **propagate**, to allow the event and adapt the module to a new internal structure.

- **Given a potential change in the ecosystem**
  - we **identify which parts of the ecosystem are affected** via a “change propagation” algorithm.
  - we **rewrite the ecosystem to reflect the new version** in the parts that are affected and do not veto the change via a rewriting algorithm.
    - Within this task, we **resolve conflicts** (different modules dictate conflicting reactions) via a conflict resolution algorithm.

Manousis+ @ ER 2013 for the details of impact analysis (summary coming)
ER 2014 for the visualization (not here)
University E/S Architecture Graph
Architecture Graph

Modules and Module Encapsulation

Observe the input and output schemata!!

SELECT V.STUDENT_ID, S.STUDENT_NAME, AVG(V.TGRADE) AS GPA
FROM V_TR V |><| STUDENT S ON STUDENT_ID
WHERE V.TGRADE > 4 / 10
GROUP BY V.STUDENT_ID, S.STUDENT_NAME
Policies to predetermine reactions

Policies to **predetermine the modules’ reaction to a hypothetical event?**
How to handle evolution?

Propagate ALL possible evolution events

View for Courses

CREATE VIEW V_COURSE AS
SELECT S.S_ID, S.S_DESCR, C.ID, C.C_NAME, C.ID
FROM Semester S INNER JOIN CourseStd CS ON CS.S_ID = S.S_ID
INNER JOIN Course C ON C.ID = CS.CourseID

Remove CS.C_NAME

Block Deletion for V_TR.C_NAME

Propagate all other possible evolution events

Report on DBI, DBII Grades

FROM V_TR V1 INNER JOIN V_TR V2 ON V1.STUDENT_ID = V2.STUDENT_ID
WHERE V1.C_NAME = 'DBI'
AND V2.C_NAME = 'DBII'

As V1

As V2

View for Student Transcripts

CREATE VIEW V_TR AS
SELECT V.*, T/student_id, T.GRADE
FROM V_Course V INNER JOIN Transcript T ON T.COURSE_ID = V.C_ID

Propagate ALL possible evolution events

Report on Average Grade

SELECT V.STUDENT_ID, V.S.STUDENT_NAME, AVG(V.GRADE) AS GPA
FROM V_TR V ON V.PLACE = 'STUDENT S ON STUDENT_ID GROUP BY V.STUDENT_ID, V.S.STUDENT_NAME

Propagate ALL possible evolution events

//2 policy rules suffice to annotate the entire ecosystem:
NODE: ON * THEN PROPAGATE;
Q_pass2courses_IN_V1.C_SNAME ON DELETE_SELF THEN BLOCK;
Internals of impact assess. & rewriting

1. **Impact assessment.** Given a potential event, a status determination algorithm makes sure that the nodes of the ecosystem are assigned a status concerning (a) whether they are affected by the event or not and (b) what their reaction to the event is (block or propagate).

2. **Conflict resolution and calculation of variants.** Algorithm that checks the affected parts of the graph in order to highlight affected nodes with whether they will adapt to a new version or retain both their old and new variants.

3. **Module Rewriting.** Our algorithm visits affected modules sequentially and performs the appropriate restructuring of nodes and edges.
Impact assessment & rewriting
Conflicts: what they are and how to handle them (more than flooding)

BEFORE

- View0 initiates a change
- View1 and View 2 accept the change
- Query2 rejects the change
- Query1 accepts the change

AFTER

- The path to Query2 is left intact, so that it retains its semantics
- View1 and Query1 are adapted
- View0 and View2 are adapted too, however, we need two versions for each: one to serve Query2 and another to serve View1 and Query1
Played an impact analysis scenario: delete attr. ‘word’ from search_index

1. The table allowed the deletion, but...

2. Queries Q215 and Q216 vetoed