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Abstract
We introduce Leap-List, a concurrent data-structure that is tailored to provide linearizable range queries. A lookup in Leap-List takes $O(\log n)$ and is comparable to a balanced binary search tree or to a skip-list. However, in Leap-List, each node holds up-to $K$ immutable key-value pairs, so collecting a linearizable range is $K$ times faster than the same operation performed non-linearizably on a skip-list.

We show how software transactional memory support in a commercial compiler helped us create an efficient lock-based implementation of Leap-List. We used this STM to implement short transactions which we call Locking Transactions (LT), to acquire locks, while verifying that the state of the data-structure is legal, and combine them with a transactional COP mechanism to enhance data structure traversals.

We compare Leap-List to prior implementations of skip-lists, and show that while updates in the Leap-List are slower, lookups are somewhat faster, and for range-queries the Leap-List outperforms the skip-list’s non-linearizable range query operations by an order of magnitude. We believe that this data structure and its performance would have been impossible to obtain without the STM support.
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1. Introduction and Related Work
We are interested in linearizable concurrent implementations of an abstract dictionary data structure that stores key-value pairs and supports, in addition to the usual Update(key, value), Remove(key), and Find(key), a Range-Query(a, b) operation, where $a \leq b$, which returns all pairs with keys in the closed interval $[a, b]$, where $a$ and $b$ may not be in the data structure. This type of data structure is useful for various database applications, in particular in-memory databases. This paper is interested in the design of high performance linearizable concurrent range queries. As such, the typically logarithmic search for the first item in the range is not the most important performance element. Rather, it is the coordination and synchronization around the sets of neighboring keys being collected in the sequence. This is a tricky new synchronization problem and our goal is to evaluate which transactional support paradigm, if any, can help in attaining improved performance for range queries.

1.1 Related Work
Perhaps the most straightforward way to implement a linearizable concurrent version of an abstract dictionary-with-range-queries, is to directly employ software transactional memory (STM) in implementing its methods. An STM allows a programmer to specify that certain blocks of code should be executed atomically relative to one another. Recently, several fast concurrent binary search-tree algorithms using STM have been introduced by Afek et al. [2] and Bronson et al. [4]. Although they offer good performance for Updates, Removes and Finds, they achieve this performance, in part, by carefully limiting the amount of data protected by the transactions. However, as we show empirically in this paper, computing a range query means protecting all keys in the range from modifications during a transaction, leading to poor performance using the direct STM approach.

Another simple approach is to lock the entire data structure, and compute a range query while it is locked. One can refine this technique by using a more fine-grained locking scheme, so that only part of the data structure needs to be locked to perform an update or compute a range query. For instance, in leaf-oriented trees, where all key-value pairs in the set are stored in the leaves of the tree, updates to the tree can be performed by local modifications close to the leaves. Therefore, it is often sufficient to lock only the last couple of nodes on the path to a leaf, rather than the entire path from the root. However, as was the case for STM, a range query can only be computed if every key in the range is protected, so typically every node containing a key in the range must be locked.

Brown and Avni [5] introduced range queries in k-ary trees with immutable key. The k-ary trees allow efficient range-queries by collecting nodes in a depth-first-search order, followed by a validation stage. The nodes are scanned, and if any one is outdated, the process is retried from the start. The k-ary search tree is not balanced, and its operations cannot be composed.

Ctrie is a non-blocking concurrent hash trie, which offers $O(1)$ time snapshot, due to Prokopec et al. [10]. Keys are hashed, and the bits of these hashes are used to navigate the trie. To facilitate the computation of fast snapshots, a sequence number is associated with each node in the data structure. Each time a snapshot is taken, the root is copied and its sequence number is incremented. An update or search in the trie reads this sequence number $seq$ when it starts and, while traversing the trie, it duplicates each node whose sequence number is less than $seq$. The update then performs a variant of a double-compare-single-swap operation to atomically change a pointer while ensuring the roots current sequence number matches $seq$. Because keys are ordered by their hashes in the trie, it is hard to use Ctrie to efficiently implement range queries. To do so, one must iterate over all keys in the snapshot.

The B-Tree data structure can be used for range queries, however, when looking at the concurrent versions of B-Trees such as the lock-free one of Braginsky and Petrank [3], and the blocking, industry standard from [12], both do not support the range-query functionality. Both algorithms do not have leaf-chaining, forcing one to perform a sequence of lookups to collect the desired range.
In [12] this would imply holding a lock on the root for a long time, and in [3] it seems difficult to get a linearizable result. In addition, the keys in both are mutable so one would have to copy each entry individually.

1.2 The Leap-List in a Nutshell
Leap-Lists are Skip-Lists [11] with “fat” nodes and an added short-cut access mechanism in the style of the String B-tree of Ferragina and Grossi [6]. They have the same probabilistic guarantee for balancing, and the same layered forward pointers as Skip-Lists. Each Leap-List node holds up to K immutable keys from a specific range, and an immutable bitwise trie is embedded in each node to facilitate fast lookups when K is large.

When considering large range queries, the logarithmic-time lookup for the start of the range accounts for only a small part of the operation’s complexity. Especially when the whole structure resides in memory. The design complexity of a full k-ary structure (in which nodes at all levels have K elements), with log\(_2\)(n) lookup time is thus not justified. In our Leap-List, unlike full k-ary structures, an update implies at most one split or merge of a node, and only at the leaf level. This allows updates to lock only the specific leaf being changed and only for the duration of changing pointers from the old node to the new one.

For Leap-List synchronization, we checked the following options, sorted in an increasing order of required effort:

- **Pure STM:** We tried to put each Leap-List operation in a software transactional memory (STM) transaction. This option was especially attractive with the rising support for STM in mainstream compilers. Unfortunately, as we report, we discovered that this approach introduced unacceptable overheads.

- **Read-write locks:** We explored read-write locks per Leap-List. While the read-locks were very scalable, the write locks serialized many workloads, hence making updates relatively slow.

- **COP:** We employed consistency oblivious programming (COP) [2] to reduce the overhead of STM. In COP, the read-only prefix of the operation is executed without any synchronization, followed by an STM transaction that checks the correctness of the prefix execution and performs any necessary updates. The COP requires that an un-instrumented traversal of the structure will not crash, which implies strong isolation of transactions in the underlying STM. Otherwise the traversal encounters uncommitted data, and hitting uncommitted data inevitably leads to uninitialized pointers, unallocated buffers, and segmentation faults. The current GCC-TM compiler uses weakly isolated transactions. Thus, we had to add transactions also in read-only regions of the code which hurt performance.

- **Locking Transactions (LT):** With LT, transactions are used only to acquire locks, and not to write tentative data. Thus, a read which sees unlocked data knows it is committed. Another aspect of LT, is that using a short transaction anyone can lock any data and use it.

We use LT to improve the performance of the previous COP algorithm. In the COP, an updating operation performs its read-only prefix without synchronization, and then executes the verification and updates inside a transaction. In LT, the read-only part is checking for locks, and retries. These checks have negligible overhead compared to a transaction. Then the transaction atomically verifies validity and locks the written addresses. After the transaction commits, a postfix of the operation writes the data to the locked locations and releases them.

- **Fine grained locks:** To generate the fine-grain version of LT Leap-List we had to recreate mechanisms that exist in STM, and still, did not manage to create a fully stable implementation.

In case of a merge, where a remove replaces two old nodes by one new node, we need to lock all pointers to and from both nodes. Here, unlike the skip-list case [9], locking can fail at any point and force us to release all locks and retry to avoid deadlocks. This unrolling is “free” using an STM.

Once a set of nodes is locked, a thread needs to perform validations on the state of the data structure, such as checking live marks etc. With LT, using STM, these validations happen before acquiring the locks, and then when committing, an abort will happen if any check should fail. Thus the locks are taken for a shorter duration. To improve our performance we would need to execute a form of STM revalidation.

After executing the above sequence, we found that our fine grained implementation still suffered from live-locks; we did not manage to avoid them. These live-locks were eliminated with the STM based LT approach.

Our conclusion was that we were effectively reproducing the very mechanisms that are already given by an STM, and still did not get the stability of an STM. The LT Leap-List implementation has minimal overhead because lookups do not execute transactions and range-queries execute one instrumented access per K values in the range. The LT Leap-List is thus the most effective solution.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives a detailed description of the Leap-List design and operations’ implementation. In Section 3 we show the LT technique is the best performer for Leap-List synchronization, and is scalable even when transactions encompass operations on multiple Leap-Lists. Finally, in Section 4 we summarize our work, and give some directions for future work.

2. Leap-List Design
We now describe the detailed design of our L-Leap-Lists data structure. Note that the updating functions compose operations on multiple Leap-Lists. Our implementation supports the following operations:

- **Update(ll, k, v, s)** - Receives arrays of Leap-Lists, keys and values of size s, and updates the value of the key k[i] to be v[i] in Leap-List ll[i]. If the key k[i] is not present in ll[i], it is added to ll[i] with the given value v[i].

- **Remove(ll, k, s)** - Receives arrays of Leap-Lists and keys of size s, and removes the key-value pair of the given key k[i] from ll[i].

- **Lookup(ll, k)** - Receives a single Leap-List and a key, and returns the value of the corresponding given key k in ll. The operation returns an indication in case the key is not present in ll.

- **Range-Query(ll, k_from, k_to)** - Receives a single Leap-List and 2 keys, and returns the values of all keys in ll which are in the range [k_from, k_to].

The Update and Remove are linearizable operations applied to L-Leap-Lists and Lookup and Range-Query search are linearizable operations applied to a single Leap-List. This allows concurrent operations on multiple database table indexes. We implemented the L-Leap-List data-structure using the experimental GCC Transactional Memory (GCC-TM). GCC-TM is a word-based STM implementation with a default configuration in which transactions are weakly isolated.
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\[ \text{Leap-List Search Predecessors} \]

\begin{verbatim}
input : LeapList l, key k
output: Two node arrays of pointers - pa and na
node *x, *x.next;
int i;
retry:
x := l;
for i = max_level - 1; i ≥ 0; i = i - 1 do
  while (true) do
    x.next := x->next[i];
    if MARKED(x.next) \( \vee \) \( \neg \) x.next->live then goto retry;
  if x.next->high ≥ k then
    break;
  else x := x.next
end
end
pa[i] := x;
na[i] := x.next;
return (pa, na);
\end{verbatim}

An example of a single Leap-List structure is depicted in Figure 1. As shown, each node may hold up to a predefined number of data items with different keys and a set of pointers for each level below that node level. The operations of the Leap-Lists are implemented using the COP scheme [2], where in the “search phase”\(^1\) the data-structure pointers are accessed outside of a transactional context to achieve better performance. Due to the weakly isolated nature of GCC-TM and the need to prevent uncommitted pointers from guiding us to uncommitted nodes, we use a novel method of writing marked pointers in a transaction and removing the mark after a successful commit. A marked pointer indicates that the pointed node is currently being updated by an active transaction, or was updated by a transaction that was successfully committed. Another alternative we explored was to access pointers in single-location read transactions. However, this alternative proved to have a larger negative impact on performance with the current GCC-TM implementation. Nevertheless, we expect it will exhibit the best performance with HTM support, as single-location uncontented read transactions should be ideal for HTM.

2.1 Leap-List Data-Structure

The Leap-List node is presented in Figure 2. It holds a live mark, for COP verification; high, which denotes the upper bound of its keys range; count, which is the number of key-value pairs present in the node, and level which is the same as a level in skip-list. It also holds an array of forward pointers next each pointing to the next element in the corresponding level. A trie is used to quickly find the index of key \( k \) in the keys-values array, a technique introduced in the String B-tree of Ferragina and Grossi [6]. Note that unlike in a skip-list, where each node represents a single key, in Leap-List each node represents a range of keys, i.e. all the keys from a certain range. The keys-values array of size count holds all the keys and their corresponding values in the node. The trie uses the minimal number of levels to represent all the keys in the node, where the

\(^{1}\)We consider the “search phase” to consist of the Lookup and Range-Query operations, and the read-only accesses that are done in the Update and Remove operations before any write access.

![Figure 1: A single Leap-List with maximum height of 4 and node size of 2. The number below each node is the highest possible key of that node. The left-most node is always empty.](image)

![Figure 2: Data-Structure description](image)

![Figure 3: Leap-List Search Predecessors operation](image)
2.1.2 Lookups

The lookup operation is presented in Figure 4, and is using the predecessors search function. Note that the node returned in $na[0]$ is the node that has $k$ in its range. We can prove the lookup is linearizable, as the predecessors search traverses only committed nodes. If a thread searches for the key $k$, it must traverse a node that $k$ is in its range, and if such a live node is reached, then this node was present in the data-structure during the lookup execution.

In line 30, Lookup uses the node’s trie to extract the index of the value of key $k$ in the array values, and returns the value from that index.

2.1.3 Range Queries

The range query operation is presented in Figure 5, and starts with a predecessors search to find the node where the range starts from. Then, within a transaction, it first checks that the node is still live in line 39 and if not aborts, and retries the range-query operation in line 45. If the node is still marked as live, the transaction traverses the lowest level of the Leap-List’s pointers from the first node to the node which has a high value which is higher than the requested range high bound, and retrieves a snapshot range query. Note that in line 41 the algorithm ensures that even in the case of a partial update to the pointer to the next node (due to update or remove operations), it can still traverse through it.

2.1.4 Updates

Figure 6 describes the update function. As previously described, the function receives arrays of Leap-Lists, keys and their size. The update operation either inserts a new key-value pair to each Leap-List if the key is not already present, or otherwise updates the key’s value.

The function is divided into the following 3 parts: (1) setup (Figure 8), (2) LT (Figure 9), and (3) release and update (Figure 10). During the setup part, a thread iterates over each Leap-List, performs a predecessors search, and creates a new node with its key-value pairs (including the updated key-value pair). Note that in case the number of keys in the node is above some threshold, it splits that node. During a split it creates 2 nodes: one with a new random height that holds the first half of the key-value pairs, and another with the same height as the old node that holds the second half of the key-value pairs. The max_level is set to the maximum levels up to $N$’s level. This function is used in the lookup and range-query operations, as well as in the beginning of the update and remove operations.

The traversal only compares the high key of the node in line 18 and decides if it should continue or stop at that node. When reading a pointer, the thread verifies that that pointer is not marked and that the node is still live in line 17, so it only traverses committed and valid nodes. (As previously noted, an alternative method would be replacing the mark by executing line 16 in a transaction. However, with the current GCC-TM implementation the overhead of starting a transaction is too high. We estimate that with HTM this would work much better, and will actually make the lookup wait-free, as a single-location read transaction must succeed.)

2.1.5 Remove

The remove function is presented in Figure 7. The function receives arrays of Leap-Lists, keys and their size, and linearizably removes the key-value pair of each given key from its corresponding Leap-List. In case a key is not found in a Leap-List, that Leap-List is not modified.

Similarly to the update function, the remove function is also divided to the setup (Figure 11), LT (Figure 12) and release and update (Figure 13) parts. During the setup part, the thread again iterates over each Leap-List, performs a predecessors search, and searches for the key to be removed. If a Leap-List does not contain the corresponding key, it moves on to the next Leap-List. In case the key exists it keeps the key and its successor nodes to the new node (nodes) in lines 116-137, and finishes the transaction by setting the old node’s live bit to false (line 113), and attempting to commit the transaction. We note that in this part, the transaction does not observe partial modifications made by other transactions, and so a successful commit ensures a consistent view of the nodes that are affected by the operation.

Following a successful transaction commit, the third part releases and updates the pointers of the predecessor nodes to point to the new node (nodes). In lines 116-137 the algorithm sets the next pointer of the new node (nodes) to the previous nodes that were in the Leap-List. It continues by setting the next pointers of the predecessor nodes to the new node (nodes) in lines 139-145, and finishes by setting the live flags of the new node (nodes) to true.
Leap-List Remove

**input**: Leap-Lists ll, keys k, sizes s

19
20 node *pa[max_lists][max_level], *na[max_lists][max_level], *n[max_lists];
21 node *new_node[max_lists][2];
22 int max_height[max_lists];
23 boolean committed := false, split[max_lists];

24 foreach j<\i\< do
25     new_node[j][0] := new node;
26     new_node[j][1] := new node;
27 end
28
29 retry:
30
31 Update_Setup(ll, k, v, s, pa, na, n, new_node, max_height, split);
32
33 tx_start:
34
35 Update_LT(s, pa, na, n, new_node, max_height);
36
37 committed := true;
38
39 tx_end:
40
41 if ¬committed then goto retry;
42
43 Update_Release_and_Update(s, pa, na, n, new_node, split);
44
45 Deallocate unneeded nodes.

Figure 6: Leap-List Remove

Leap-List Update

**input**: Leap-Lists ll, keys k, values v, and size s

47 node *pa[max_lists][max_level], *na[max_lists][max_level], *n[max_lists];
48 node *new_node[max_lists][2];
49 int max_height[max_lists];
50 boolean committed := false, split[max_lists];

51 foreach j<\i\< do
52     new_node[j][0] := new node;
53     new_node[j][1] := new node;
54 end
55
56 retry:
57
58 Update_Setup(ll, k, v, s, pa, na, n, new_node, max_height, split);
59
60 tx_start:
61
62 Update_LT(s, pa, na, n, new_node, max_height, split);
63
64 tx_end:
65
66 if ¬committed then goto retry;
67
68 Update_Release_and_Update(s, pa, na, n, new_node, split);
69
70 Deallocate unneeded nodes.

Figure 6: Leap-List Update

Leap-List Update - Setup

**input**: Leap-Lists ll, keys k, values v, size s, nodes pa, nodes na, nodes n, nodes new_node, integers max_height, booleans split

79 foreach j<\i\< do
80     (pa[j], na[j]) := PredecessorSearch(ll[j], k[j]);
81     n[j] := na[j][0];
82     if n[j] → count = node_size then
83         split[j] := true;
84         new_node[j][1] → level := n[j] → level;
85         new_node[j][0] → level := get_level();
86         max_height[j] := max(new_node[j][0] → level, new_node[j][1] → level);
87     else
88         split[j] := false;
89         new_node[j][0] → level := n[j] → level;
90         max_height[j] := max(new_node[j][0] → level, new_node[j][1] → level);
91 end
92 CreateNewNodes(new_node[j], n[j], k[j], v[j], split[j]);
93
94 end

Figure 8: Leap-List Update - Setup.

Leap-List Update - LT

**input**: size s, nodes pa, nodes na, nodes n, nodes new_node, integers max_height

94 foreach j<\i\< do
95     if ¬n[j] → live then tx_abort;
96     foreach i<\j\< do
97         if pa[i][j] → next[i] ≠ n[j] then tx_abort;
98         if ¬n[j] → next[i] → live then tx_abort;
99     end
100     if ¬n[j] → max_height[j] then
101         if ¬pa[i][j] → next[j][i] ≠ na[i][j] then tx_abort;
102         if ¬pa[i][j] → live then tx_abort;
103         if ¬na[i][j] → live then tx_abort;
104     end
105     if ¬n[j] → level then
106         if MARKED(n[j] → next[i]) then tx_abort;
107         n[j] → next[i] := MARK(n[j] → next[i]);
108     end
109     if ¬n[j] → max_height[j] then
110         if MARKED(pa[i][j] → next[i]) then tx_abort;
111         pa[i][j] → next[i] := MARK(pa[i][j] → next[i]);
112     end
113     n[j] → live := false;
114 end

Figure 9: Leap-List Update - LT.

adjacent node (upon merge) are live, and if not, the retry of the last key removal from the current Leap-List is performed. The thread concludes this part by calling RemoveAndMerge which updates a new node with the key-value pairs from the node (and the adjacent node), without the removed key-value pair.

The second part, the LT, is performed in a single transaction. In this part the thread first verifies the nodes that were found in the setup part are still valid (i.e., they are still live), their successive nodes are still live, and the pointers from their predecessors point to them. If one of the conditions does not hold, the transaction is aborted, and the whole remove operation is restarted. It then
Leap-List Update - Release and Update

\begin{verbatim}
input : size s, nodes pa, nodes na, nodes n, nodes new_node,
        booleans split
foreach j < s do
  if split[j] then
    if new_node[j][1] => level > new_node[j][0] => level then
      foreach i < new_node[j][0] => level do
        new_node[j][0] => next[i] := new_node[j][1];
        new_node[j][1] => next[i] := UNMARK(n[j] => next[i]);
      end
    end
  end
  else
    foreach i < new_node[j][0] => level do
      new_node[j][0] => next[i] := UNMARK(n[j] => next[i]);
    end
  end
end

foreach i < new_node[j][0] => level do
  pai[j][i] => next[i] := new_node[j][0];
end

if split[j] ∧ (new_node[j][1] => level > new_node[j][0] => level) then
  foreach i < new_node[j][0] => level ≤ i < old_node[j][1] => level do
    new_node[j][0] => next[i] := new_node[j][1];
  end
end

new_node[j][1] => next[i] := true;
if split[j] then new_node[j][1] => live := true;
\end{verbatim}

Figure 10: Leap-List Update - Release and Update.

continues to mark the next pointers of the nodes that are about to be removed, and the next pointers of their predecessors. The transaction concludes by setting the live bit of the nodes to false, and attempts to commit. In case the commit fails, the remove operation is retried from the beginning of the setup part.

However, if the transaction successfully commits, the third part releases and updates each Leap-List to include the new nodes. It first sets the next pointers of the new node to point to the unmarked removed nodes next pointers in lines 217-227. Following this we

Leap-List Remove - Setup

\begin{verbatim}
input : Leap-Lists ll, keys k, values v, size s, nodes pa,
        nodes na, nodes n, nodes old_node, booleans merge,
        booleans changed
foreach j < s do
  retry_last := merge[j] := false;
  (pa,na) := PredecessorSearch(ll[j], k[j]);
  old_node[j][0] := na[j][0];
  if get_index(old_node[j][0] => trie, k[j]) = NOT_FOUND then
    changed[j] := false;
    continue;
  end
  repeat
    total := old_node[j][1] := old_node[j][0] => next[0];
    if ¬ then goto retry_last;
    until ¬is_marked(old_node[j][1]) ;
    total := old_node[j][0] => count;
    if old_node[j][1] then
      total += old_node[j][1] => count;
      if total ≤ node_size then merge[j] := true;
    end
    end
    Set n[i]'s level, count, high and low;
    if ¬old_node[j][0] => live then goto retry_last;
    if merge[j] ∧ ¬old_node[j][1] => live then goto retry_last;
    changed[j] := RemoveAndMerge(old_node[j], n[j], k[j], merge[j]);
  end
\end{verbatim}

Figure 11: Leap-List Remove - Setup.

set the next pointers of the old nodes pointers to the new node (lines 229-230). It concludes, in line 232, by setting the new nodes live bit.

3. Evaluation

In this section we present the evaluation of our Leap-List implementation using COP and the LT technique and compare it to an STM-based Leap-List, an STM based Leap-List implementation that uses only COP, and a RW-Lock Leap-List implementation that uses a reader-writer lock. In Section 3.1 we compare to Skip-list implementations.

Experimental setup: We collected results on a machine powered by four Intel E7-4870. An Intel E7-4870 is a chip multithreading (CMT) processor, with 10 2.4 GHz cores each multiplexing 2 hardware threads, for a total of 20 hardware strands per chip. All implementations were compiled using GCC version 4.7 [1] which has built-in support for transactional memory. We used the linearizable memory allocation manager which was proposed in [7]. We compared the throughput (operations per second) of the following four algorithms:

1. Leap-LT - our proposed algorithm that uses COP and the LT technique as described in Section 2.
2. Leap-tm - a Leap-List implementation which wraps each operation within a transaction.
3. Leap-COP - an STM-based Leap-List implementation that uses COP (separating the search and update/remove operation).
4. Leap-rwlock - A Read-Write lock Leap-List implementation, in which the lookup and range-query operations acquire the
Leap-List Remove - LT

**input**: size s, nodes pa, nodes na, nodes n, nodes old_node, booleans merge, booleans changed

173 **foreach** i<s do
174  if changed[j] then
175    if ¬old_node[j][0]→live then tx_abort;
176    if merge[j] ∧ ¬old_node[j][1]→live then tx_abort;
177    **foreach** i<old_node[j][0]→level do
178      if pa[j][i]→next[i]¬old_node[j][0] then
179        tx_abort;
180      if ¬pa[j][i]→live then tx_abort;
181      if ¬old_node[j][0]→next[i]→live then tx_abort;
182    end
183    if merge[j] then
184      if old_node[j][0]→next[0]¬old_node[j][1] then tx_abort;
185      if old_node[j][1]→level > old_node[j][0]→level then
186        **foreach** i<old_node[j][0]→level do
187          if ¬old_node[j][1]→next[i]→live then tx_abort;
188        end
189      end
190      **foreach** old_node[j][0]→level ≤ i < old_node[j][1]→level do
191        if ¬pa[j][i]→next[i]¬old_node[j][1] then tx_abort;
192        if ¬old_node[j][1]→next[i]→live then tx_abort;
193      end
194    else
195      **foreach** i<old_node[j][1]→level do
196        if ¬old_node[j][1]→next[i]→live then tx_abort;
197      end
198    end
199  if MARKED(old_node[j][1]→next[i]) then
200    old_node[j][1]→next[i] := MARKED(old_node[j][1]→next[i]);
201  end
202  end
203  **foreach** i<old_node[j][1]→level do
204    if MARKED(old_node[j][0]→next[i]) then
205      tx_abort;
206    end
207  end
208  if ¬MARKED(pa[j][i]→next[i]) then tx_abort;
209  end
210  end
211  old_node[j][0]→live := false;
212  if merge[j] then old_node[j][1]→live := false;
213  end

Figure 12: Leap-List Remove - LT.

Figure 13: Leap-List Remove - Release and Update.

**input**: size s, nodes pa, nodes na, nodes n, nodes old_node, booleans merge, booleans changed

215 **foreach** i<s do
216  if changed[j] then
217    if merge[j] then
218      **foreach** i<old_node[j][1]→level do
219        n[j]→next[i] := UNMARK(old_node[j][1]→next[i]);
220      end
221      **foreach** old_node[j][1]→level ≤ i<old_node[j][0]→level do
222        n[j]→next[i] := UNMARK(old_node[j][0]→next[i]);
223    end
224  else
225    **foreach** i<old_node[j][0]→level do
226      n[j]→next[i] := UNMARK(old_node[j][0]→next[i]);
227    end
228  end
229  **foreach** i<n[j]→level do
230    pa[j][i]→next[i] := n[j];
231  end
232  n[j]→live := true;
233  end

Settings: We compared different mixtures of update, remove, lookup and range-query operations using the above algorithms on 4 Leap-Lists (i.e., the size of the arrays on update and remove operations is 4). Each Leap-List is configured with a node of size 300, and with a maximal level of 10^5. Each experiment execution is set to 10 seconds, and is repeated three times. We show the average of the three results. We now present the throughput of the above algorithms using various workload configurations. The keys range between 0 to 100000, and a range-query operation range spans a random range between 1000 to 2000.

Figure 14 exhibits the throughput of the different algorithms when varying the number of threads from 1 to 80. In this scenario each Leap-List is initialized with 100,000 successive elements. The write-only case, 100% modifications (only updates and removes), is presented in figure 14-(a). We observe that the throughput of the Leap-LT is better than all other algorithms, and scales well up to 32 threads. It achieves up to 220%, 355%, and 930% better throughput compared with the Leap-COP, Leap-tm, and Leap-rwlock algorithms respectively. This shows that even under an extreme write-dominated workload, our algorithm still performs well.

In Figure 14-(b) we present a read-dominated case with a mixture of 40% lookups, 40% range-queries and 20% modifications. Leap-LT scales up to 40 threads because there are less modifications. Compared with the Leap-COP, Leap-tm, and Leap-rwlock algorithms it achieves up to 200%, 330%, and 980% better throughput respectively. When comparing the absolute throughput values, one can see that the read-dominated workload has a higher throughput than the write-only workload. This is because a higher modifications rate incurs a high overhead of update and remove operations.

We experimentally found these values achieve good performance.
long predecessor search operations when the number of nodes is larger.

Figure 16-(a) and figure 16-(b) depict the throughput when using 80 threads, a Leap-List with 100,000 elements and varying the rate of lookup and range-query operations respectively between 0% to 90%. Both figures show that as the modifications rate is decreased, the throughput of all algorithms increases. In the case where no range-query operations occur (Figure 16-(a)) Leap-LT shows between 190% (0% lookup rate) to 260% (90% lookup rate) higher throughput compared with Leap-COP. The case where no lookup operations occur (Figure 16-(b)) exhibits similar results where Leap-LT shows between 240% (0% range-queries rate) to 200% (90% range-queries rate) higher throughput compared with Leap-COP. Note that in the case of 100% lookup and range-query operations rate (not shown here) the Leap-LT results are even better. Leap-LT is better by 650% and 320% compared to the second best Leap-COP in the 100% lookup and 100% range-query cases respectively.

3.1 Comparison to skip-lists

It is natural to compare our Leap-LT to the known Skip-List datastructure. We compare the throughput of various settings of a single Leap-List to: (1) Skip-tm - a skip-list implementation that uses the GCC-TM to synchronize operations; (2) Skip-cas - a skip-list implementation as described in [8]. These implementations store a single key-value pair in each node, and use mutable objects, thus having a lower modify operations overhead compared to our Leap-LT. Note that for this comparison we used a single Leap-List datastructure (L = 1), and that the range-query operations of the Skip-cas implementation do not return a consistent range-query (i.e., this operation is non-atomic and may return an inconsistent result).

Figures 17-(a), 17-(b), and 17-(c) show the throughput when using a data-structure with 1,000,000 elements, and varying the number of threads between 1 to 80. When there are only modify operations (Figure 17-(a)) we observe that both Skip-cas and Skip-tm are better than Leap-LT, and that Skip-cas is much better. This is due to the higher overhead of the update and remove operations in Leap-LT.

However, we see different results when there are more lookup and range-query operations, as can be seen in Figure 17-(b) where there are 40% lookups, 40% range-queries and 20% modifications. Here we see that Leap-LT is up to 2x and 38x better than Skip-cas and Skip-tm respectively. This is due to the overhead of the range-query operation that needs to iterate many nodes and to the large number of elements which reduces conflicts between concurrent modifying operations.

A workload which exhibits only lookup operations (Figure 17-(c)), shows that Leap-LT and Skip-cas are comparable and are much better than Skip-tm. This is because no contention occurs.
and the reduced overhead of the former algorithms produces better throughput.

Figure 17-(d) shows the main strength of our Leap-LT implementation on a workload of only range-query operations. It achieves better scalability and up to 35x better throughput on this workload compared to the Skip-cas implementation. Moreover, we note that this is achieved while ensuring a consistent operation result (which is not ensured in Skip-cas).

4. Summary

In this paper we presented a novel concurrent data-structure, Leap-List, that provides linearizable range queries. We implemented it using a technique called Locking Transactions, which reduces the executed transactions’ lengths. We compared different Leap-List implementations, and also compared our technique to a Skip-List implementation.

We believe that the availability of hardware transactions will greatly enhance Leap-List performance because its implementation is based on short transactions. In the future we plan to test the Leap-List in an In-Memory Data-Base implementation, to replace the B-trees for indexes. We believe this can significantly improve the throughput of many Data-Base workloads.

5. Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by NSF grant CCF-1217921 and by grants from the Oracle and Intel corporations.

References


