## Lab 3-Alternative solutions

## Lab 3

- Input file

A1008ULQSWloo6,Boo17OAQIY
$\mathrm{A}_{100} \mathrm{EBHBG} \mathrm{GF}_{5}, \mathrm{Boon}_{3} \mathrm{~T}_{5} \mathrm{YO}_{4}$
A1017YoSGBINVS,Booo9F3SAK
A101F8M8DPFOM9,Boo5HY2BRO,BoooH7MFVI
A102H88HCCJJAB,Boo07A8XV6
$\mathrm{A}_{102} \mathrm{ME}_{7} \mathrm{M}_{2} \mathrm{YW} \mathrm{WP}_{5}$,BoooFKGT8W
A102OP2OSXRVH,Boo1EO5SGU,BoooEHoRTS
A102TGNH1Dg15Z,BoooRHXKC6,Booo2DHNXC,Booo2DHNXC,BoooXJK7UG,Boooo8DFK5,Booo
SP1CWW,BooogYD7P2,BoooSP1CWW,Boooo8DFK5,BooogYD7P2
A1051WAJLoHJWH,BoooW5 ${ }_{5} \mathrm{H} 6$
A1052Vo4GOA7RV,Boo2GJgJY6,Boo1E5E3JY,Boo8ZRKZSM,Boo2GJgJWS

- Each line contains
" a reviewer ID (AXXXXXX) and
- the list of products reviewed by her/him (BXXXXXX)


## Lab 3

- Your goal is to find the top 100 pairs of products most often reviewed (and so bought) together
- We consider two products as reviewed (i.e., bought) together if they appear in the same line of the input file


## Lab 3: Possible solutions

At least three different "approaches" can be used to solve Lab 3

## Solution \#1

## Lab 3: Solution \#1

1. A chain of two MapReduce jobs is used

- The first job computes the number of occurrences of each pair of products that occur together in at least one line of the input file
" It is like a word count where each "word" is a pair of products
- The second job selects the top-k pairs of products, in terms of num. of occurrences, among the pairs emitted by the first job
- It implements the top-k pattern


## Lab 3: Solution \#1

- The first job computes the number of occurrences of each pair of products analyzing the input file



## Lab 3: Solution \#1

- The second job computes the global top-k pairs of products in terms of num. of occurrences



## Solution \#2

## Lab 3: Solution \#2

## 2. One single MapReduce job is used

- The job
- Computes the number of occurrences of each pair of products
" It is again like a word count where each "word" is a pair of products
- However, the reducer does not emit all the pairs (pair of products, \#of occurrences) that it computes
- The top-k list is computed in the reducer and is emitted in its cleanup method


## Lab 3: Solution \#2

- In the reducer, the job computes also the top-k list
- By initializing the top-k list in the setup method of the reducer
- By updating the top-k list in the reduce method (immediately after the computation of the frequency of the current pair of products)
- By emitting the final top-k list in the cleanup method of the reducer
- There must be one single instance of the reducer in order to compute the final global top-k list


## Lab 3: Solution \#2

- There is one single job that computes the number of occurrences and the global top-k list at the same time in its single instance of the reducer


Global top-k list
("product_x,product_y", num. Occurrences_xy) ("product_y,product_z", num. Occurrences_yz)

## Solution \#3

## Lab 3: Solution \#3

3. A chain of two MapReduce jobs is used

- The first job is the same job used by Solution \#2
- However, in this case the number of instances of the reducers class is set to a value greater than one
- This setting allows parallelizing the reduce step of the first job
- Each reducer emits a local top-k list
- The first job returns a number of local top-k lists equal to the number of reducers of the first job


## Lab 3: Solution \#3

- The second job computes the final top-k list merging the pairs of the local top-k lists emitted by the first job
- It is based on the standard Top-k pattern


## Lab 3: Solution \#3

- The first job computes the number of occurrences of each pair of products but each instance of the reducer emits only its local top-k pairs
("product_x,product_y", 1)
("product_y,product_z", 1)


Local top-k list Reducer \#1
("product_x,product_y", num. Occurrences_xy)

Local top-k list Reducer \#M
("product_y,product_z", num. Occurrences_yz)

## Lab 3: Solution \#3

- The second job computes the global top-k pairs of products in terms of num. of occurrences merging the local list of job \#1



## Comparison of the three proposed solutions

## Lab 3: Comparison of the proposed solutions

- Solution \#1
- +Adopts two standard patterns
-     - However, the output of the first job is very large
- One pair for each pair of products occurring together at least one time in the input file


## Lab 3: Comparison of the proposed solutions

- Solution \#2
- +Only one job is instantiated and executed (there is only one job in Solution \#2) and its output is already the final top-k list
-     - However, only one reducer is instantiated
- It could become a bottleneck because one single reducer must analyze the potentially large set of pairs emitted by the mappers sequentially
- The slowest of the three solutions
- This solution MUST NOT BE USED
- It is highly inefficient


## Lab 3: Comparison of the proposed solutions

- Solution \#3
- +Each reducer of the first job emits only the pair contained in its local top-k lists
- One top-k list for each reducer
- The pairs of the top-k lists emitted by the reducers are significantly smaller than all the pairs of products occurring together at least one time
- Since the first job instantiates many reducers, the parallelism is maintained for the first job that is the heaviest one
-     - It is not a standard pattern

