13.7. VARIABLE-LENGTH DATA AND RECORDS

Storage of BLOBs

A BLOB must be stored on a sequence of blocks. Often we prefer that these blocks are allocated consecutively on a cylinder or cylinders of the disk, so the BLOB may be retrieved efficiently. However, it is also possible to store the BLOB on a linked list of blocks.

Moreover, it is possible that the BLOB needs to be retrieved so quickly (e.g., a movie that must be played in real time), that storing it on one disk does not allow us to retrieve it fast enough. Then, it is necessary to stripe the BLOB across several disks, that is, to alternate blocks of the BLOB among these disks. Thus, several blocks of the BLOB can be retrieved simultaneously, increasing the retrieval rate by a factor approximately equal to the number of disks involved in the striping.

Retrieval of BLOBs

Our assumption that when a client wants a record, the block containing the record is passed from the database server to the client in its entirety may not hold. We may want to pass only the "small" fields of the record, and allow the client to request blocks of the BLOB one at a time, independently of the rest of the record. For instance, if the BLOB is a 2-hour movie, and the client requests that the movie be played, the BLOB could be shipped several blocks at a time to the client, at just the rate necessary to play the movie.

In many applications, it is also important that the client be able to request interior portions of the BLOB without having to receive the entire BLOB. Examples would be a request to see the 45th minute of a movie, or the ending of an audio clip. If the DBMS is to support such operations, then it requires a suitable index structure, e.g., an index by seconds on a movie BLOB.

13.7.6 Column Stores

An alternative to storing tuples as records is to store each column as a record. Since an entire column of a relation may occupy far more than a single block, these records may span many blocks, much as long files do. If we keep the
values in each column in the same order, then we can reconstruct the relation
from the column records. Alternatively, we can keep tuple ID’s or integers with
each value, to tell which tuple the value belongs to.

**Example 13.22:** Consider the relation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The column for $X$ can be represented by the record $(a, c, e)$ and the column for $Y$ can be represented by the record $(b, d, f)$. If we want to indicate the tuple to which each value belongs, then we can represent the two columns by the records $((1, a), (2, c), (3, e))$ and $((1, b), (2, d), (3, f))$, respectively. No matter how many tuples the relation above had, the columns would be represented by variable-length records of values or repeating groups of tuple ID’s and values.

If we store relations by columns, it is often possible to compress data, the values all have a known type. For example, an attribute gender in a relation might have type CHAR(1), but we would use four bytes in a tuple-based record, because it is more convenient to have all components of a tuple begin at word boundaries. However, if all we are storing is a sequence of gender values, then it would make sense to store the column by a sequence of bits. If we did so, we would compress the data by a factor of 32.

However, in order for column-based storage to make sense, it must be the case that most queries call for examination of all, or a large fraction of the values in each of several columns. Recall our discussion in Section 10.6 of “analytic” queries, which are the common kind of queries with the desired characteristic. These “OLAP” queries may benefit from organizing the data by columns.

### 13.7.7 Exercises for Section 13.7

**Exercise 13.7.1:** A patient record consists of the following fixed-length fields: the patient’s date of birth, social-security number, and patient ID, each 10 bytes long. It also has the following variable-length fields: name, address, and patient history. If pointers within a record require 4 bytes, and the record length is a 4-byte integer, how many bytes, exclusive of the space needed for the variable-length fields, are needed for the record? You may assume that no alignment of fields is required.

**Exercise 13.7.2:** Suppose records are as in Exercise 13.7.1, and the variable-length fields name, address, and history each have a length that is uniformly distributed. For the name, the range is 10–50 bytes; for address it is 20–80 bytes, and for history it is 0–1000 bytes. What is the average length of a patient record?