

Revisiting the MapReduce Paradigm: an R-Specific View

Norm Matloff and Alex Rumbaugh
University of California at Davis

UCB R Group
May 19, 2015
Updated, May 22

Visual Summary

Visual Summary



Visual Summary



Visual Summary



Visual Summary



My view: Plain Old R can work better in many situations

Overview

Overview

- When I was here one year ago, I speculated that Hadoop would start to lose popularity sometime in the future.

Overview

- When I was here one year ago, I speculated that Hadoop would start to lose popularity sometime in the future.
 - Too slow.

Overview

- When I was here one year ago, I speculated that Hadoop would start to lose popularity sometime in the future.
 - Too slow.
 - Not many ops.

Overview

- When I was here one year ago, I speculated that Hadoop would start to lose popularity sometime in the future.
 - Too slow.
 - Not many ops.
- That time seems to have begun.

Overview

- When I was here one year ago, I speculated that Hadoop would start to lose popularity sometime in the future.
 - Too slow.
 - Not many ops.
- That time seems to have begun.
- E.g. see *The Hadoop Honeymoon Is Over*,
<http://smartdatacollective.com/martynjones/318406/hadoop-honeymoon-over>

Overview

- When I was here one year ago, I speculated that Hadoop would start to lose popularity sometime in the future.
 - Too slow.
 - Not many ops.
- That time seems to have begun.
- E.g. see *The Hadoop Honeymoon Is Over*,
<http://smartdatacollective.com/martynjones/318406/hadoop-honeymoon-over>
- There is a new kid on the block, Spark,

Overview

- When I was here one year ago, I speculated that Hadoop would start to lose popularity sometime in the future.
 - Too slow.
 - Not many ops.
- That time seems to have begun.
- E.g. see *The Hadoop Honeymoon Is Over*,
<http://smartdatacollective.com/martynjones/318406/hadoop-honeymoon-over>
- There is a new kid on the block, Spark, with an R interface, SparkR, a big improvement

Overview

- When I was here one year ago, I speculated that Hadoop would start to lose popularity sometime in the future.
 - Too slow.
 - Not many ops.
- That time seems to have begun.
- E.g. see *The Hadoop Honeymoon Is Over*, <http://smartdatacollective.com/martynjones/318406/hadoop-honeymoon-over>
- There is a new kid on the block, Spark, with an R interface, SparkR, a big improvement
- But I will argue that for us R users, the utility of either Hadoop or SparkR is much more limited than many people realize.

Overview

- When I was here one year ago, I speculated that Hadoop would start to lose popularity sometime in the future.
 - Too slow.
 - Not many ops.
- That time seems to have begun.
- E.g. see *The Hadoop Honeymoon Is Over*, <http://smartdatacollective.com/martynjones/318406/hadoop-honeymoon-over>
- There is a new kid on the block, Spark, with an R interface, SparkR, a big improvement
- But I will argue that for us R users, the utility of either Hadoop or SparkR is much more limited than many people realize.

Overview

- When I was here one year ago, I speculated that Hadoop would start to lose popularity sometime in the future.
 - Too slow.
 - Not many ops.
- That time seems to have begun.
- E.g. see *The Hadoop Honeymoon Is Over*, <http://smartdatacollective.com/martynjones/318406/hadoop-honeymoon-over>
- There is a new kid on the block, Spark, with an R interface, SparkR, a big improvement
- But I will argue that for us R users, the utility of either Hadoop or SparkR is much more limited than many people realize.
- And I will present an alternative.

Overview of MapReduce

Overview of MapReduce

- Parallel ops (cluster or multicore).

Overview of MapReduce

- Parallel ops (cluster or multicore).
- Work flow: map/sort/reduce.

Overview of MapReduce

- Parallel ops (cluster or multicore).
- Work flow: map/sort/reduce.
- Example: word count.

Overview of MapReduce

- Parallel ops (cluster or multicore).
- Work flow: map/sort/reduce.
- Example: word count.
 - Map: Read a line, break into words, emit one record for each (with count 1).

Overview of MapReduce

- Parallel ops (cluster or multicore).
- Work flow: map/sort/reduce.
- Example: word count.
 - Map: Read a line, break into words, emit one record for each (with count 1).
 - Sort by word.

Overview of MapReduce

- Parallel ops (cluster or multicore).
- Work flow: map/sort/reduce.
- Example: word count.
 - Map: Read a line, break into words, emit one record for each (with count 1).
 - Sort by word.
 - Get counts by adding all the 1s for each unique word.

Overview of MapReduce

- Parallel ops (cluster or multicore).
- Work flow: map/sort/reduce.
- Example: word count.
 - Map: Read a line, break into words, emit one record for each (with count 1).
 - Sort by word.
 - Get counts by adding all the 1s for each unique word.
- Most famous example: Hadoop.

What's Wrong with Hadoop

What's Wrong with Hadoop

- SLOW.

What's Wrong with Hadoop

- SLOW. Like an elephant. :-)
 - Input to code must come from disk, output must be written to disk.

What's Wrong with Hadoop

- SLOW. Like an elephant. :-)
 - Input to code must come from disk, output must be written to disk.
 - Awful for iterative algorithms.

What's Wrong with Hadoop

- SLOW. Like an elephant. :-)
 - Input to code must come from disk, output must be written to disk.
 - Awful for iterative algorithms.
 - Sort phase (*shuffle*) is performed even if one's algorithm doesn't need it.

What's Wrong with Hadoop

- SLOW. Like an elephant. :-)
 - Input to code must come from disk, output must be written to disk.
 - Awful for iterative algorithms.
 - Sort phase (*shuffle*) is performed even if one's algorithm doesn't need it.
- Difficult to install/configure.

What's Wrong with Hadoop

- SLOW. Like an elephant. :-)
 - Input to code must come from disk, output must be written to disk.
 - Awful for iterative algorithms.
 - Sort phase (*shuffle*) is performed even if one's algorithm doesn't need it.
- Difficult to install/configure. Not everyone is a systems expert.

What's Wrong with Hadoop

- SLOW. Like an elephant. :-)
 - Input to code must come from disk, output must be written to disk.
 - Awful for iterative algorithms.
 - Sort phase (*shuffle*) is performed even if one's algorithm doesn't need it.
- Difficult to install/configure. Not everyone is a systems expert. Even worse when also need to install R interface.

What's Wrong with Hadoop

- SLOW. Like an elephant. :-)
 - Input to code must come from disk, output must be written to disk.
 - Awful for iterative algorithms.
 - Sort phase (*shuffle*) is performed even if one's algorithm doesn't need it.
- Difficult to install/configure. Not everyone is a systems expert. Even worse when also need to install R interface.
- Map and reduce ops too low-level.

What's Wrong with Hadoop

- SLOW. Like an elephant. :-)
 - Input to code must come from disk, output must be written to disk.
 - Awful for iterative algorithms.
 - Sort phase (*shuffle*) is performed even if one's algorithm doesn't need it.
- Difficult to install/configure. Not everyone is a systems expert. Even worse when also need to install R interface.
- Map and reduce ops too low-level. "Build a house from matchsticks."

What Hadoop Gets Right

What Hadoop Gets Right

- Distributed file system (HDFS).

What Hadoop Gets Right

- Distributed file system (HDFS).
- “Move the computation to the data,” rather than *vice versa*.

What Hadoop Gets Right

- Distributed file system (HDFS).
- “Move the computation to the data,” rather than *vice versa*.
- Thus reduce time-consuming network communication time.

What Hadoop Gets Right

- Distributed file system (HDFS).
- “Move the computation to the data,” rather than *vice versa*.
- Thus reduce time-consuming network communication time.
- Redundancy/fault tolerance, very important if have a huge cluster.

Revisiting the
MapReduce
Paradigm: an
R-Specific
View

Norm Matloff
and Alex
Rumbaugh
University of
California at
Davis

Spark

- Extended map/reduce paradigm.

Spark

- Extended map/reduce paradigm.
- Cacheability of intermediate results, i.e. no costly writes to disk.

Spark

- Extended map/reduce paradigm.
- Cacheability of intermediate results, i.e. no costly writes to disk.
- *Lazy* computation: programmer's several specified ops automatically combined into faster coalesced code.

Spark

- Extended map/reduce paradigm.
- Cacheability of intermediate results, i.e. no costly writes to disk.
- *Lazy* computation: programmer's several specified ops automatically combined into faster coalesced code.
- Shuffle often avoided.

Spark

- Extended map/reduce paradigm.
- Cacheability of intermediate results, i.e. no costly writes to disk.
- *Lazy* computation: programmer's several specified ops automatically combined into faster coalesced code.
- Shuffle often avoided.
- Runs on top of HDFS or other DFS,

Spark

- Extended map/reduce paradigm.
- Cacheability of intermediate results, i.e. no costly writes to disk.
- *Lazy* computation: programmer's several specified ops automatically combined into faster coalesced code.
- Shuffle often avoided.
- Runs on top of HDFS or other DFS, so retain “move the computation to the data” philosophy.

Spark

- Extended map/reduce paradigm.
- Cacheability of intermediate results, i.e. no costly writes to disk.
- *Lazy* computation: programmer's several specified ops automatically combined into faster coalesced code.
- Shuffle often avoided.
- Runs on top of HDFS or other DFS, so retain “move the computation to the data” philosophy.
- Typically way faster than Hadoop.

Spark

- Extended map/reduce paradigm.
- Cacheability of intermediate results, i.e. no costly writes to disk.
- *Lazy* computation: programmer's several specified ops automatically combined into faster coalesced code.
- Shuffle often avoided.
- Runs on top of HDFS or other DFS, so retain “move the computation to the data” philosophy.
- Typically way faster than Hadoop.
- Has various high-level ops, not just map and reduce.

Spark

- Extended map/reduce paradigm.
- Cacheability of intermediate results, i.e. no costly writes to disk.
- *Lazy* computation: programmer's several specified ops automatically combined into faster coalesced code.
- Shuffle often avoided.
- Runs on top of HDFS or other DFS, so retain “move the computation to the data” philosophy.
- Typically way faster than Hadoop.
- Has various high-level ops, not just map and reduce.
- Elegant, sophisticated fault-tolerance mechanism.

Drawbacks to Spark

Drawbacks to Spark

- Still have installation/configuration headaches, even worse than Hadoop.

Drawbacks to Spark

- Still have installation/configuration headaches, even worse than Hadoop. Ditto for SparkR.

Drawbacks to Spark

- Still have installation/configuration headaches, even worse than Hadoop. Ditto for SparkR.
- High-level ops are abstract, steep learning curve.

Drawbacks to Spark

- Still have installation/configuration headaches, even worse than Hadoop. Ditto for SparkR.
- High-level ops are abstract, steep learning curve. (Where have we heard that before?)

Drawbacks to Spark

- Still have installation/configuration headaches, even worse than Hadoop. Ditto for SparkR.
- High-level ops are abstract, steep learning curve. (Where have we heard that before?)
- Not clear that SparkR has much advantage over Plain Old R (POR).

Drawbacks to Spark

- Still have installation/configuration headaches, even worse than Hadoop. Ditto for SparkR.
- High-level ops are abstract, steep learning curve. (Where have we heard that before?)
- Not clear that SparkR has much advantage over Plain Old R (POR). See next slide.

What's in It for R Users?

What's in It for R Users?

- Granted, Hadoop/Spark have automatic fault tolerance, and an efficient sort, both important.

What's in It for R Users?

- Granted, Hadoop/Spark have automatic fault tolerance, and an efficient sort, both important.
- But many apps don't need a sort, and many Hadoop users have small clusters (Hadoop Wiki, <https://wiki.apache.org/hadoop/PoweredBy>).

What's in It for R Users?

- Granted, Hadoop/Spark have automatic fault tolerance, and an efficient sort, both important.
- But many apps don't need a sort, and many Hadoop users have small clusters (Hadoop Wiki, <https://wiki.apache.org/hadoop/PoweredBy>).
- So, POR seems preferable for many users.

What's in It for R Users?

- Granted, Hadoop/Spark have automatic fault tolerance, and an efficient sort, both important.
- But many apps don't need a sort, and many Hadoop users have small clusters (Hadoop Wiki, <https://wiki.apache.org/hadoop/PoweredBy>).
- So, POR seems preferable for many users.
 - No Java/database/configuration issues.

What's in It for R Users?

- Granted, Hadoop/Spark have automatic fault tolerance, and an efficient sort, both important.
- But many apps don't need a sort, and many Hadoop users have small clusters (Hadoop Wiki, <https://wiki.apache.org/hadoop/PoweredBy>).
- So, POR seems preferable for many users.
 - No Java/database/configuration issues.
 - No need to learn new abstractions.

What's in It for R Users?

- Granted, Hadoop/Spark have automatic fault tolerance, and an efficient sort, both important.
- But many apps don't need a sort, and many Hadoop users have small clusters (Hadoop Wiki, <https://wiki.apache.org/hadoop/PoweredBy>).
- So, POR seems preferable for many users.
 - No Java/database/configuration issues.
 - No need to learn new abstractions.
 - No forced shuffle.

What's in It for R Users?

- Granted, Hadoop/Spark have automatic fault tolerance, and an efficient sort, both important.
- But many apps don't need a sort, and many Hadoop users have small clusters (Hadoop Wiki, <https://wiki.apache.org/hadoop/PoweredBy>).
- So, POR seems preferable for many users.
 - No Java/database/configuration issues.
 - No need to learn new abstractions.
 - No forced shuffle.
 - POR at least as expressive as SparkR, and already familiar.

What's in It for R Users?

- Granted, Hadoop/Spark have automatic fault tolerance, and an efficient sort, both important.
- But many apps don't need a sort, and many Hadoop users have small clusters (Hadoop Wiki, <https://wiki.apache.org/hadoop/PoweredBy>).
- So, POR seems preferable for many users.
 - No Java/database/configuration issues.
 - No need to learn new abstractions.
 - No forced shuffle.
 - POR at least as expressive as SparkR, and already familiar.
- We've developed Snowdooop as an alternative:

Snowdoop Overview

Snowdoop Overview

- Pure POR!

Snowdoop Overview

- Pure POR! Uses the portion of R's **parallel** package adapted from the old **Snow**.

Snowdoop Overview

- Pure POR! Uses the portion of R's **parallel** package adapted from the old **Snow**.
- Retains the DFS philosophy.

Snowdoop Overview

- Pure POR! Uses the portion of R's **parallel** package adapted from the old **Snow**.
- Retains the DFS philosophy.
- Includes a distributed sort; could be optimized.

Snowdoop Overview

- Pure POR! Uses the portion of R's **parallel** package adapted from the old **Snow**.
- Retains the DFS philosophy.
- Includes a distributed sort; could be optimized.
- So simple, it's embarrassing, tough to call it a "package."

Word Count

Word Count

```
# prep: use SD filesplit(), load SD at nodes

# ndigs is number of digists in file suffix

fullwordcount <- function(cls, basename, ndigs) {
  counts <- clusterCall(cls, wordcensus, basename, ndigs)
  addlistssum <- function(lst1, lst2)
    addlists(lst1, lst2, sum) # SD
  Reduce(addlistssum, counts)
}

wordcensus <- function(basename, ndigs) {
  fname <- filechunkname(basename, ndigs) # SD
  words <- scan(fname, what="")
  tapply(words, words, length, simplify=FALSE)
}
```

Word Count, cont'd.

Word Count, cont'd.

Test:

Word Count, cont'd.

Test:

```
library(partools)
cls <- makeCluster(2)
setclsinfo(cls) # SD
clusterEvalQ(cls, library(partools))
filesplit(cls, "x") # SD
fullwordcount(cls, "x", 1) # SD
```

Output

Output

```
> fullwordcount(c1s,"x",1)
```

```
$a  
[1] 2
```

```
$chuck  
[1] 2
```

```
$Could  
[1] 2
```

```
$How  
[1] 1
```

```
$much  
[1] 1
```

```
$wood  
[1] 1
```

```
$woodchuck  
[1] 2
```

```
$If  
[1] 1
```

```
$'Wood?'  
[1] 1
```

Snowdooop vs. Hadoop Speed

Snowdoop vs. Hadoop Speed

Disclaimer: No serious experiments done yet, just some small, very preliminary simulations.

Snowdoop vs. Hadoop Speed

Disclaimer: No serious experiments done yet, just some small, very preliminary simulations.

k-Means Clustering:

Snowdoop vs. Hadoop Speed

Disclaimer: No serious experiments done yet, just some small, very preliminary simulations.

k-Means Clustering:

- Antonio, author of the R-Hadoop interface **rnr**, told me that the k-Means example is “just an example,” not claimed to be fast.

Snowdoop vs. Hadoop Speed

Disclaimer: No serious experiments done yet, just some small, very preliminary simulations.

k-Means Clustering:

- Antonio, author of the R-Hadoop interface **rnr**, told me that the k-Means example is “just an example,” not claimed to be fast.
- Our simulations (though not for large n , only 10^5) indicate that Snowdoop is about 100X faster than Hadoop.

Snowdoop vs. Hadoop Speed

Disclaimer: No serious experiments done yet, just some small, very preliminary simulations.

k-Means Clustering:

- Antonio, author of the R-Hadoop interface **rnr**, told me that the k-Means example is “just an example,” not claimed to be fast.
- Our simulations (though not for large n , only 10^5) indicate that Snowdoop is about 100X faster than Hadoop.
- Same simulations show Snowdoop gives about a 50% speedup over R’s serial **kmeans()** function, with 5 nodes.

Snowdoop vs. Hadoop Speed

Disclaimer: No serious experiments done yet, just some small, very preliminary simulations.

k-Means Clustering:

- Antonio, author of the R-Hadoop interface **rnr**, told me that the k-Means example is “just an example,” not claimed to be fast.
- Our simulations (though not for large n , only 10^5) indicate that Snowdoop is about 100X faster than Hadoop.
- Same simulations show Snowdoop gives about a 50% speedup over R’s serial **kmeans()** function, with 5 nodes. Note: **kmeans()** is written in C, not R.

Snowdoop vs. Hadoop Speed

Disclaimer: No serious experiments done yet, just some small, very preliminary simulations.

k-Means Clustering:

- Antonio, author of the R-Hadoop interface **rnr**, told me that the k-Means example is “just an example,” not claimed to be fast.
- Our simulations (though not for large n , only 10^5) indicate that Snowdoop is about 100X faster than Hadoop.
- Same simulations show Snowdoop gives about a 50% speedup over R’s serial **kmeans()** function, with 5 nodes. Note: **kmeans()** is written in C, not R.

sorting:

- This should be Hadoop’s forte’.

Snowdoop vs. Hadoop Speed

Disclaimer: No serious experiments done yet, just some small, very preliminary simulations.

k-Means Clustering:

- Antonio, author of the R-Hadoop interface **rnr**, told me that the k-Means example is “just an example,” not claimed to be fast.
- Our simulations (though not for large n , only 10^5) indicate that Snowdoop is about 100X faster than Hadoop.
- Same simulations show Snowdoop gives about a 50% speedup over R’s serial **kmeans()** function, with 5 nodes. Note: **kmeans()** is written in C, not R.

sorting:

- This should be Hadoop’s forte’.
- Yet we are finding Snowdoop 2X faster.

Snowdoop vs. SparkR Speed

Snowdoop vs. SparkR Speed

- Haven't done a comparison yet.

Snowdoop vs. SparkR Speed

- Haven't done a comparison yet.
- But SparkR has no right to be faster than Snowdoop for nonsort apps.

Snowdoop vs. SparkR Speed

- Haven't done a comparison yet.
- But SparkR has no right to be faster than Snowdoop for nonsort apps.
- None of the apps in MLlib, Spark's machine learning (aka statistics) library uses sorting.

Snowdoop vs. SparkR Speed

- Haven't done a comparison yet.
- But SparkR has no right to be faster than Snowdoop for nonsort apps.
- None of the apps in MLlib, Spark's machine learning (aka statistics) library uses sorting.
- A BARUG speaker from Spark said that they haven't compared timings to non-MapReduce platforms.

Snowdoop vs. SparkR Speed

- Haven't done a comparison yet.
- But SparkR has no right to be faster than Snowdoop for nonsort apps.
- None of the apps in MLlib, Spark's machine learning (aka statistics) library uses sorting.
- A BARUG speaker from Spark said that they haven't compared timings to non-MapReduce platforms.
- With both Hadoop and Spark, is it really a matter of "It's not important how well the dog could walk on his hind legs, but that he could do it at all"?

Snowdoop vs. SparkR Speed

- Haven't done a comparison yet.
- But SparkR has no right to be faster than Snowdoop for nonsort apps.
- None of the apps in MLlib, Spark's machine learning (aka statistics) library uses sorting.
- A BARUG speaker from Spark said that they haven't compared timings to non-MapReduce platforms.
- With both Hadoop and Spark, is it really a matter of "It's not important how well the dog could walk on his hind legs, but that he could do it at all"?

Stay tuned.

Obtaining Snowdoop

Obtaining Snowdoop

- Still under development.

Obtaining Snowdoop

- Still under development.
- In our **partools** package, on CRAN and GitHub.