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Motivation

- Search in P2P networks still remains an open and challenging problem
- Scalable solutions for exact match queries (DHT – $O(\log n)$). Limited query semantic
- Good solutions for keyword matches
- Exhaustive search for unstructured networks (BubbleStorm, Random Walks)
Existing Solutions

- Unstructured Networks
  - Data is replicated on the network
  - Complex queries
  - Search is difficult
- Problems
  - Large amount of traffic (replication)
  - Network coverage is not guaranteed
Desirable Features

- Direct search for participants which have not been visited yet
- Support complex queries
- Explore peers’ heterogeneity
Splitquest Approach

- Peers can estimate the network size (n)
- Peers belong to groups
- Peers replicate their content in peers belonging to the same group
- Any peer from the group can answer queries for data stored on the group
SplitQuest: Topology

- Hybrid Approach
  - Peers are placed uniformly on a virtual ring
    - each peer has a predecessor and successor
    - peers are uniquely identified in the interval $[0,1]$
  - Peers make random connections
  - Contiguous subinterval of the $[0,1]$ interval = group
  - The size of the subinterval defines the number of peers in a group and consequently the number of groups in the network
SplitQuest - Approach

- Uniform Distribution
  - Groups with approximately the same sizes

- Every peer has a shortcut for a node in the successor group and a shortcut for a node in the predecessor group
SplitQuest – Index Replication

- A peer installs replicas in peers from the same group
  - Peers send replicas for the predecessor and successor nodes until entire group is covered
SplitQuest – Search Algorithm

- Search is directed to cover all groups in the network
  - When a message reaches a peer in the group, it means it reaches all peers in that group
  - Every message has an associated subinterval of [0, 1]
    - The subinterval indicates which groups have not been covered yet
  - When a peer receives a message
    - Checks if it has connections (groups or shortcuts) for groups not covered yet
    - Sends a message to a connected peer with a subinterval of the initial message, the new subinterval does not contain the subinterval covered by the peer
Search Example

Starts a query for x

Replicates obj X
Group Size

- The expected number of peers in a contiguous subinterval is proportional to the subinterval length.
- Choose a group size that minimizes the overhead of index replication and query propagation.
  - n: number of peers
  - d: size of a group
  - q: number of groups in the network (n/d)
  - M: number of search and data messages
  - M = q + d
  - M = n/d + d
  - Optimal solution d = sqrt(n)
Analysis

- Groups are visited only once
- Query messages propagate through groups in a random way ➔ broadcast in a random tree
Analysis

Start a query

All groups covered!
Devroye [2] shows that for well-behaved distributions the height of the three is:

- $H_q = 4.31 \times \log q$

In SplitQuest, $q$ is the number of groups

Height of the Three

- Theoretical Upper Bound Limit x Practical Limits
Simulations

- C++ simulator
- BubbleStorm (SIGCOMM’07)
- Metrics:
  - Success rate / Latency / Number of messages
- Topologies: power-law, regular and real trace
- Network sizes: from 1000 to 1000000 peers
- Similar to BubbleStorm simulation (wiki)
- Scenarios: static and dynamic
  - Data rate: insert 100 articles / second in random peers
  - Wait time of replication
  - Start search from a random peer
- Subinterval length = 1/sqrt(n)
Preliminary Results

- Number of Messages

![Graph showing the number of messages for different network sizes for SplitQuest and BubbleStorm]
Preliminary Results

- Number of Hops: First Match Latency

![Graph showing latency against network size for SplitQuest and BubbleStorm. The graph indicates a trend where latency increases with network size, with BubbleStorm showing a lower latency compared to SplitQuest for all network sizes.]
Preliminary Results

- Number of Hops: First Match Latency

![Graph showing latency in hops vs network size for SplitQuest and BubbleStorm traces.](image-url)
Preliminary Results

- Number of Hops: First Match Latency

![Graph showing latency vs network size for different algorithms.](image)
Preliminary Results

- Success Rate: Churn
Conclusion

- SplitQuest appears promising
  - Fast
  - Supports complex queries
  - Avoids duplication of search messages
Future Work

- What is the impact of replicating metadata in more than one group?
- Can we allow groups of different sizes?
- How do probability distributions of node degrees and connections influence the three height?
- Can we have one single architecture that supports both DHT-like queries and complex queries efficiently?