

Optimizing LLM Queries in Relational Workloads

Shu Liu*, Asim Biswal*, Audrey Cheng*, Xiangxi Mo, Shiyi Cao,
Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, Matei Zaharia
UC Berkeley
lshu@berkeley.edu

ABSTRACT

Analytical database providers (e.g., Redshift, Databricks, BigQuery) have rapidly added support for invoking Large Language Models (LLMs) through native user-defined functions (UDFs) to help users perform natural language tasks, such as classification, entity extraction, and translation, inside analytical workloads. For instance, an analyst might want to extract customer sentiments on millions of product reviews. However, LLM inference is highly expensive in both computational and economic terms: for example, an NVIDIA L4 GPU running Llama2-7B can only process 6 KB of text per second. In this paper, we explore how to optimize LLM inference for analytical workloads that invoke LLMs within relational queries. We show that relational queries present novel opportunities for accelerating LLM inference, including reordering rows to maximize key-value (KV) cache reuse within the LLM inference engine, re-ordering columns within a row to further increase cache reuse, and deduplicating redundant inference requests. We implement these optimizations in Apache Spark, with vLLM as the model serving backend and achieve up to 4.4× improvement in end-to-end latency on a benchmark of diverse LLM-based queries on real datasets. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to explicitly address the problem of optimizing LLM invocations within SQL queries.

PVLDB Reference Format:

Shu Liu*, Asim Biswal*, Audrey Cheng*, Xiangxi Mo, Shiyi Cao, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, Matei Zaharia. Optimizing LLM Queries in Relational Workloads. PVLDB, 14(1): XXX-XXX, 2020. doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX

PVLDB Artifact Availability:

The source code, data, and/or other artifacts have been made available at <https://github.com/lynnliu030/vldb24>.

1 INTRODUCTION

Large Language Models (LLMs) are making it dramatically easier to analyze textual data. In fact, a number of analytical database vendors, including AWS Redshift [4], Databricks [2], and Google BigQuery [5], have already added LLM invocation functions to their SQL APIs. As an example, consider the following SQL query:

```
SELECT user, request, support_response,
       LLM("Did {support_response} address {request}?",
          ⇨ support_response, request) AS success
FROM customer_tickets
WHERE support_response <> NULL
```

where the LLM is invoked to analyze whether customer service requests are effectively addressed. Increasingly, analysts wish to leverage LLMs in such queries for tasks, such as classification, entity extraction, summarization, and translations [2]. We will refer to SQL queries that invoke LLMs as *LLM queries*.

Unfortunately, applying LLMs in this manner to real-world datasets (which can contain millions of rows) has significant computational and economic costs. For example, classifying 15,000 rows of movie reviews from the Rotten Tomatoes Movies dataset [28] takes 30 minutes on an NVIDIA L4 GPU instance running a Llama 7B model [33]. On a similar sized instance, an analytical database, such as DuckDB [29], can process more than 100GB of data per second in the TPC-DS benchmark [3]. Processing the equivalent amount of data via the same LLM would take 96 days, more than 8 million times longer! Thus, minimizing the cost of LLM invocations is the critical objective for LLM queries. Later in this section, we demonstrate that for the movie review workload, our optimizations can reduce the runtime from 30 minutes to 8 minutes.

Given the staggering costs of LLM inference, there has been extensive research on how to optimize this process. At a high level, LLM generation occurs sequentially for each request due to the autoregressive nature of the model (new tokens generated depend on all previous tokens), so requests are batched to improve throughput. However, all computational states of each request in a batch must be stored in memory during inference. As a result, memory management is a critical factor for LLM inference performance. Specifically, LLM inference engines store intermediate states for past prompts and generations, or *prefixes* of these requests, in a key-value (KV) cache [21, 34]. Reuse of prefixes (e.g., between requests that share the same prompt) in the cache has been shown to have an outsized impact on performance [18, 21, 38, 40]. Accordingly, existing inference systems aim to maximize the hit rate of the KV cache.

Unfortunately, current LLM inference systems are designed for online serving workloads—they process requests in arrival, or first-in, first-out (FIFO) order and make no assumptions about future requests. As a result, they miss out on opportunities to improve performance by leveraging the workload information present in relational analytics. In this work, we address the problem of optimizing inference for LLM queries. We introduce a range of techniques that reduce end-to-end query latency (including LLM request time).

To optimize for relational analytics queries using LLMs, we propose **prefix sharing maximization (PSM)** to dynamically reorder

*Equal contribution.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International License. Visit [to view a copy of this license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/). For any use beyond those covered by this license, obtain permission by emailing info@vldb.org. Copyright is held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to the VLDB Endowment. Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment, Vol. 14, No. 1 ISSN 2150-8097. doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX

the columns and rows of input data to significantly improve the KV cache hit rate. Our key insight is that with oracular knowledge of all requests to be sent to the LLM, we can reorder the requests as well as the fields inside each request to increase the number of cache hits. For instance, two requests that share the same prefix (which may be non-consecutive under FIFO ordering) should be served together so that the latter one can observe a cache hit. Likewise, in requests that input multiple fields of data (e.g., a product name and review) into the LLM, the fields should be ordered to maximize the number of shared prefixes. In real datasets, there can be many shared prefixes across both columns and rows of data, so we can markedly increase the KV cache hit rate by changing the order and format of requests.

Finding the optimal order and format of requests is challenging because there are an exponential number of ways to order the columns and rows of data in a query. Consequently, we present a heuristic-based **column reordering** algorithm that reorders fields within each row processed based on estimated cache savings. Our algorithm scores column values based on their frequency and size to determine the order priority of the entire column. We also present a **row sorting** optimization that groups requests with shared prefixes together to increase cache reuse.

In addition to our prefix sharing maximization techniques, we also present two optimizations to further reduce the computational costs of LLMs in relational queries. First, we observe that many real-world workloads have duplicates in textual data that lead to redundant LLM invocations. With **deduplication**, we can minimize the number of LLM calls without affecting the accuracy of the overall query. Second, we enhance the functionality of existing database query optimizers to **estimate LLM operator costs** within query expressions. This optimization allows for the strategic reordering of operations by taking into account the significant expense associated with LLM operators, thereby optimizing performance.

We implement our techniques in Apache Spark [8] with vLLM [21] as the model serving backend. Given the lack of standard workloads in this area, we build a diverse benchmark suite of LLM queries on multiple real-world datasets. We construct a wide range of query types, such as multi-LLM invocations within the same query and retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) [22] queries, across a variety of recommendation and question-answering datasets, including Amazon Product Review [14], the Rotten Tomatoes Movie Dataset [28], and the Stanford Question Answering Dataset (SQuAD) [30]. We find that our techniques provide 1.5–4.4× improvements in end-to-end query latency while preserving query semantics. In summary, our contributions are as follows:

- We present our prefix sharing maximization approach which applies a column reordering algorithm and row sorting optimization to improve the KV cache hit rate for LLM inference in relational analytics.
- We introduce deduplication and cost estimation techniques to further reduce the invocation costs of LLMs from SQL.
- We present a set of LLM query benchmarks using real-world data to represent a range of retrieval and processing tasks.
- We evaluate our optimizations using vLLM and Spark and to observe up to a 4.4× decrease in end-to-end query latency.

2 BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

LLMs are a powerful tool for programmatic analysis of text data and are being rapidly incorporated into major analytical DBMSes [2, 4, 5]. LLM inference has several unique characteristics that have significant implications for performance. In this section, we provide a brief overview of the inference process and the key components of the LLM architecture to provide context. We then present opportunities to improve performance under relational analytics.

LLM inference. Today’s LLMs are autoregressive Transformer models [34], which generate words as tokens, one at a time, based on a given prompt and the existing sequence of tokens that have already been outputted. A *token* is a concise representation of a chunk of characters, typically using Byte-Paired Encoding [41]. On average, a token is approximately four English characters.

The inference process for LLMs occurs in two stages: (i) the prefill stage in which the model processes all the input prompt tokens at once and (ii) the decoding stage during which token generation occurs. Generation for each request proceeds sequentially (i.e., new tokens must be generated one by one) since the process depends on (the product of conditional probabilities of) all previous tokens. This process continues until the model outputs a termination token.

An LLM inference engine (e.g. vLLM [21], TGI [16], TensorRT-LLM [27]) runs the transformer models and schedules the prefill and decode stages. Since each request must be processed sequentially, the LLM inference engine batches multiple requests in a continuous fashion [39] together to improve throughput. However, to process multiple requests in a batch, the memory usage of each request must be efficiently managed: during the inference process, the intermediate computed state for all tokens involved must be stored in memory. This token state is cached as key and value vectors in the *key-value (KV) cache*, and each token can take up to 800KB for a 13B Model [21]. Accordingly, an average request involving 2000 tokens can take up to 1.6GB of space. Even with batching (for online workloads, batch sizes of up to 32 are used [39]), LLM inference is computationally expensive and is currently limited to processing about 2000 tokens/s on a single GPU. As such, LLM performance is currently the bottleneck in many analytical tasks.

KV cache. A crucial factor for LLM serving throughput is memory management within the KV cache. To enable maximum cache utilization (i.e., hit rate), recent work proposes sharing tokens across requests. Since many user prompts share the same *prefix*, or input prompt, the KV cache can store one copy of the prefix in advance to reduce redundant computation during the prefill phase. For instance, if two requests share a prefix, the first request will have already performed some computation on the input tokens and loaded these results in the KV cache. The subsequent request can directly reuse these values for further inference without having to recompute the shared tokens. An example of prefix sharing across requests to enhance KV cache efficiency is shown in Figure 1.

Existing research on KV cache management focuses only on online inference in which the LLM assumes no knowledge about future requests [21]. In contrast, invoking an LLM through a SQL query provides information about the structure and data of the full set of requests before execution. We can leverage this information through a variety of techniques to significantly improve the performance of such queries.



Figure 1: Example of prefix sharing across requests in a KV cache. Green tokens (“Classify” and “:”) are universally shared across all three requests. This means that only one set of KV needs to be computed, reducing redundant computations. Purple tokens (“Hi”) represent partial sharing between Req 1 and 2, illustrating selective reuse. Black tokens are the ones that require computation.

2.1 Optimization Opportunities in Analytics

In this paper, we optimize LLM inference in the context of relational analytics queries. We describe new opportunities to improve performance by utilizing the structure and semantics of SQL workloads.

Improving KV cache hit rate. Existing LLM inference engines, which are designed for the online setting, make no assumptions about future requests and execute queries as they arrive, or first-in, first-out (FIFO), order. As a result, they miss out on opportunities to improve cache hit rate by leveraging the workload information present in relational analytics. At the query optimizer level, we have full knowledge about the structure of each request (e.g., prompt and input data) and often the format / length of the outputted response. This information can be used to determine when prefixes should be loaded into and removed from the KV cache to maximize the cache hit rate. For instance, under FIFO execution, two non-consecutive requests that share a prefix may both lead to cache misses. Instead, if we ordered these requests together, we could ensure that the latter results in a cache hit. Since all prefixes are known in batch queries, we can group shared prefixes together to increase the KV cache hit rate. Overall, we want to maximize the *token hit rate*, or the ratio of tokens that can be served from the KV cache.

Our Approach: Data-Aware Caching and Request Scheduling. We leverage workload information to enhance the KV cache hit rate. Specifically, we introduce algorithms that reorder requests, and fields in each request, to maximize prefix sharing across requests. We reorder requests to the LLM at both the column level and row level to enable cache reuse and efficient memory usage.

Avoiding redundant computation. Naively invoking the LLM on textual data can lead to many redundant requests. Perhaps surprisingly, structured text data often contains duplicate entries. Naive execution of the queries can lead to redundant computation. To reduce overall latency, we should minimize the number of calls made to the LLM by identifying and filtering for these requests that will lead to the same response.

Our Approach: Eliminating Redundant Requests. We leverage workload information to reduce the number of LLM requests without affecting query accuracy. Specifically, we deduplicate exact input prompts to ensure we invoke the LLM only when necessary.

Accounting for LLM operator costs. LLM operators within SQL queries are often the most expensive parts of these requests. As standard DB query optimizers rely on accurately estimating the cost of the key operators to generate efficient query plans, they

should account for LLM operator costs. For instance, a predicate pushdown should be applied before invoking the LLM.

Our Approach: Cost Estimation. We incorporate LLM operator costs into the SQL query optimizer to ensure the most expensive operations are invoked only when necessary. Specifically, we model LLM computational costs during the query planning process.

3 REQUEST FORMULATION

In this section, we introduce our request scheduling algorithms designed to maximize prefix sharing in the KV cache. We leverage full workload information from batch queries to ensure all requests sharing the same prefixes are executed consecutively to optimize overall LLM inference efficiency. Specifically, we present column-level and row-level reordering algorithms that group queries based on the data they access.

3.1 Request Structure

We define the LLM function within the context of structured queries: this function accepts structured expressions as input, such as one or multiple columns $\{a, b, c\}$ or $\{pr.*\}$, and processes them to extract and analyze data. The design of our UDF input structure allows for dynamic reordering of fields within these expressions to optimize for cache efficiency.

3.2 Column Reordering

Since cache hits occur only for the prefix of requests, determining the right order of columns in SQL queries can have a significant impact on performance. For example, consider the following query:

```

SELECT
  LLM("Give an overview based on this: ", pr.*)
FROM
  (SELECT
    r.reviewText,
    r.reviewerName,
    p.description,
    p.title,
  FROM reviews r
  JOIN product p ON r.asin = p.asin
) AS pr

```

This query passes in multiple columns, such as *reviewText*, *reviewerName*, and *description*, for each row of data sent to the LLM for summarization. Using the default column order (e.g., *reviewText* happens to be first in the schema) can be inefficient because there are more distinct values in this column, leading to more unique prefixes. Instead, we can place the *description* column first to increase the number of shared prefixes: since many reviews are associated with the same product, these prefixes can be cached and reused.

The objective of column level input reordering is to order fields within requests such that we maximize the token hit rate of the KV cache. This task is complicated by the diversity in shared prefix values and their variable lengths. For instance, longer shared prefixes might lead to more token hits even if they arise less frequently than shorter prefixes. Thus, a reordering strategy needs balance between prefix frequency and size to maximize cache reuse.

Algorithm 1 Column-Level Reordering

```
1: Input: Table  $T$ 
2: Output: Reordered Columns List  $L$ 

3: Initialize  $L \leftarrow []$ 
4: Precompute  $ASL \leftarrow \text{Map}()$   $\triangleright$  Pre-computed average string
   length for each column

5: function CALCULATESCORES( $T$ )
6:   Initialize  $ColumnScores \leftarrow \text{Map}()$ 
7:   for each column  $m$  in  $T$  do
8:      $C_m \leftarrow \text{Cardinality}(T, m)$ 
9:      $ColumnScores[m] \leftarrow ASL[m] \times \left(\frac{TableLength}{C_m}\right)$ 
10:  end for
11:  return  $ColumnScores$ 
12: end function

13:  $T_{current} \leftarrow T$ 
14:  $ColumnScores \leftarrow \text{CalculateScores}(T_{current})$ 
15: while Columns remain for selection in  $T_{current}$  do
16:    $c_{select} \leftarrow \text{argmax}_c(ColumnScores)$ 
17:    $L.append(c_{select})$ 
18:   Remove  $c_{select}$  from  $T_{current}$ 
19:    $ColumnScores \leftarrow \text{CalculateScores}(T_{current})$   $\triangleright$  Calculate
   scores for remaining columns
20: end while
21: return  $L$ 
```

3.2.1 Oracle Algorithm. Finding the best order of columns is challenging because there is an exponential number of possible permutations for a given number of columns. For instance, a dataset with N rows and M columns would produce $N \times M!$ possible orders. Enumerating all of them would be prohibitively expensive in practice, so we need a heuristic that enables us to efficiently find an effective ordering.

3.2.2 Reordering Algorithm. Our reordering algorithm employs column statistics—specifically, the cardinality of column values—to quickly search for an effective ordering. Databases typically maintain statistics, such as the number of unique entries (i.e., cardinality) and distribution of values for each column, on store data, which we leverage to infer the potential for prefix sharing. We simplify the problem by establishing a fixed column ordering for all rows. This allows us to avoid having to consider an exponential number of permutations. In practice, many datasets have columns with high cardinality (i.e., few shared prefixes), so their order does not affect the cache hit rate.

Concretely, our algorithm begins by precomputing two pieces of metadata for each column: the average string length (ASL) and the cardinality (C) (or the number of unique values). These metrics enable us to estimate the likelihood of each column contributing to the token hit rate. We obtain the average length of the values in a given column by running a SQL query (e.g., $\text{AVG}(\text{CHAR_LENGTH}(\text{col}))$) on the data. We retrieve the cardinality from existing database statistics present in most systems.

T	Without Reordering		With Reordering	
	Keys accessed	Cache state	Keys accessed	Cache state
1	1, 2, 3	-	1, 2, 3	-
2	-	1, 2, 3	-	1, 2, 3
3	4, 5, 6	1, 2, 3	1, 2, 3	1, 2, 3
4	-	4, 5, 6	-	1, 2, 3
5	1, 2, 3	4, 5, 6	4, 5, 6	1, 2, 3
6	-	1, 2, 3	-	4, 5, 6
7	4, 5, 6	1, 2, 3	4, 5, 6	4, 5, 6

Table 1: Comparison of KV cache state with different prefix input orders. Red represents cache misses: without reordering, there are 12 cache misses; with reordering, there are only 6 cold misses.

Next, the algorithm calculates a score for each column. We draw inspiration from standard caching algorithms, such as GDSF [11], which give equal weight to size and frequency factors. Our algorithm uses the following formula:

$$Score(col) = ASL_{col} \times \frac{\text{Total Number of Rows}}{C_{col}}$$

Under this method, higher scores correspond to columns with longer and more frequent shared data values. Our algorithm then places columns in order of descending scores.

3.2.3 Limitations. While our column-level input reordering algorithm demonstrates the potential for enhancing cache efficiency, it has limitations. The primary assumption under our approach is the fixed ordering of columns across all data rows. This assumption simplifies the computational complexity but may not always hold in real-world scenarios. In practice, different rows could benefit from different orderings based on the specific data they contain. Future work could explore smarter reordering strategies, as we will talk about in Section 8.2.2.

3.3 Row Sorting

Once we determine a column order, we need to group the rows of data such that we maximize the number of shared prefixes across requests. To achieve this, we concatenate all column values into a string and sort these strings lexicographically (over different rows) to determine the row order.

To demonstrate how this technique improves cache usage, consider an example in which we have a batch size of three and six distinct prefixes that each appear three times (as illustrated in Table 1). If the requests arrive in the following order (with batches shown in brackets): [1, 2, 3], [4, 5, 6], [1, 2, 3], [4, 5, 6], the KV cache would evict and recompute all six prefixes under a caching algorithm, such as FIFO, leading to inefficient cache use. Instead, if we sort the rows of input to group common prefixes together (e.g., [1, 2, 3], [1, 2, 3], [4, 5, 6], [4, 5, 6]), we ensure that each prefix is loaded into the cache only once and reused across any requests it is involved in. Upon eviction, we know that this prefix will never need to be loaded into the cache again. This approach can greatly reduce cache eviction and recomputation, leading to faster LLM processing times.

Conveniently, the structured nature of SQL queries enables us to efficiently sort requests—we can identify and easily group shared

data based on the relational schema by using existing database operations (e.g., GROUP BY and ORDER BY).

4 DEDUPLICATION

Since LLM invocations are the bottleneck in most LLM queries, we can further reduce runtime by minimizing the number of inference calls we need to make. Specifically, we can deduplicate across requests that have the same input prompts. Perhaps surprisingly, large textual datasets often contain many duplicates. For instance, in the previous query shown in Sec 3.2, many reviews might mention similar product. Processing every review through an LLM or vector DB would lead to redundant computations. Instead, we can identify these duplicates before passing them to the LLM or vector DB to significantly reduce the computational load. In modern recommendation datasets, there are often high degrees of duplication in the table columns. For example, the Rotten Tomatoes Movie dataset [28], commonly used in recommendation models, has a `review_type` column corresponding to the category of the review (e.g., “Fresh” or “Rotten”). As a result, the selectivity ratio, or the ratio of distinct values compared to total values, is only 0.008, since there only two distinct categories.

4.1 Exact Deduplication

For the purposes of this work, we choose to apply deduplication without affecting query results. In the RDBMSes, this is commonly achieved through the use of distinct filters (e.g., DISTINCT in SQL) on the query inputs. This approach is straightforward and effective for reducing the number of LLM invocations by filtering out duplicate requests before they reach the model.

However, applying deduplication across many rows of data can present challenges, especially regarding memory and processing time. Furthermore, in scenarios with a vast amount of distinct data, identifying duplicates is not that helpful. We show the ablation study on deduplication with columns of different selectivity ratios in Figure 8 in Section 7.

Beyond exact matches, *semantic* deduplication, which identifies records that are semantically similar, represents a promising area for future research. We discuss it further in Section 8.4.

5 SQL OPTIMIZATIONS

Traditionally, relational databases employ cost-based query optimizers to enhance the performance of requests. These optimizers analyze query structures and operators to minimize data accesses and computational overheads. We extend these optimizers to account for LLM operators costs so that they can find query plans that minimize LLM invocations.

5.1 LLM Operator Costs

We augment cost estimation for the external functions that are used to invoke LLMs. Currently, LLMs are most commonly accessed via UDFs. For instance, Databricks offers an `ai_query()` function that allows users to call a model endpoint [1]. Similarly, Amazon Redshift enables uses to LLM calls via UDF functions [4]. We estimate LLM costs based on the token length of the input and estimated decode length over requests. In most cases, LLM invocations are

```
-- Selection, Projection
SELECT u.UserID
FROM Users u
JOIN Comments c ON u.CommentID = c.CommentID
WHERE
  LLM("{Few_shot_examples}, sentiment on the {Text}
  ↔ is", c.Text) = 'Negative'
AND c.Timestamp > '2023-10-01'
```

Figure 2: SQL Example with one LLM and one non-LLM filter. The order in which these filters are applied affects the end-to-end query execution time.

significantly more expensive than other query operators, so these calls are pulled up in the query plan.

As an example of how LLM operator costs affect query planning, consider the query provided earlier in Figure 2 as an example. Without accounting for LLM inference costs, a naive execution might call the UDF on every row in the table before applying the filter `c.Timestamp > '2023-10-01'`. This would lead to unnecessary LLM invocations and could significantly increase overall execution time. A better execution strategy would be to apply the filter before invoking the LLM UDF, thereby reducing the dataset size that the LLM processes. This optimization would also benefit other query operators, such as joins. In general, the optimizer will pull up LLM calls as much as possible since these tend to be the most expensive parts of the query.

6 IMPLEMENTATION

In this section, we describe the implementation of our optimizations, which consists of 4K lines of Python code integrated with Spark [8].

6.1 LLM UDFs and Optimizations

To invoke the LLM in SQL queries, we implement a PySpark [6] UDF that makes external calls to an LLM endpoint and a vector database. The UDF takes in a prompt for the LLM as well as data values (per column) as arguments to pass to the model. LLM output post-processing is also handled in the UDF.

Prompt construction. Our UDF converts column values to prompt strings that can be parsed by an LLM. The first part of every prompt is the *system prompt*, or the instructions for the LLM. Next, data values are passed in per column. If there are multiple columns, the prompts are constructed in the order specified by our column reordering algorithm. All rows of data are also ordered with our row-sorting algorithm.

Output post-processing. LLM output can be inconsistent and contain rambling answers (even if the model is told not to explicitly in its instruction prompt). Accordingly, we implement our UDF to optionally take in output pattern(s) as arguments, which the UDF searches for in the LLM output. For example, in a sentiment analysis query, we may only want our outputs to be "Positive", "Negative", or "Neutral", so we specify these output targets to the UDF.

Field	Type	Example
asin	identifier	0741304058
reviewText	string	"A favorite cd now..."
verified	boolean	True
overall	double	5.0
summary	string	"Five Stars"
Format	string	"MP3 Music"
description	list of strings	["Great CD for babies...", "...", "..."]

Table 2: Amazon Products Schema

Field	Type	Example
rotten-tomatoes-link	identifier	m/10002114-dark-water
review-type	string	"Fresh"
review-content	string	"Fun, brisk and imaginative"
top-critic	boolean	True
movie-info	string	"In this moody..."

Table 3: Rotten Tomatoes Movies Schema

6.2 Prefix Caching

The current vLLM implementation assumes that all prefixes of a batch of requests can fit in the KV cache, but this does not hold when there is a high diversity prefix size, which is typical for batch analytical workloads. We address this limitation by implementing a novel eviction strategy for the KV cache within vLLM. Our approach is reactive: when a new request is scheduled and there is insufficient GPU memory to accommodate the new requests, the system automatically evicts prefixes based on the first-in, first-out (FIFO) order. If a previously evicted prefix is needed for a future request, it is recomputed and readmitted into the cache. This strategy ensures that the system dynamically adapts to changing workload patterns while managing memory constraints effectively.

7 EVALUATION

In this section, we evaluate the effectiveness of our optimizations within a constructed benchmark suite of queries. We illustrate that:

- (1) LLM output generation time dominates query latency, and optimizations that reduce the number of inputs the LLM receives significantly improve performance.
- (2) Changing the order of inputs we provide to the LLM, both within a single prompt and within a batch of prompts, can noticeably reduce query latency.

7.1 Evaluation Benchmark

Given the lack of standard benchmarks for LLM queries, we construct a benchmark suite to represent real-world data retrieval and processing tasks. We create a range of query types over datasets from various sources to assess the impact of integrating LLMs into relational analytics.

7.1.1 Datasets. We build our benchmark suite on a variety of commonly used datasets for recommendation and natural language processing (NLP) models.

- (1) **Amazon Product Reviews**[14] is a recommendation dataset that contains product reviews and metadata from Amazon. We select the 5-core subset of data from the digital music category, which consists of 64,706 reviews. We show several example fields of interest from this dataset in Table 2. We use 15014 rows of this dataset in our queries.
- (2) **Rotten Tomatoes Movie Reviews**[28] is a recommendation dataset that stores critic review data along with movie metadata from the popular movie review website Rotten Tomatoes. This dataset consists of 1130018 reviews. We show part of the schema with fields of interest in Table 3. We use 15018 rows of this dataset in our queries.
- (3) **Stanford Question Answering Dataset (SQuAD)** is a reading comprehension dataset with more than 100,000 rows and consists of questions posed by crowdworkers on a set of Wikipedia articles. The context to every question is a segment of text, or span, from the corresponding reading passage.

7.1.2 LLM Queries. We incorporate a broad range of query types and use cases in our benchmark suite:

- (1) **Q1: LLM projection.** This query type makes calls to an LLM within a SELECT statement to process information from specified database column(s). It reflects common tasks in data analytics in which the LLM is used for summarization and interpretation based on certain data attributes.
- (2) **Q2: LLM filter.** This query type leverages LLM for filtering data within a WHERE clause. The LLM processes and analyzes information to meet some specified criteria, such as identifying positive reviews. This query type illustrates typical use cases in sentiment analysis and content filtering, which are important for application tasks, such as customer feedback analysis and content moderation.
- (3) **Q3: Multi-LLM invocation.** This query type involves multiple LLM calls in different parts of the query and addresses scenarios in which several layers of data processing or analysis are required. It represents advanced analytical tasks, such as combining different data insights or performing sequential data transformations.
- (4) **Q4: LLM aggregation.** This query type incorporates LLM outputs into further query processing. For example, one such query could use LLMs to assign sentiment scores to individual reviews and then aggregate these scores to calculate an average sentiment for overall customer feedback. This query type is essential for tasks that need to extract insights from complex textual data.
- (5) **Q5: Retrieval-augmented generation (RAG).** This query type leverages external knowledge bases for enhanced LLM processing, enriching LLM queries with a broader context. It simulates use cases where queries need to pull in relevant information from external sources, such as document databases or knowledge graphs, to provide comprehensive answers.

We present examples for each query type below. We run Q1-Q4 on the Amazon Product Reviews and Rotten Tomatoes Movie Reviews datasets, and Q5 on SquAD. We evaluate Q1, Q2, and Q4 on around 15,000 rows of the datasets, and Q3 with around 10,000 rows

of the datasets since this query takes significantly longer to run. For Q5, we evaluate 5,000 questions, where each question retrieved $K=3$ contexts to augment its answer.

- Q1: LLM Projection

```
SELECT LLM("Recommend movies for the user based
↳ on {movie information} and {user review}",
↳ m.movie_info, r.review_content)
FROM reviews r
JOIN movies m ON r.rotten_tomatoes_link ==
↳ m.rotten_tomatoes_link
```

- Q2: LLM Filter

```
SELECT m.movie_title
FROM Movies m
JOIN Reviews r ON r.rotten_tomatoes_link =
↳ m.rotten_tomatoes_link
WHERE
LLM("Analyze whether this movie would be
↳ suitable for kids based on {movie
↳ information} and {user review}",
↳ m.movie_info, r.review_content) ==
↳ "Yes"
AND r.review_type == "Fresh"
```

- Q3: Multi-LLM invocation

```
SELECT
LLM("Recommend movies for the user based on
↳ {movie information} and {user review}",
↳ m.movie_info, r.review_content) AS
↳ recommendations
FROM Movies m
JOIN Reviews r ON r.rotten_tomatoes_link =
↳ m.rotten_tomatoes_link
WHERE
LLM("Analyze whether this movie would be
↳ suitable for kids based on {movie
↳ information} and {user review}",
↳ m.movie_info, r.review_content) == "Yes"
AND r.review_type == "Fresh"
```

- Q4: LLM Average

```
SELECT
AVG(
LLM("Rate a satisfaction score between 0
↳ (bad) and 5 (good) based on {review}
↳ and {info}: ",
r.review_content, m.movie_info)
) as AverageScore
FROM reviews r
JOIN movies m ON r.rotten_tomatoes_link =
↳ m.rotten_tomatoes_link
GROUP BY m.movie_title
```

- Q5: RAG

```
SELECT
LLM("Given the following {context}, answer
↳ this {question}",
VectorDB.similarity_search(s.question),
s.question
)
FROM squad s
WHERE s.is_impossible == False
```

7.1.3 *Evaluation Metrics.* Our key evaluation metric is end-to-end query execution time. Additionally, we analyze the token hit rate (THR), which represents the ratio of prefix tokens that are served from the KV cache. This metric corresponds directly with the query latency speed-up.

7.2 Experimental Setup

We run experiments on a g2-standard-48 GCP instance (48vCPUs, 192GB RAM) with an NVIDIA L4 GPU accelerator hosted in the us-central1 region. For the LLM endpoint, we use Meta’s LLaMA-2 model with 7B parameters [33]. This model is lightweight and inexpensive to host locally, making it well-suited to analytical tasks. We use vLLM [21] as our model serving engine. As vLLM does not currently support prefix eviction and thus cannot handle requests where all prefixes can not fit in memory, we implemented a FIFO eviction policy for prefixes within vLLM. For RAG queries, we use BGE embedding models (BAAI/bge-large-en-v1.5) [37] to embed the context, and use Facebook Similarity Search Library (FAISS) [17] to store these context embeddings into an index.

7.3 End-to-End Benchmark Results

Overview. Figure 3 and Figure 4 shows the end-to-end latency results on our optimization techniques for our full benchmark suite. As baselines, we show the results of not using the KV cache for prefixes (No Cache) and caching without any reordering (Cache (FIFO)). We also measure the impact of caching with our column reordering and row reordering. We denote this as Caching with Prefix Sharing Maximization, or Cache (PSM). We measure Cache (PSM) with and without deduplication and SQL optimization. The result shows that our approach can achieve 4.4× speedup compared to baselines. We discuss each query type’s evaluation in detail below.

Q1: LLM projection. This query type applies the LLM to selected data for a given task. For the Movie dataset, we use the LLM to recommend movies to a user based on their review of a given movie. For the Product dataset, we use the LLM to analyze whether the product quality inferred from a user’s review matches the quality advertised in the product description.

We achieve up to 3.6× speed-up in the Movie dataset and 2.3× speed-up in the Product dataset on projection queries, compared to our no KV cache baseline. The significant speed-ups result from the sharing of large prefixes. Q1 has the longest system prompt out of all our query types: the total length of this prompt is 172 tokens for the Movie dataset and 141 tokens for the Product dataset. As a result, we observe significant savings by avoiding recomputation on these longer prefixes. The No Cache baseline constructs a prompt for each row in the table and thus sends as many prompts to the





Figure 3: End-to-end Result: Our optimizations (Cache (PSM + Dedup + SQL Opt)) achieves 1.76 - 2.68 × on Movie Dataset and 1.64 - 3.18 × speed-up on Product Dataset over Cache with FIFO ordering (Cache(FIFO)).




Figure 4: End-to-end Result: Our optimizations (Cache (PSM)) achieve 1.5× over Cache with FIFO ordering (Cache (FIFO)) on SquAD Dataset.

LLM as there are rows in the table. No computation is saved by the model itself, and as a result this method incurs the highest query runtime for each of our queries.

We analyze the impact of our optimizations in detail on the Movie dataset. Cache (FIFO) provides 1.7× speedup over No Cache since we can now reuse computed tokens for the instruction prompt. Cache (PSM) enables the *movie_info* column to be ordered first and we sort the requests to achieve a further speed-up of 1.7×. Our other techniques (deduplication and SQL optimizations) have minimal impact on this query type. For the former, the *review_content* column contains few duplicates (100 rows), so the latency speed-up is marginal. The latter does not apply to Q1 because this query does not contain a filter clause.

Our optimizations achieve similar improvements on the Product dataset. Cache (FIFO) improves query latency by only 1.1× over the No Cache baseline. This is because the suffix (i.e., differing tokens) dominates in the input prompts. Figure 4 shows the average token length of the *reviewText* and *description* input columns to be 381.54 and 282.56 tokens, respectively. Since the instruction prompt is only 141 tokens long, most of the user prompts must be computed even if the instruction prompt is cached. Cache (PSM) achieves much higher speed-ups by ordering the *description* column first. Since this column contains many longer shared prefixes, we can benefit much more from cached prefixes. Consequently, we achieve a 1.7× speedup over the No Cache baseline and 1.5× speedup over default caching. Similar to the Movie dataset, the deduplication and SQL filter optimizations have less impact on this query type. There is

no filter clause, and the *reviewText* column contains many unique values. Nonetheless, roughly 2,000 rows are deduplicated leading to a further 1.4× speedup over only our caching techniques.

Q2: LLM filter. This query type applies LLM as a filtering tool. In particular, for the Movie dataset, we filter rows based on a standard SQL operator *review_type* (with condition “Fresh”) and an LLM operator (with condition ‘Negative’). For the Product dataset, we use the *verified* column (with the condition “True”) to filter and the same LLM operator to filter for “Negative” sentiment in a review.

We show the benefits of 4.4× speed-up over no caching in both the Movie Product datasets. In the Movie dataset, Cache (FIFO) provides up to 1.7× speed-up over No Cache, since the former saves computation by storing the instruction prompt. Cache (PSM) provides a further speed-up of 1.5×. Since we cache the *movie_info* column alongside the instruction prompt and sort our rows based on this column (which has many duplicates), the requests benefit from prefix sharing. For deduplication, the *review_content* column that is included in this query has few duplicates, so this technique has minimal impact. On the other hand, our SQL optimizations significantly benefit performance (1.8× improvement over just our caching techniques). Since Q2 contains both a non-LLM and an LLM filter, the order of execution between these two clauses impacts query latency. Pushing the non-LLM filter down first results in only 10,461 rows being passed to the LLM after the first filter (*review_type* == “Fresh”) out of the total 15,008 rows in the table.

For the Product dataset, Cache (FIFO) provides a 1.3× speedup over the No Cache baseline. For Cache (PSM), we order *description* as the first column and cache it alongside the instruction prompt to increase the cache hit rate. For deduplication, the *reviewText* column has few duplicates, so this optimization has limited impact. Our SQL optimization enables us to push down the non-LLM filter so that only 8,874 rows out of the 15,000 are passed to the LLM after the first filter (*verified* == True). As a result, we achieve 2.2× improvement over only our caching techniques.

Q3: Multi-LLM invocation. We achieve 3.0× speed-up over on the Movie dataset and 4.1× on the Product dataset on multiple invocation queries over the No Cache baseline. In this query, we combine Q1 and Q2 for each dataset. We first apply the LLM filter before invoking the LLM again for recommending products and movies in the SELECT statement.

On the Movie dataset, Cache (FIFO) provides 1.7 \times improvement over the No Cache baseline. Cache (PSM) provides 1.4 \times improvement over default caching. Our SQL optimization has the biggest impact on latency (1.3 \times speed-up) for this query type: since the non-LLM filter (*review_type* == "Fresh") has a selectivity ratio of 0.7, we significantly reduce the number of LLM invocations. For the Product dataset, Cache (FIFO) and Cache (PSM) provide the same speed-ups as on the Movie dataset. Our SQL optimizations result in a 2.2 \times speed-up over our caching techniques.

Q4: LLM aggregation. We achieve a 3.4 \times speed-up in the Movie dataset and a 2.2 \times speed-up in the Product dataset over the No Cache baseline on aggregation queries using our optimizations. We use the AVG operator to aggregate the average sentiment score on the reviews column with the description column provided as context. For the Movie dataset, we group by *movie_title* and average over the LLM sentiment score output. For the Product dataset, we group by *asin* and average over the LLM sentiment score output. The results of this query type are similar to that of Q1, as the same columns are passed into the LLM with an instruction prompt of similar length. Specifically, the length of the instruction prompt is 166 tokens for the Movie dataset and 112 tokens for the Product dataset.

On the Movie dataset, Cache (FIFO) provides a 1.9 \times speed-up over the No Cache baseline. Cache (PSM) generates an additional 1.8 \times speed-up over default caching since the *movie_info* columns contain many shared values. Like Q1, there is no LLM-filter clause and few duplicates in the *review_content* column. As a result, the query latency with all optimizations is nearly identical to that with just the caching techniques.

For the Product dataset, Cache (FIFO) leads to a 1.4 \times speed-up over the No Cache baseline, and Cache (PSM) brings 1.5 \times speed-up over default caching. Similar to Q1, the *description* column is cached with the instruction prompt. There are marginal deduplication benefits (1.1 \times improvement over our caching techniques) with roughly 2000 rows being deduplicated.

Q5: RAG. We achieve a 1.5 \times speed-up on the SQuAD dataset. In this experiment, we embed all the context into a FAISS index and retrieved 5,000 questions for the question-answering task. For each question, we perform a K-nearest neighbor search on the vector index to fetch the top K relevant context, where we choose K = 3.

The contexts are computed offline into the embedding format to be stored in the vector index. At runtime, each question needs to be embedded to search on the FAISS index, and this is implemented in a batch parallel fashion so it only takes up 0.4% of the end-to-end time. We perform row reordering within both the contexts being fetched for each question, as well as across multiple questions grouping similar contexts. We achieve 1.4 \times speed-up over cache with no reordering and 1.5 \times speed-up over no cache. Unsurprisingly, we find that LLM invocation dominates the overall query latency as opposed to traditional SQL operators (e.g. filters, joins, etc.). Specifically, the SQL operator time consisted of just 0.35% of the No Cache method runtime and 1.4% of the runtime applying all optimizations.

Token Hit Rate. We also measure the token hit rate (%) for Cache (FIFO) and Cache (PSM) for the query types in Figure 3. This metric is calculated as the ratio of tokens that can be served from the

Column Name	ASL	Cardinality	Score
"description"	282.56	144	29460.80
"reviewText"	381.54	12932	442.97
"Format"	8.93	16	8379.69

Table 4: Column statistics for Product table.

Column Name	ASL	Cardinality	Score
"movie_info"	407.27	68	89946.78
"review_content"	131.50	14977	131.86
"review_type"	5.3	2	39797.7

Table 5: Column statistics for Movie table.




Figure 5: Cache Hit Rate Ablation. We illustrate the cache hit rate improvements achieved by Cache (PSM) compared to Cache (FIFO), showing up to a 26% increase on the Product dataset and up to a 38% increase on the Movie dataset.




Figure 6: Column Ordering Ablation. Best Column Order is what our system selects automatically, and Default Column Order is what the original order of the table is. Execution with Best Column Order achieves 1.8 \times speedup and 1.4 \times speedup on end-to-end query latency on Movie and Product Dataset.

KV cache over all tokens in the input prompt. It serves as an indicator of KV cache effectiveness and is directly correlated with latency performance. On the Movie dataset, Cache (PSM) achieves a 21.6–38.0% token hit rate improvement over Cache (FIFO). On the Product dataset, Cache (PSM) achieves a 17.8–26.0% token hit rate improvement over Cache (FIFO).

7.4 Impact of Column Reordering

To measure the effect of column reordering, we evaluate how overall query latency changes under varying column orders on an LLM projection query similar to Q1 but with an additional column added to the LLM context. For this set of experiments, three columns are used to provide input data into the LLM invocations from both the Movie and Product datasets. We cache the first column of our

request if there is sufficient sharing and cache only the instruction prompt otherwise. Fig 5a shows the query latency results for the default column order and the best column order (which we automatically select).

For the Movie dataset, we use the ① *movie_info*, ② *review_type*, and ③ *review_content* columns in the query. The default column order in execution is ③:②:①, whereas the best column order is ①:②:③. The column metadata is shown in Fig 5. Unsurprisingly, caching the *movie_info* column, which is repeated across different reviews of the same movie, produces the largest speed-up of a 2.0× improvement over the worst ordering (*review_content* first). While the *review_type* column has many shared values (there are only two unique values across the entire dataset), the length of each field is one token in length since the value is either “Fresh” or “Rotten”. As a result, the cached prefix is too short to result in prefix caching benefits. In contrast, the *movie_info* column has the longest average token length, resulting in large prefixes that improve performance when they are shared across requests.

For the Product dataset, we choose the ① *description*, ② *format*, and ③ *reviewText* columns. The default column order in execution is ③:②:①, whereas the best column order is ①:②:③. Column metadata is shown in Fig 4. As expected, caching the *description* column, which is repeated across reviews of the same product, produces the largest speed-up of 1.5× improvement over the worst ordering (*reviewText* first). While the *format* column has many shared values across the dataset (with only 17 unique values total), its length is too short, containing values, such as “Audio CD” and “MP3 Music”, that are two to three tokens in length. As a result, we do not see as many prefix caching benefits. The improvement on this dataset is less than on the Movie dataset for two main reasons: (1) the *description* column in the products dataset has fewer duplicates and (2) the *reviewText* column has the longest average length and its suffixes (i.e., distinct data after shared prefixes) represent a larger portion of the input data.

7.5 Impact of Deduplication

We investigate the effects of our deduplication technique in detail. We construct queries based on Q1 while changing the specific LLM column inputs. Specifically, we vary the selection of columns passed into the LLM for analysis based on the cardinality of the column. Prior to LLM invocation, we deduplicate exact input prompt matches and pass only the first occurrence of each distinct prompt into the LLM. Figure 8 shows the results on the Movie and Product datasets.

For the Movie dataset, we pass in the *movie_info* column alongside either the *review_type*, *review_score*, or *review_content* columns. Since the *review_type* column has only two distinct values, the query with this column has a runtime that is 8.2× faster than the baseline with no deduplication. There are also many duplicate values in the *review_score* column (which has only five distinct values), so the query with this column has a runtime that is 3.3× faster than the baseline. In contrast, the *review_content* column contains mostly unique values, with only 99 rows being deduplicated out of 15018. As a result, the differences in runtime for this query with/without deduplication are negligible.




Figure 7: Selectivity Ablation. Different columns are filtered on with resulting rows passed into LLM invocation. The lowest selectivity of the non LLM-filter for each of the Movie and Product tables (0.13 and 0.14 respectively) yields 6.7× and 5.3× faster query runtimes than filtering with the LLM first.




Figure 8: Deduplication Ablation. Exact prompt matches are deduplicated before going into the LLM. For the lowest cardinality column on each of the Movie (*review_type*: 2) and Product tables (*title*: 144), deduplicating inputs leads to 8.2× and 1.9× faster query execution, respectively.

For the Product dataset, we evaluate three pairs of columns: (*title*, *overall*), (*summary*, *description*), and (*reviewText*, *description*). The *overall* column, which captures the review score, has only five distinct values, so the query with this column has a 1.9× faster runtime than the no deduplication baseline. On the other hand, the *summary* and *reviewText* columns do not contain many duplicate values as mostly unique to each user. As a result, deduplication achieves only 1.1× speedup for each.

7.6 Impact of SQL Optimizations

Finally, we investigate the effects of our SQL optimizations. Specifically, we evaluate the latency impact of varying the order in which filter clauses for LLM queries are applied. We construct queries identical in structure to Q2 and vary the column(s) to filter on (alongside the LLM predicate). A naively written query could execute the LLM predicate first on the entire table before applying the non-LLM filters to the resulting set of data. We measure overall query runtime for two scenarios: (1) the LLM filter is executed first and (2) the non-LLM filters are executed first. We choose columns to filter on alongside the LLM based on their *selectivity ratio*, measured as the ratio of LLM input size to the table size. Fig 7 shows query latency as a factor of selectivity ratio.

For the Movie dataset, we choose the columns *review_type* and *top_critic* to filter on. We construct queries filtering with each possible value in *review_type* (“Fresh”, “Rotten”) and “top_critic” (True, False) as well as a combination of those values (*review_type* = Fresh & top_critic = True). We find that, as expected, query latency decreases as selectivity decreases since fewer inputs are being passed into the LLM. At the lowest selectivity level in this experiment (0.13), applying this filter order optimization yields a 6.7× faster overall runtime compared to that from executing the LLM filter first.

For the Product dataset, we choose the columns *verified* and *overall*. We construct query filtering with each possible value in *verified* (True, False) and “overall” (1.0 ... 5.0) as well as a combination of those values (*verified* = True & overall = 5.0). Similar to the Movie dataset, query latency decreases with less inputs being passed in at a lower selectivity. At the lowest selectivity level in this experiment of 0.14, applying this filter order optimization yields a 5.3x faster runtime overall over executing the LLM filter first.

8 DISCUSSION

Our techniques for optimizing LLM queries have been pragmatically motivated: we consider straightforward optimizations that apply broadly to most LLM inference systems and relational databases. In this section, we outline future directions of research to further enhance LLM inference in relational analytics. Our discussion is organized into three subsections: distributed cache and request routing, cost estimation for LLM invocations, and semantic deduplication. These directions are critical to improving the scalability of database systems with LLM invocations.

8.1 Column Reordering and Row Sorting

Our column reordering and row sorting algorithms leverage straightforward, practical heuristics to efficiently identify shared prefixes. We can further extend these algorithms in future work by adopting a finer-grained approach. For instance, instead of maintaining a fixed order of columns for all rows in a table, we can consider different column orderings for subsets of rows to potentially enable higher token hit rates.

To do so, one potential strategy would be to iteratively determine column orders for each group of rows that share a value in a designated “pivot” column. Once an order is established for a group, we can exclude these rows from subsequent iterations, thereby reducing the complexity and focusing on determining the orders of the remaining rows. This recursive approach would allow us to progressively refine the column order to enhance the cache hit rate without giving up computational efficiency. Moreover, we plan to introduce a pruning mechanism for columns that consistently show negligible impact for prefix sharing. By excluding these columns from the reordering process, we can further reduce the computational overhead of this technique.

8.2 Prefix Caching: Opportunities

8.2.1 Decode Length Knowledge. While our work focuses on memory management for input prompts, output decoding also has a significant impact on performance. In particular, there are potential performance benefits with guided decoding in the analytics

setting. Guided decoding, also known as structured generation or controlled generation, is a popular method to deterministically enforce a schema on the output of LLM [9, 25, 31, 35, 40]. Since guided decoding involves computing a large intermediate state, it does not typically employ batching, hurting GPU utilization. In the relational analytics scenario, we can utilize our knowledge of the output schema and decoding length to construct the output constraint ahead of time. In many cases, we can skip tokens that are known a priori and perform batching to improve utilization.

8.2.2 Batch-Aware Reordering. While the column reordering and row sorting techniques we present can significantly improve the cache hit rate, they do not account for how requests in a batch are processed in parallel during LLM inference in some systems. Some inference systems [16] currently do not support prefix sharing within the same batch due to simultaneous computation. For instance, consider a sequence of requests [1, 1, 1][2, 2, 2][3, 3, 3]. None of these prefixes benefit from being cached because each distinct prefix (1, 2, 3) is computed multiple times within the same batch. As a result, there are six cache misses on this workload. However, if we instead reorder these requests according to the sequence [1, 2, 3][1, 2, 3][1, 2, 3], we observe benefits from using the prefix cache—1, 2, 3 are computed and cached after the first batch, allowing them to be reused in subsequent batches. Thus, there are only three cache misses on this series of requests.

To address this, we propose a batch-aware reordering strategy that optimizes prefix utilization by aligning the request order with batch execution phases. This approach requires a warm-up phase for the cache, wherein we pre-load the cache with diverse prefixes expected to be reused in subsequent batches. Our algorithm first sorts all possible prefixes by their frequency of occurrence then arranges them across batches to ensure that each batch contains a set of distinct prefixes. This method allows us to leverage the cache more effectively: once a batch is processed, any subsequent requests can reuse the cached prefixes, significantly reducing cache misses.

8.3 Distributed Cache and Request Routing

On large-scale datasets, we need to distribute the inference workload over many machines to enable queries to be completed in a reasonable amount of time. However, distributed KV caching is challenging; we need to ensure that requests with similar or identical prefixes are directed to the same machine. RAG queries bring additional complexities: since the KV cache must store not only LLM prefixes but also embeddings and associated retrieved contents, which may be distributed across nodes. As such, balancing load over different machines with varying cache contents will be a critical objective.

8.4 Semantic Deduplication

We can extend our exact deduplication technique to filter out more data by implementing rule-based methods. Specifically, we can leverage NLP pre-processing techniques that remove case sensitivity (e.g. ‘Apple’ and ‘apple’) and noise (e.g. ‘<Apple>’ and ‘Apple’) as well as apply stemming and lemmatization (e.g. ‘running’, ‘ran’, ‘runs’), spelling correction (e.g. ‘mitake’ vs. ‘mistake’), and stop

word removal (e.g. remove ‘a’, ‘the’, etc.). These could be implemented as hard constraints (optionally specified by the user) to reduce the number of LLM invocations without impacting query accuracy since the equivalence of text is specified via the given rules.

We can deduplicate even more aggressively by identifying semantically similar rows. For example, "I like this restaurant" and "I love this place" have the same semantic meaning and will likely produce identical output under an LLM sentiment analysis task. As such, sending only one of these inputs to LLM for processing should be sufficient for most purposes. One possible direction is to evaluate token similarity within the LLM to identify semantically equivalent requests. We are also looking forward to bringing in methods in training dataset de-duplication such as SemDeDup [7] for production workload processing.

9 RELATED WORK

Our optimizations build on recent work in LLM inference as well as a long tradition of integrating machine learning and data management. We describe several major related areas below.

Model pipeline tools. LLM toolkits, which have grown rapidly in popularity, provide users with the ability to stitch model pipelines together from basic abstractions. Among these, LangChain [10] and LlamaIndex [23] have seen the most usage. LangChain’s framework allows for convenient abstractions for different parts of the LLM serving stack and also enables users to “batch” multiple requests into a model. However, this is accomplished through basic thread parallelism and without any model optimizations applied to handle the series of queries found in a typical analytics workload.

Inference-optimized systems. There has been a recent rise of dedicated systems for LLM inference, including FasterTransformer [26], Orca [39], vLLM [21], and FlexGen [32]. Our work builds upon prior work investigating high throughput LLM inference and continuous batching for model serving. However, past systems focus on the online setting and make no assumptions about what requests will be sent to the LLM. In contrast, we leverage full workload information from batch queries to significantly improve performance for these workloads.

Optimized shared prefix kernels. Since prefix sharing is a simple yet highly effective optimization, there has been recent work on developing memory-efficient GPU kernels that perform inference while leveraging shared prefixes. SGLang’s RadixAttention [40], Hydragen [18], and Cascade Inference [38] all implement optimized kernels. Our work heavily leverages these kernels to enable prefix sharing while delivering higher throughput as compared to traditional attention kernels [13].

Machine learning in databases. There is extensive work on integrating machine learning models with databases [19, 20, 24]. MADLib [15] is one example of many works that have focused on designing systems to train complex models on large datasets. Recent works such as Velox explore online serving using data management systems [12], and Ralf optimizes machine learning feature maintenance in data pipeline [36]. However, these past works did not specifically address large language models, which have extremely high computational costs and unique architectural properties, such

as the KV cache. As such, LLMs offer many new optimization opportunities in the context of relational queries. Other works, like NoScope [20], Blazelt [19], and Probabilistic Predicates [24], propose approximating expensive ML model calls with less expensive models for approximate query processing, but this can reduce query accuracy, and these works do not take advantage of the unique characteristics of KV cache reuse in LLM inference.

10 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we introduce a range of techniques to optimize LLM invocations in relational workloads. We first observe that the LLM computation is the dominant cost factor in LLM-enabled SQL workload. Each byte processed by LLMs is multiple orders of magnitude more expensive than bytes processed with traditional SQL operators. By leveraging workload information in relational analytics, coupled with observations about the LLM inference process, we can significantly improve end-to-end query performance and reduce costs without affecting query semantics. Our caching, deduplication, and SQL optimization techniques enhance prefix sharing of the LLM KV cache and reduce the number of LLM invocations needed. We observe up to 4.4× decreases in end-to-end query latency. In optimizing for LLM queries, we fill a void in existing inference systems, which only target the online setting. Our results suggest that there is a wide design space to further enhance LLM inference in the relational analytics setting to greatly improve performance.

REFERENCES

- [1] [n.d.]. <https://docs.databricks.com/en/large-language-models/how-to-ai-query.html>.
- [2] [n.d.]. AI Functions on Databricks – docs.databricks.com. <https://docs.databricks.com/en/large-language-models/ai-functions.html>. [Accessed 01-03-2024].
- [3] [n.d.]. How fast is DuckDB really? | Blog | Fivetran – fivetran.com. <https://www.fivetran.com/blog/how-fast-is-duckdb-really>. [Accessed 01-03-2024].
- [4] [n.d.]. Large Language Models for sentiment analysis with Amazon Redshift ML (Preview) | Amazon Web Services – aws.amazon.com. <https://aws.amazon.com/blogs/big-data/large-language-models-for-sentiment-analysis-with-amazon-redshift-ml-preview/>. [Accessed 01-03-2024].
- [5] [n.d.]. LLM with Vertex AI only using SQL queries in BigQuery | Google Cloud Blog – cloud.google.com. <https://cloud.google.com/blog/products/ai-machine-learning/llm-with-vertex-ai-only-using-sql-queries-in-bigquery>. [Accessed 01-03-2024].
- [6] [n.d.]. PySpark. <https://www.databricks.com/glossary/pyspark>.
- [7] Amro Abbas, Kushal Tirumala, Dániel Simig, Surya Ganguli, and Ari S. Morcos. 2023. SemDeDup: Data-efficient learning at web-scale through semantic deduplication. arXiv:2303.09540 [cs.LG]
- [8] Michael Armbrust, Reynold S. Xin, Cheng Lian, Yin Huai, Davies Liu, Joseph K. Bradley, Xiangrui Meng, Tomer Kaftan, Michael J. Franklin, Ali Ghodsi, and Matei Zaharia. 2015. Spark SQL: Relational Data Processing in Spark. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data* (Melbourne, Victoria, Australia) (SIGMOD ’15). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1383–1394. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2723372.2742797>
- [9] Luca Beurer-Kellner, Marc Fischer, and Martin Vechev. 2023. Prompting Is Programming: A Query Language for Large Language Models. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 7, PLDI (June 2023), 1946–1969. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3591300>
- [10] Harrison Chase. 2022. *LangChain*. <https://github.com/langchain-ai/langchain>
- [11] Ludmila Cherkasova and Gianfranco Ciardo. 2001. Role of Aging, Frequency, and Size in Web Cache Replacement Policies. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on High-Performance Computing and Networking (HPCN Europe 2001)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 114–123.
- [12] Daniel Crankshaw, Peter Bailis, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Haoyuan Li, Zhao Zhang, Michael J. Franklin, Ali Ghodsi, and Michael I. Jordan. 2014. The Missing Piece in Complex Analytics: Low Latency, Scalable Model Management and Serving with Velox. arXiv:1409.3809 [cs.DB]
- [13] Tri Dao, Daniel Y. Fu, Stefano Ermon, Atri Rudra, and Christopher Ré. 2022. FlashAttention: Fast and Memory-Efficient Exact Attention with IO-Awareness.

- arXiv:2205.14135 [cs.LG]
- [14] Ruining He and Julian McAuley. 2016. Ups and Downs: Modeling the Visual Evolution of Fashion Trends with One-Class Collaborative Filtering. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on World Wide Web (Montréal, Québec, Canada) (WWW '16)*. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee, Republic and Canton of Geneva, CHE, 507–517. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2872427.2883037>
- [15] Joe Hellerstein, Christopher Ré, Florian Schoppmann, Daisy Zhe Wang, Eugene Fratkin, Aleksander Gorajek, Kee Siong Ng, Caleb Welton, Xixuan Feng, Kun Li, and Arun Kumar. 2012. The MADlib Analytics Library or MAD Skills, the SQL. arXiv:1208.4165 [cs.DB]
- [16] Huggingface. 2023. *Text Generation Inference*. <https://huggingface.co/docs/text-generation-inference/en/index>
- [17] Jeff Johnson, Matthijs Douze, and Hervé Jégou. 2019. Billion-scale similarity search with GPUs. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data* 7, 3 (2019), 535–547.
- [18] Jordan Juravsky, Bradley Brown, Ryan Ehrlich, Daniel Y. Fu, Christopher Ré, and Azalia Mirhoseini. 2024. Hydragen: High-Throughput LLM Inference with Shared Prefixes. arXiv:2402.05099 [cs.LG]
- [19] Daniel Kang, Peter Bailis, and Matei Zaharia. 2019. BlazeIt: optimizing declarative aggregation and limit queries for neural network-based video analytics. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 13, 4 (dec 2019), 533–546.
- [20] Daniel Kang, John Emmons, Firas Abuzaid, Peter Bailis, and Matei Zaharia. 2017. NoScope: optimizing neural network queries over video at scale. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 10, 11 (aug 2017), 1586–1597.
- [21] Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. 2023. Efficient Memory Management for Large Language Model Serving with PagedAttention. In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (conf-loc>, <city>Koblenz</city>, <country>Germany</country>, </conf-loc>)* (SOSP '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 611–626. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3600006.3613165>
- [22] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. 2021. Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks. arXiv:2005.11401 [cs.CL]
- [23] Jerry Liu. 2022. *LlamaIndex*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1234>
- [24] Yao Lu, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Srikanth Kandula, and Surajit Chaudhuri. 2018. Accelerating Machine Learning Inference with Probabilistic Predicates. In *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Management of Data (Houston, TX, USA) (SIGMOD '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1493–1508.
- [25] Microsoft. 2023. *Guidance*. <https://github.com/guidance-ai/guidance>
- [26] NVIDIA. 2023. *Faster Transformer*. <https://github.com/NVIDIA/FasterTransformer>
- [27] NVIDIA. 2023. *TensorRT LLM*. <https://github.com/NVIDIA/TensorRT-LLM>
- [28] Bo Pang and Lillian Lee. 2005. Seeing stars: Exploiting class relationships for sentiment categorization with respect to rating scales. In *Proceedings of the ACL*.
- [29] Mark Raasveldt and Hannes Mühleisen. 2019. DuckDB: an Embeddable Analytical Database. In *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Management of Data (Amsterdam, Netherlands) (SIGMOD '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1981–1984. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3299869.3320212>
- [30] Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. SQuAD: 100,000+ Questions for Machine Comprehension of Text. arXiv:1606.05250 [cs.CL]
- [31] Microsoft Research. 2023. *Artificial Intelligence Controller Interface (AICI)*. <https://github.com/microsoft/aici>
- [32] Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Binhang Yuan, Zhuohan Li, Max Ryabinin, Daniel Y. Fu, Zhiqiang Xie, Beidi Chen, Clark Barrett, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Percy Liang, Christopher Ré, Ion Stoica, and Ce Zhang. 2023. FlexGen: High-Throughput Generative Inference of Large Language Models with a Single GPU. arXiv:2303.06865 [cs.LG]
- [33] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models. arXiv:2307.09288 [cs.CL]
- [34] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2023. Attention Is All You Need. arXiv:1706.03762 [cs.CL]
- [35] Brandon T. Willard and Rémi Louf. 2023. Efficient Guided Generation for Large Language Models. arXiv:2307.09702 [cs.CL]
- [36] Sarah Wooders, Xiangxi Mo, Amit Narang, Kevin Lin, Ion Stoica, Joseph M. Hellerstein, Natacha Crooks, and Joseph E. Gonzalez. 2023. RALF: Accuracy-Aware Scheduling for Feature Store Maintenance. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 17, 3 (nov 2023), 563–576. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3632093.3632116>
- [37] Shitao Xiao, Zheng Liu, Peitian Zhang, and Niklas Muennighoff. 2023. C-Pack: Packaged Resources To Advance General Chinese Embedding. arXiv:2309.07597 [cs.CL]
- [38] Zihao Ye, Ruihang Lai, Bo-Ru Lu, Chien-Yu Lin, Size Zheng, Lequn Chen, Tianqi Chen, and Luis Ceze. 2024. Cascade Inference: Memory Bandwidth Efficient Shared Prefix Batch Decoding. <https://flashinfer.ai/2024/02/02/cascade-inference.html>
- [39] Gyeong-In Yu, Joo Seong Jeong, Geon-Woo Kim, Soojeong Kim, and Byung-Gon Chun. 2022. Orca: A Distributed Serving System for Transformer-Based Generative Models. In *16th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 22)*. USENIX Association, Carlsbad, CA, 521–538. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi22/presentation/yyu>
- [40] Lianmin Zheng, Liangsheng Yin, Zhiqiang Xie, Jeff Huang, Chuyue Sun, Cody Hao Yu, Shiyi Cao, Christos Kozyrakis, Ion Stoica, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Clark Barrett, and Ying Sheng. 2023. Efficiently Programming Large Language Models using SGLang. arXiv:2312.07104 [cs.AI]
- [41] Vilém Zouhar, Clara Meister, Juan Luis Gastaldi, Li Du, Tim Vieira, Mrinmaya Sachan, and Ryan Cotterell. 2023. A Formal Perspective on Byte-Pair Encoding. arXiv:2306.16837 [cs.CL]