

LearnedKV: Integrating LSM and Learned Index for Superior Performance on SSD

Wenlong Wang
University of Minnesota

David Hung-Chang Du
University of Minnesota

Abstract

In this paper, we introduce LearnedKV, a novel tiered key-value (KV) store that seamlessly integrates a Log-Structured Merge (LSM) tree with a Learned Index. This integration yields superior read and write performance compared to standalone indexing structures on SSDs. Our design capitalizes on the LSM tree's high write/update throughput and the Learned Index's fast read capabilities, enabling each component to leverage its strengths. We analyze the impact of size on LSM tree performance and demonstrate how the tiered Learned Index significantly mitigates the LSM tree's size-related performance degradation, particularly by reducing the intensive I/O operations resulting from re-insertions after Garbage Collection (GC). To maintain rapid read performance for newly inserted keys, we introduce a non-blocking conversion mechanism that efficiently transforms the existing LSM tree into a new Learned Index with minimal overhead during GC. Our experimental results, conducted across diverse workloads, show that LearnedKV outperforms state-of-the-art solutions by up to 1.32x in read requests and 1.31x in write performance.

1 Introduction

In the era of big data, unstructured data, which lacks a predefined data model or structure, is projected to constitute over 80% of all data collected globally by 2025 [14]. This type of data, including texts, photos, and videos, continues to expand at an extraordinary annual rate of 55-65%. Relational databases struggle to efficiently handle the variability and complexity inherent in unstructured data, necessitating the exploration of alternative solutions. One such solution is the Key-Value (KV) store [8, 9, 12, 16, 18, 34, 38, 39], a data storage paradigm specifically designed for storing, retrieving, and managing data in pairs of keys and values, analogous to a dictionary. In a KV store, each entry consists of a unique identifier (the key) and its associated data (the value). This structure enables KV stores to be highly flexible, accommodating a wide variety of data types and formats without the

need for a rigid schema.

Most commonly used operations within a KV store include point searches, which retrieve specific values using unique keys; range searches, which fetch all key-value pairs within a specified key range; and write/update operations, which insert new key-value pairs or modify existing ones. This versatility makes KV stores ideal for various applications, such as caching, session storage, and large-scale data processing. Leading technology companies have adopted KV stores to enhance their data management capabilities, with notable implementations including LevelDB by Google, DynamoDB by Amazon, and RocksDB by Meta. These systems leverage different methods to exemplify the efficiency and scalability of KV stores in managing the growing volumes of unstructured data, thereby optimizing storage usage and improving access speeds.

Later, once introduced by Kraska et al. [24], the Learned Index has profoundly reshaped perspectives on indexing system design. The essence of this novel index structure is to "learn" the distribution of the key of data in a key range and employ mathematical techniques to create one or multiple models representing data locations. Unlike traditional index structures, such as B+-Tree, which explicitly traverses the tree based on the key to identify the data location, the Learned Index aims to "predict" data locations with a certain tolerable key range by plugging the key into the models. Since the prediction is not always accurate, a subsequent local search will then be performed in the neighborhood of the predicted location. By eliminating explicit mappings, the Learned Index significantly reduces internal pointer tracing and saves index space compared with the B+-Tree-based structures, thereby substantially enhancing read performance.

However, during its developmental roadmap, the Learned Index has faced several challenges, notably in write operation support. The fundamental nature of the Learned Index involves multiple mathematical models that are learned based on the distribution of the keys. Write operations tend to invalidate or weaken these models due to shifts in key distribution. Although some researchers have developed "updatable"

Learned Indexes [17, 35], which employ various methods to mitigate the impact of write operations, they still do not compete effectively with other indexes designed for larger-than-memory systems [25].

In the early stage of this technique, most researchers positioned the Learned Index as an in-memory index [17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 27, 33, 35]. They stored all index and leaf nodes, which contain key-value pairs, in DRAM without persistence support. This design proved robust as it could surpass most traditional in-memory indexes and could provide persistence through additional techniques such as replication across multiple servers and Write-Ahead Logging (WAL) on SSD.

However, with the increasing volume of data that needs to be maintained, DRAM is no longer sufficient to host the entire index. Moreover, in many modern DBMSs, the main memory is utilized for high-performance data processing and computing, which competes for limited resources [25]. Consequently, it is both crucial and promising to explore the adaptation of the Learned Index to modern fast storage solutions like SSDs.

Discussing the index structures in SSDs, the Log-Structured Merge-Tree (LSM-Tree) [31] and its variants represent essential topics that cannot be overlooked. Originally proposed by O’Neil et al., the LSM-Tree demonstrated significant potential for adaptation to persistent key-value stores due to its efficient management of small random writes, converting them into large sequential writes. Subsequent research over decades has led to the design of numerous LSM-Tree variants, tailored for integration into modern, large-scale key-value (KV) stores [2, 3, 11, 21, 22, 26, 34, 36]. Notably, instances such as RocksDB [3] at Meta and LevelDB [2] at Google continue to receive maintenance in industrial settings and are subjects of extensive study within the research community. Consequently, exploring the LSM-Tree concept to enhance the Learned Index on SSDs presents a promising avenue for supporting data persistence while efficiently handling both read and write requests.

While recent studies have explored combinations of the LSM and the Learned Index [6, 13, 29], all have predominantly utilized the Learned Index as a supplementary backup indexing path alongside traditional methods. These studies restrict the application of the Learned Index to narrow scopes such as an SST file, overlooking its inherent potential to replace traditional indexing mechanisms entirely. Consequently, these approaches have not fully harnessed the combined strengths of both indexing systems.

In this paper, we analyze the advantages and disadvantages of the LSM and the Learned Index. The LSM excels in handling write operations but suffers from increasing read and write amplification as the volume of indexed data grows. Conversely, the Learned Index offers superior read performance and minimal space usage but struggles with efficient updates on SSD and necessitates a sorted data array prior to training. The LSM is better suited for data modifications, whereas the Learned Index thrives with static data sets. To fully capitalize

on the strengths of both the LSM and the Learned Index, we propose treating them not just as individual indexes but as complementary systems. Specifically, they can concurrently index different segments of the same key-value (KV) store. This approach allows the LSM to maintain high insert/update throughput, while the lightweight Learned Index enhances the speed of read operations.

The optimal scenario entails that the data (key-value pairs) indexed by the Learned Index remains unmodified but is frequently accessed for reads, while all insertions or updates occur within the data indexed by the LSM. However, predicting data modifications at the time of index construction is impractical. To address this challenge, we propose a mechanism to facilitate data migration between the two indexes. This approach allows each index to function optimally within its strength—fast read from the Learned Index and robust updates mechanism from the LSM—enhancing overall system efficiency and responsiveness.

What is the mechanism? In many practical applications, a key-value (KV) store is tasked with managing small-sized keys linked to significantly larger-sized values. The size of these values can range from 100B to over 10KB [7, 8, 10, 15, 30]. To mitigate the high write amplification associated with frequent compaction of these large values, a technique known as "KV Separation" is commonly employed. This method segregates keys and values, addressing the disparity in access frequency of the small-sized keys and large-sized values. In such scenarios, only the keys undergo compaction. Therefore, a Garbage Collection (GC) process to reclaim space from outdated or deleted key-value pairs in the Value Log—where pairs are appended—is crucial for optimizing storage utilization and system performance. The essence of a GC process involves aggregating all valid key-value pairs in the value log, transferring them to a new log, and reclaiming the space from the previous log.

During the garbage collection (GC) process, we find that sorting the key index in memory incurs a negligible cost, allowing the valid key-value pairs to be appended to the new log in key order. Additionally, we refrain from modifying existing elements in the log during regular read or write requests, aligning well with the conditions favorable for constructing a Learned Index to enhance performance. Consequently, during the GC process, converting the LSM to a Learned Index is both feasible and cost-effective. This conversion can significantly accelerate future read operations with minimal impact on overall system performance.

In this paper, we introduce LearnedKV, an efficient tiered key-value (KV) store architecture that integrates the LSM and Learned Index to achieve high performance for both read and write operations on SSDs. We contend that, through thoughtful design, this tiered combination can leverage the high update throughput of the LSM along with the superior read throughput of the Learned Index. Both indexes can coexist in a complementary way such that their advantages are fully

explored.

In summary, we categorize our contributions as follows:

- We analyzed the garbage collection (GC) process in state-of-the-art KV separation designs and identified that the valid key-value pairs, which are appended to the new log, provide an ideal dataset for constructing a Learned Index. These datasets, already sorted before appending and not subjected to further updates or insertions, perfectly mitigate the inherent disadvantages of the Learned Index on SSD.
- We introduced LearnedKV, a tiered KV store that employs both the Learned Index and the LSM on-storage. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to utilize the Learned Index as a tiered index in conjunction with the LSM. Unlike previous approaches that directed the Learned Index to an SST file within the LSM, our method allows the Learned Index to directly point to key-value pairs. This tiered architecture not only reduces the size of the LSM and utilizes the Learned Index to enhance read speeds but also avoid the intensive I/O typically associated with LSM re-insertion post-GC.
- We developed a non-blocking GC and conversion process that supports ongoing user requests even during GC. Simultaneously, this process facilitates the construction of the Learned Index based on valid key-value pairs. This non-blocking approach minimizes the performance degradation typically induced by GC operations.
- We conducted evaluations of our design alongside state-of-the-art works in KV stores across various workloads. The results demonstrate that LearnedKV achieves up to 32% higher read throughput and 31% higher write throughput compared to existing solutions.

2 Background

In this section, we first present the Log-Structured Merge-Tree (LSM-Tree) structure and one of its derivations, the RocksDB. We then discuss the concept of KV separation, which is integral to our design. Following this, we provide an overview of both in-memory and on-storage learned indexes, outlining their respective advantages and limitations.

2.1 LSM and RocksDB

The Log-Structured Merge-Tree (LSM-Tree) [31], introduced in 1996, has become a popular and widely adopted structure for persistent key-value storage. Originally designed to enhance high-throughput systems such as transaction systems, which often receive data in a log-like structure and predominantly perform write operations, the LSM-Tree offers distinct advantages over the B-tree structure. Specifically, the

LSM-Tree efficiently transforms many small random writes into large, sequential updates. This capability is particularly beneficial for achieving higher write throughput on modern persistent storage mediums like Solid-State Drives (SSDs), which are better optimized for sequential rather than random writes.

Numerous researchers have investigated methods to support large-scale key-value stores using the LSM structure [2, 3, 11, 21, 22, 26, 36]. A notable example, RocksDB [3], was developed by Meta as an extension of LevelDB [2]. LevelDB itself is extensively utilized across various modern applications, but RocksDB enhances it further, optimizing for fast storage media such as SSDs and write-intensive workloads. Additionally, RocksDB offers a range of tunable features and configurations, enabling users to tailor systems to meet diverse requirements.




Figure 1: RocksDB architecture

As shown in Figure 1, RocksDB comprises three main components: in-memory Memtables, on-storage Write-Ahead Logs (WAL), and SST files on storage. New writes are first stored in a mutable Memtable with all its key-value pairs sorted, which, upon becoming full, is transformed into an immutable Memtable before being flushed to the storage as an SST file. The Write-Ahead Log (WAL) serves as a safeguard against data loss due to system crashes or power failures, recording new writes simultaneously with their entry into the Memtable. Once the Memtable is flushed to storage, the corresponding entries in the WAL can be discarded and a new WAL is created for subsequent writes.

SST files on storage are structured into several levels (L_0, L_1, \dots, L_n), with the size of each level increasing by a typical factor of 10. The higher levels (i.e. L_0 and L_1 in an LSM tree) are smaller, whereas the lower levels (i.e. $L_n - 1$ and L_n) are larger. When an immutable Memtable is flushed, it first enters level L_0 . A background process known as compaction periodically merges SST files from higher levels into lower levels, during which redundant or outdated key-value pairs are eliminated, retaining only the latest versions.

To fulfill read requests, RocksDB sequentially searches the

in-memory Memtable (both the active mutable and the list of immutable ones) and the SST files across all levels. In L_0 , where SST files may overlap in key ranges, each file might need to be searched. In contrast, in higher levels, where key ranges do not overlap, at most one SST file will contain the targeted key. RocksDB utilizes an index to locate this file efficiently. To minimize the overhead of unnecessary reads, techniques such as Bloom Filters are employed. By using a small amount of space and accepting a certain false positive rate, Bloom Filters significantly reduce the likelihood of accessing SST files that do not contain the desired key.

2.2 KV Separation

For many realistic workloads, the KV store needs to serve the small-sized key together with its large-sized value varying from 100B to even larger than 10KB [7, 8, 10, 15, 30]. To eliminate the heavy I/O overhead from the compaction process with large-sized value, a technique called "KV separation" was studied by recent researchers [28, 30, 32]. The strategy is to isolate the keys and values, particularly when there is a significant size difference between them and keys are accessed more frequently than values. By storing them separately, the LSM compaction process only involves keys and pointers to the stored key-value pairs, significantly reducing write amplification. Furthermore, by decreasing the size of each element within the LSM, overall storage usage is optimized.

Among the various designs, WiscKey [30] pioneered the concept of KV separation, wherein it stores large-sized values in an append-only log while placing keys and their location into the LSM. This approach notably reduces write amplification and incorporates a mechanism known as Garbage Collection (GC) to periodically reclaim outdated key-value pairs from the tail of the value log. Subsequent studies, such as HashKV [28] and FenceKV [32], highlighted that verifying the validity of key-value pairs can lead to significant read amplification due to the need to query the LSM. To address this, these studies introduced the partitioning of the key space into multiple logs, either based on the key's hash value (in HashKV) or the key range (in FenceKV). During each GC cycle, only one partitioned value log is reclaimed. As key-value pairs are consistently appended at the end of the log, newer versions of a key will naturally reside closer to the end, allowing them to efficiently reclaim invalid entries by scanning the log.

The Garbage Collection (GC) process is a critical operation in KV separation systems, tasked with cleaning up outdated versions of key-value pairs. Over time, accumulations of insertions and updates can overwhelm the storage capacity, occupying unnecessary space. These outdated or deleted data entries can reduce the actual available space and cause page fragmentation. Such fragmentation can compel systems to read more fragmented pages, consequently increasing the overall system I/O and impacting performance negatively.

2.3 In-memory Learned Index

Since its introduction in 2017 [24], the Learned Index has captured significant attention within the research community. Numerous researchers have recognized the potential of this innovative approach, exploring its application across various settings. Initially, much of the focus was on deploying the Learned Index in main memory environments [17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 27, 33, 35]. This body of work highlights the versatility and adaptability of the Learned Index, underscoring its potential to revolutionize traditional indexing techniques.

Unlike traditional index structures such as B+-Trees, the Learned Index utilizes a machine-learning method to "learn" the key distribution of the dataset. This approach involves taking a dataset sorted by keys and using keys as inputs to predict their locations. Various methods, such as Linear Regression and Neural Networks, are employed to train a model that can predict the location of a given key within the dataset. This model replaces the explicit key-to-location mapping with a more lightweight, approximate mapping, thus reducing space consumption and query costs. Ideally, if the model could perfectly fit the dataset's distribution, it would precisely locate each key's position. However, building such a perfect model is typically unfeasible in real-world scenarios due to the complexity of actual key distributions, which often exceed the capabilities of lightweight models. Consequently, the model's accuracy is not guaranteed, and a local search is usually conducted around the predicted location. To manage the search distance in worst-case scenarios, some indexes [19, 23, 24] implement an "error bound" parameter. This parameter limits the difference between the predicted and actual locations of each key during index construction, ensuring that the maximum local search distance during queries remains within the error bound. Also, when the data distribution is difficult to represent by a single model, researchers have developed the idea of hierarchically placing multiple levels of models, such as the design in [24]. Each model partitions the entire key range by linking to multiple child models, each representing a sub-key range, and distributes queries to the appropriate sub-key ranges. In this case, each model does not have to be complicated even in a highly-skewed dataset and a simple model can imply a smaller error bound and more efficiency in querying. In all, studies show that the Learned Index can improve read performance by a factor of 1.8x - 3.2x in various real workloads compared to many traditional indexes [24].

2.4 On-storage Learned Index with LSM and its Limitation

As data volumes continue to expand in real-world applications, maintaining the entire index in memory becomes increasingly challenging due to DRAM size limitations and resource contention. Consequently, adapting the concept of the Learned Index to modern fast storage solutions, such as

SSDs, represents a crucial and promising direction. While prior studies have explored adaptations of in-memory Learned Indexes for SSD storage, demonstrating potential advantages in specific workloads, these adaptations have not yet consistently outperformed traditional B+-tree indexes on SSDs in terms of overall performance [25]. This gap in performance underscores the need for further research and innovation in this area.

Some recent research has shifted focus towards designing better-adapted Learned Indexes for SSD environments to support large-scale KV stores. A key area of exploration is the potential integration of the Learned Index with the Log-Structured Merge-Tree (LSM) on SSD [31], which is recognized for its high-performance indexing capabilities in large-scale KV stores. Notable efforts include Bourbon [13], which employs piecewise linear regression models to avoid traditional index block lookups in SST files. Google’s approach [6] involves a novel data placement strategy, positioning keys within the block predicted by the model. Additionally, TridentKV [29] introduces an adaptive training method for file indexing that adjusts based on workload characteristics, aiming to optimize performance.




Figure 2: Bourbon lookup process

However, the studies mentioned above primarily focus on using the Learned Index to replace or bypass the index blocks of SST files without significantly altering the fundamental index structure. For instance, Bourbon [13] exemplifies this approach. As shown in Figure 2, Bourbon initially identifies the target SST file using standard LSM-Tree procedures, which include level-by-level navigation and bloom filter checks. Once the SST file is located, Bourbon consults the in-memory models to predict the location of the target key within the SST file. Subsequently, it loads the data chunk within the predetermined error bound into memory and searches for the target key. Once found, the corresponding key-value pair is retrieved from the value log using the pointer provided in the data chunk. While the other two designs [6, 29] implement various optimizations, such as a model-based data placement strategy to minimize extra reads due to the error bound, the core concept of integrating the Learned Index as a supplementary component remains consistent.

Several limitations are inherent to existing designs, which guide us toward our proposed architecture: (1) Each Learned Index model is typically tied to its corresponding SST file. With frequent merging and creation of SST files during the

LSM compaction process, the Learned Index models are also frequently rebuilt, leading to redundant storage I/O. A design that decouples the Learned Index from the SST files and LSM could maintain the Learned Index unchanged throughout the compaction process, thereby saving on the costs associated with frequent model rebuilding. (2) Existing designs often overlook the potential for the Learned Index to function independently as a compact and efficient index, with its size being up to two orders of magnitude smaller than traditional indexes [24]. Instead, these designs increase the overall system size because they treat the Learned Index as an additional supplement while still retaining the standard index blocks. By decoupling the Learned Index from the LSM and using both as separate indexes, we could significantly reduce the total index size and enhance the system’s read performance with minimal overhead. These points highlight opportunities for optimizing the integration of Learned Indexes within large-scale storage systems, aiming for efficiency and reduced resource consumption.

3 Motivation

3.1 Size affects performance

With the rapid growth of data volumes in the real world, the size of data that needs to be handled by each data center is also increasing rapidly. Consequently, the Log-Structured Merge-Tree (LSM), which is commonly used for storing and retrieving various data, must be able to handle large-scale data within acceptable latencies. Because the LSM stores multiple versions of a single key, its storage usage may grow even faster than the rate of key-value pair increase. Although the LSM itself has mechanisms such as compaction of outdated data and the addition of extra levels when necessary, the size of the LSM inevitably expands to an extremely large scale. This expansion in size can significantly impact its performance in two key aspects.

- *Write performance.* As the size of the LSM grows, the frequency and cost of the compaction process increase because there are potentially more SST files involved. Consequently, the write throughput is affected as the compaction overhead is amortized by each write operation.
- *Read performance.* The LSM’s read performance is largely correlated with its tree depth because, in the worst case, the lookup procedure can end up in the bottom level and needs to check the target key’s availability at each level. Thus, having a deep LSM can significantly reduce its read performance due to the overwhelming number of checks required.

To quantitatively estimate the performance impact of large LSM sizes, we conducted an experiment recording the read




Figure 3: Read and Write time cost of the RocksDB across different stages

and write throughput on LSMs of different sizes. The results are shown in Figure 3. We used RocksDB [3] as the LSM instance. We divided the 1M workload into 10 stages, starting with an empty RocksDB instance and writing 100K new keys into it for each stage. Thus, the number of keys in the LSM, which is used to reflect the LSM size in this experiment, increases proportionally to the stage number. At the beginning of stage i , the number of keys is $100K * i$ ($i=0,1,2,\dots,9$). During each stage, we recorded the time cost of performing 100K write operations and then recorded the time cost of performing another 100K read operations. To ensure the read target key is not always cached in the Memtable, we randomly selected 100K keys from all the keys already written in the LSM. We repeated the same experiment 10 times and recorded the average throughput number. Based on the experiment results, it is evident that with the increasing number of keys being inserted, the read time cost increased by up to 81%, and the write time cost also increased by up to 53%. Although the figure for write time cost is more fluctuating, it still shows an ascending trend. The fluctuation, based on our observation, is because the compaction overhead gradually takes a larger portion of the write cost, and the comparison between the cost of compaction cannot be simply concluded between similar LSM sizes (the size of LSM in adjacent stages differs by 100K keys). Thus, this simple experiment demonstrates that the LSM size can affect both read and write performance, presenting a promising opportunity to improve read and write throughput by reducing the LSM size.

Existing studies related to using the on-storage Learned Index to accelerate the LSM [6,13,29] have provided a promising research direction and explored some possibilities. However, all of them restrict their methods to replacing the index block of each SST file with the Learned Index, having no impact on the size of the LSM. They have overlooked the

significant potential of the Learned Index to replace the entire LSM or at least a large portion of it. By doing so, the size of the LSM can be greatly reduced by the Learned Index. Consequently, write throughput can be improved due to a smaller LSM, while read throughput is also optimized by the Learned Index. Both read and write operations can greatly benefit from the on-storage Learned Index.

3.2 Learned Index for improving read performance, LSM for improving write performance

As introduced in Section 2, the Learned Index can outperform many traditional indexes, such as the B+-Tree, in read performance by a factor of 1.8x - 3.2x [24]. However, only a few existing in-memory learned indexes [17,19,35] can support efficient updates, and in terms of overall performance, none of the existing state-of-the-art Learned Indexes can surpass the traditional B+-Tree index in the SSD environment [25]. Meanwhile, the LSM is commonly used to support update-intensive workloads and can efficiently absorb write requests and make them persistent in storage. Thus, we can easily develop the idea of building a hybrid index that combines the Learned Index and LSM in SSD, leveraging the Learned Index’s fast lookup and the LSM’s efficient update capabilities.




Figure 4: Abstraction of tiered storage with LSM and Learned Index

Unlike existing on-storage solutions for Learned Index in LSM [6,13,29], we aim to build a tiered index where the LSM is used for absorbing random writes, and the Learned Index helps accelerate the lookup process. The abstraction of our design is shown in Figure 4. Theoretically, this tiered index can achieve performance no worse than the pure LSM on-storage in three aspects. (1) *Lookup performance*. In a single-threaded environment, our tiered index first queries the LSM for the target key. If the LSM query fails, it then queries the Learned Index. In a multi-threaded environment, we can simultaneously access both the LSM and the Learned Index, always prioritizing the key from the LSM, as it contains the most recent entries. From another perspective, the Learned Index can be analogized to a large bottom level in an

LSM tree. Based on the concept of "level learning" in Bourbon [13], building a learning model upon a level-based dataset can speed up read queries by up to 92%. Although there will be an extra LSM failure lookup, the overhead is quite limited and affordable because of the small size of the LSM. Thus, in our design, if the Learned Index is used, we can potentially surpass the original LSM in lookup performance. (2) *Index Size & Compaction cost*. As a portion of the dataset is already indexed by the Learned Index, the size of the LSM can be reduced, as well as the number of SST files possibly involved in a compaction process. Consequently, the compaction cost can also be reduced. (3) *Re-insert after Garbage Collection (GC)*. In the existing key-value separation mechanism design, the valid keys will be reinserted into the LSM after the GC process. If we build the Learned Index at this time using these valid key-value pairs, we can not only reduce the amount of data residing in the LSM but also avoid the overhead of reinserting them into the LSM. (4) *Update latency*. Because write operations are always first handled by the Memtable from the LSM, the latency (not considering the effect of background compaction) of a single write operation should be similar. Thus, we can say that, compared with state-of-the-art works, this tiered index can have comparable performance in the worst case and can surpass them in both read and write performance with reasonable design choices.

So far, the tiered index can continuously absorb random writes in the LSM, and none of the newly inserted keys will be placed into the Learned Index. As a result, the keys in the Learned Index will gradually become outdated, and fewer queries will be conducted through the Learned Index. Consequently, the advantage of this tiered index will diminish. Meanwhile, based on our theory, the more queries that can be conducted through the Learned Index, the greater the performance benefit we can obtain. Thus, we need a mechanism that periodically migrates or converts the data in the LSM to the Learned Index to ensure that a high ratio of queries can go through the Learned Index.

Challenge 1: How to efficiently convert data from the LSM to the Learned Index? One of the prerequisites for building a Learned Index is a set of sorted data. Even though each level and each SST file in the LSM is already sorted by key, the capacity of such a Learned Index, if built in this way, will be bounded by the size of the level or SST file. It cannot handle the case when we want to build the Learned Index upon multi-level data or even the entire LSM. The more invalid keys residing in the Learned Index, the less likely a query will go through the Learned Index, and the less benefit we can gain from the tiered index. Additionally, the conversion process always comes with some cost, so the more data being converted at each time, the longer we can postpone the next conversion, which can help reduce the amortized cost for each conversion. Therefore, to maximize the benefit with a similar overhead, we believe that, at certain times, we need to convert the entire LSM into the Learned Index in one shot. With this

method, the challenge becomes *"How can we efficiently build the Learned Index upon the data in the entire LSM?"* We will further discuss our solution to this challenge in detail in Section 4 and Section 5.

Challenge 2: Under which conditions does the conversion provide more benefits? There are multiple criteria to trigger the conversion, including the number of keys in the LSM, the size of the LSM, the space utilization of the storage, or a combination of several of them. However, each of these criteria involves trade-offs between early and late conversion. In the case of early conversion, it can frequently put the latest data into the Learned Index so that the size of the LSM is greatly reduced, and more incoming queries can go through the Learned Index, resulting in more benefits in read performance. However, because each conversion must involve some overhead from data re-organization, overly frequent conversions may cause unnecessary operation overhead. On the other hand, late conversion has less overhead from data re-organization. However, it will show fewer benefits from the Learned Index because more queries will end up in the LSM. Additionally, more keys will accumulate in the LSM, and query performance can be reduced due to the large size of the LSM. In the extreme case, if we never perform the conversion, it will be exactly the same as a traditional LSM tree on storage.

3.3 What We Aim to Achieve

As discussed in the previous sections, all existing works attempt to add a Learned Index block inside the LSM or replace the index block in SST files. These methods utilize the higher performance of the Learned Index to alleviate the extra overhead from training the models. However, the Learned Index may work independently without an LSM. Especially when the size of an LSM continues to increase, the cost of searching for a key residing in a large bottom level is much higher than in a smaller LSM, and the compaction cost will increase with the size of the LSM. Thus, our main idea is to use the Learned Index to replace the entire LSM, or at least a portion of it (not only its index block), to reduce the LSM index size and further improve read and write throughput.

4 LearnedKV

4.1 Architecture and Basic Operations

To address the challenges mentioned above, we propose LearnedKV, an efficient tiered key-value store consisting of an LSM and a Learned Index, which can achieve high read and write performance on SSD. The overall architecture, along with illustrations of the read and write operations, is shown in Figure 5. LearnedKV consists of three main components: an LSM Tree, a Learned Index, and a Value Log. Following the trends of prior work, the Value Log is append-only and is used






Figure 5: LearnedKV Architecture

for supporting large and various-sized values. As a resource constraint in common practice, the Value Log is assumed to be fixed-sized and will gradually fill up with both valid and invalid Key-Value (KV) pairs until it triggers a Garbage Collection (GC) process. The detailed GC process will be introduced in later sub-sections. Valid KV pairs are those keys that are newly inserted and never updated. Once a new KV pair with the same key as an existing one is appended to the Value Log, the old one is considered logically "invalid". The target of a later GC process is to reclaim the space for those invalid KV pairs and only keep the valid ones. As shown in the figure, while the Value Log stores the full key-value pairs, both the LSM and Learned Index only store the keys and their locations in the Value Log. For simpler understanding, we say they store key-offset pairs, where the offset indicates the location of the corresponding key-value pair in the Value Log.

During insertion, the key and value are first appended at the end of the Value Log, and the position of this key-value pair in the Value Log is recorded as the "offset" of the key. Then, the $\langle key, offset \rangle$ pair is inserted into the Memtable. When the number of keys in a Memtable becomes large enough, they are flushed to storage and compacted into lower levels of the LSM tree, following the same process as RocksDB.

For a point search request, we first search for the target key within the Memtable residing in DRAM and directly return



the result to the user if found. Then, the LSM on storage is queried, and if the key is still not found, we query the Learned Index. The detailed structure of the Learned Index is illustrated in Figure 6. It consists of a list of models and a file named "Key List". Following the trend of prior studies, we adopted the Linear Regression Model as our base model. While a detailed discussion about model choices is located in Section 4.4, we will briefly introduce how these models work during search requests. As shown in Figure 6, each model in the list consists of a starting key (s), slope (a), and intercept (b). When searching for a key, we first use binary search to locate the largest starting key (s_i) that is not larger than the target key. Then, we use the linear model: $y = a * s_i + b$, where y denotes the predicted offset of the corresponding Key-Offset pair in the "Key List" file. The "Key List" file consists of a set of sorted Key-Offset pairs, where the "Offset" denotes the position of the KV pair stored in the Value Log. Thus, when a Key-Offset pair is predicted by the model, it is loaded into memory together with a chunk of surrounding Key-Offset pairs within the prediction error range. After the correct Key-Offset pair is identified in memory, we use the offset to directly load the whole Key-Value pair from the Value Log. On the other hand, the LSM also stores the Key-Offset information. So, if the key is found in the LSM, we can use the associated offset to directly load the KV pair in the same way. Note that when a key is found in both the LSM and the Learned Index, we select the one from the LSM since our mechanism ensures that the keys residing in the LSM will always be late-comers and, thus, are valid ones.

4.2 GC-triggered Conversion from LSM to Learned Index

One of our main contributions is that we can convert the entire LSM into a Learned Index with negligible extra cost. As discussed earlier, one significant obstacle to building a Learned Index is that it requires the dataset to be sorted and should not accept any further updates. In prior works, we find




Figure 7: Non-blocking Garbage Collection and Conversion. The dashed box means the file is newly created in the current step.

that during the process of garbage collection (a mechanism to periodically reclaim outdated data in the value log), the KV store collects all valid key-value pairs by scanning the value log (in HashKV [28]) or issuing a range query request (in FenceKV [32]). During this process, they need to build a temporary in-memory index (hash table in HashKV) to buffer the valid keys and their locations in the value log. We can make some extra effort to sort the in-memory index so that the buffered keys, together with their locations, are in ascending order. As a result, when we re-insert these valid key-value pairs into the new value log based on the order from the in-memory index buffer, the new value log will be naturally sorted in ascending order of the keys.

By doing so, we inherit the concept of the garbage collection process from prior works. We can also configure our index to trigger this process periodically or whenever the space usage reaches a certain threshold.

The extra effort we pay is the sorting cost of the in-memory buffer, which can be completed with $O(n \log n)$ time complexity, where n is the number of valid key-value pairs involved in the Garbage Collection process. Because the sorting is performed in-memory and involves no extra I/O with the storage, and in-memory operations typically have orders of magnitude less latency than fetching data from storage, the cost of in-memory sorting is negligible when considering the performance of an on-storage KV Store.

Thus, after a Garbage Collection process, we already have the valid key-value pairs sorted in the new value log. At the same time, we can write the sorted keys and their locations in the value log into a separate file called "Key List," as shown in Figure 5. This newly created file has fixed-size elements (pairs of keys and offsets), and they are sorted based on the key. At this stage, the "Key List" file is created during each Garbage Collection process and destroyed during the next periodic Garbage Collection. It is not modified between two adjacent Garbage Collections. Thus, it provides the ideal static and sorted dataset on which the Learned Index can be built.

As the newly created Learned Index contains exactly the same valid keys as the LSM and is even more compact and robust for reads, we no longer need the old LSM tree. Therefore, we can reclaim the space occupied by the old LSM and

the old value log in the SSD, and create a new LSM to absorb incoming writes.

The Need for an Extra Key List As the key-value pairs in the new value log after a Garbage Collection are naturally sorted, one alternative design is to skip the "Key List" file and directly build a Learned Index upon the value log. This method can save one level of indirection, which in turn saves one storage I/O in the real implementation.

However, this method may be less efficient in some circumstances where the value size is quite large, which is the case in most real-world workloads based on existing work [30]. Most Learned Index predictions are inaccurate [24] because pushing the model prediction to extreme accuracy results in much higher model complexity. Therefore, we may need to examine each key-value pair within the range (typically called the error bound) where the target key is possibly located. Given the same model complexity, the number of key-value pairs within the error bound remains the same. However, if the model is built upon the value log instead of the "Key List," the data size that needs to be loaded for each examined key is the sum of the key size and the value size. In contrast, loading from the "Key List" only requires a key and a pointer to its key-value pair location. In realistic workloads, the former can vary from 100B to even larger than 4KB [30], while the pointer is typically 8B in modern 64-bit systems. Thus, in this alternative method, the index may result in much more data loading and degrade the overall throughput.

While the alternative method can still be helpful in some circumstances where the value size is not large (e.g., 8B), we leave it as an optional add-on that users can decide to enable or disable based on their specific scenario. It is disabled by default.

However, in some circumstances where the value size is large but fixed, the "Key List" file can be optimized to consist only of <key>s. Because the "Key List" always indexes the sorted part of key-value pairs in the Value Log and each key-value pair has an equal size, the offset of each key is actually its index in the "Key List" multiplied by the size of the key-value pair. Thus, we can reduce the size of the "Key List" by the portion that offsets occupy in the "Key List."

4.3 Non-blocking Garbage Collection and Conversion

A robust KV store, like RocksDB [3], should be able to handle user requests under any circumstances and should not block requests due to internal structure modifications such as a Garbage Collection (GC) process. To address this issue, we propose a non-blocking Garbage Collection scheme, along with the conversion from the old LSM to a new Learned Index, in our LearnedKV. This enables us to serve user requests with acceptable overhead during a GC process and incur no extra cost after the GC.

As shown in Figure 7, the detailed scheme can be divided into the following steps: (1) *Before GC (Figure 7a)*: Prior to triggering Garbage Collection, our system comprises three main components on SSD (LSM, Learned Index, and Value Log) and an active Memtable in memory. For simplicity, we abstract the "Models" and "Key List" from Figure 5 into "Learned Index" as they can be considered a unified entity. At this stage, new KV pairs are appended to the Value Log, while their keys and corresponding offsets are inserted into the Memtable. (2) *Beginning of GC (Figure 7b)*: When GC is initiated, either by a periodic schedule or upon reaching a space usage threshold, we first create a new LSM-tree (including an in-memory Memtable and on-storage LSM) and a new Value Log. These files are initially empty but ready for future insertions/updates. Consequently, all subsequent write operations are directed to these newly created files. We then freeze the old Memtable, converting it to an immutable Memtable that no longer accepts writes. Concurrently, we begin collecting all valid key-value pairs by scanning the old Value Log, using a temporary in-memory index to track the valid keys and their offsets. (3) *Building Learned Index (Figure 7c)*: After collecting all valid key-value pairs, we sort the in-memory index and migrate them into a "compact" Value Log. This log is termed "compact" because all residing key-value pairs are considered valid (barring cases where a new version of a key is inserted during the GC process). Based on the key distribution in this "compact" Value Log, we construct our new Learned Index. Upon completion of migration and Learned Index construction, we reclaim the space occupied by the old Value Log, LSM, and the old Learned Index. (4) *After GC (Figure 7d)*: From the moment the new LSM and Value Log are created at the start of GC, they continuously accommodate user write requests without blocking. Thus, they contain all key-value pairs inserted during the GC process, while the "Compact" Value Log created in the previous step contains all valid key-value pairs from before the GC process. Logically, we can consider these as a unified entity, with new key-value pairs appended after the "compact" ones. This approach completes the entire GC process, reclaiming all outdated keys in both LSM and Value Log without necessitating reinsertion into the LSM.

Our approach of creating separate LSM and Value Log

structures enables uninterrupted write operations during the Garbage Collection (GC) process. Moreover, this design eliminates the need for costly merging operations of newly-created files post-GC. For read requests during GC, we maintain a non-blocking strategy, though it necessitates querying both the old LSM and Learned Index, as well as the new insertions. However, given that the GC process is time-bounded, the volume of new insertions during this period is inherently limited. Furthermore, our Learned Index is specifically optimized for read operations, which we anticipate will effectively mitigate and smooth out any potential read overhead. Consequently, we consider the read performance impact during GC to be within acceptable limits, efficiently managed by the Learned Index structure.

4.4 Learned Index: Greedy-PLR+

The Learned Index is a machine-learning-based indexing structure designed to predict and efficiently search for data locations. It excels in simplicity and efficiency when applied to static and sorted data. As demonstrated in previous sections, our Garbage Collection (GC) process enables us to construct a Learned Index directly upon the sorted portion of data, eliminating the need for additional sorting operations.

From a compatibility standpoint, our design can accommodate various Learned Index models, including RS [23], RMI [24], and Alex [17]. However, our primary objective is to build and query the model with minimal overhead, without requiring in-place update capabilities. To maintain consistency with Bourbon [13], we have chosen Greedy-PLR (Piece-wise Linear Regression) [37] as our baseline statistical model. We leave the exploration of other potential Learned Index combinations for future research.

Given that our Learned Index is persistently stored on SSD, we have optimized the algorithm to better align with SSD access patterns. We refer to this optimized version as "Greedy-PLR+". This adaptation enhances the efficiency of our index structure in the context of SSD-based storage systems.

Greedy-PLR+, an adaptation of the original Greedy-PLR [37], offers an effective balance of fast lookup capabilities, simple training procedures, and minimal space overhead. Its architecture, composed of multiple piece-wise models, enables efficient operation across sparse key spaces. The algorithm divides the given dataset into multiple linear segments, which collectively represent the complex key-location distribution. This segmentation allows for accurate key location within a specified number of page accesses during queries.

Our Greedy-PLR+ differs from the original algorithm in its optimization for block devices like SSDs. In this context, search cost is more closely related to page distance (the difference between the predicted and actual page numbers) rather than absolute location distance.

The algorithm operates as follows on a sorted dataset of key-location pairs:

1. It begins by connecting the first two data points to form the initial line segment (each segment consists of a starting key, a slope, and an intercept).
2. For subsequent data points, it checks whether the page number of the predicted location (using the current segment's slope and intercept) falls within a defined error bound.
3. If the prediction is within the error bound, the data pair is considered part of the current segment.
4. If the prediction exceeds the error bound, the current segment is terminated, and a new segment is initiated by connecting the current data point with the next one.
5. This process iterates over the entire dataset, resulting in a list of segments, each defined by an intercept and a slope.

The algorithm's time complexity is $O(n)$, where n represents the number of data points in the dataset. This linear time complexity ensures efficient model construction, even for large datasets, making Greedy-PLR+ particularly suitable for SSD-based key-value stores.

As shown in Figure 6, we create an immutable file called "Key List", consisting of the set of data that would be used for training models. Each data point is formed as (key, offset), where the offset is the location of the key in the Value Log. The "Key List", when it is created, is sorted by the key. There is also a file called "Models", which consists of the set of line segments generated by the Greedy-PLR+ algorithm. Each line segment is constructed in the form of (start_key, slope, intercept), and the list of segments is sorted based on its start key.

The query process for a target key k in our system begins by loading the "Models" file and performing a lower-bound binary search among the list of models. This search identifies the segment s whose start key is the largest among those smaller than or equal to the target key k (satisfying the condition $start_{key_s} \leq k < start_{key_{s+1}}$). Using the slope and intercept of the identified segment s , we predict the location of the key k . Based on the Greedy-PLR+ algorithm's properties, we can assert that the page distance between the predicted location and the actual location will not exceed a pre-defined error bound e . We then load a data chunk from the "Key List" file, spanning the range $[p - e, p + e]$, where p is the predicted location and e is the error bound. Within this loaded chunk, we further search until we find an exact match for the target key k . Once the key is matched, we use its corresponding offset to locate the target key-value pair in the Value Log. Finally, we return the retrieved key-value pair to the user.

This querying process leverages the efficiency of our Greedy-PLR+ algorithm and the organized structure of our "Models" and "Key List" files. By limiting the search range based on the predicted location and the known error bound,

we optimize the query performance, especially for SSD-based systems where minimizing I/O operations is crucial.

4.5 Range Scan

In addition to read and write operations, supporting range scan requests is crucial for a modern, large-scale KV store. Given LearnedKV's tiered storage architecture, a target key within a scan range could be present in either the LSM tree or the Learned Index. Therefore, the KV store must efficiently perform range scans across both indexes and seamlessly combine the results to ensure comprehensive and accurate data retrieval.

RocksDB [3], which we have chosen as our LSM implementation, includes a built-in iterator API to support range scans. Given a specified starting key and a stop condition, the iterator enables sequential access to key-value pairs in sorted order within the specified range. By default, this order is sorted by key. The underlying logic is that RocksDB maintains an individual iterator for each Memtable or SST file and a "MergingIterator" that manages all individual iterators in a heap, exposing them as a sorted stream. Utilizing the iterator API, LearnedKV can efficiently perform sequential scans of keys within the target range in the LSM, along with their associated pointers to the Value Log.

Regarding the keys in the Learned Index, as described in previous sections, they are stored in the "Key List" file and are already sorted by their keys. During a range scan, LearnedKV first uses the models to predict the locations of both start_key and end_key (representing the beginning and end of the scan range, respectively). After loading the data chunks surrounding these predicted locations into memory, the exact positions of start_key and end_key can be determined. Subsequently, the missing data chunks in between can be loaded to identify the keys within the scan range.

After obtaining the two lists of sorted keys from the LSM and the Learned Index, we need to merge them into a single sorted list. According to our design, the LSM handles insertions and updates after the construction of the Learned Index, ensuring that keys in the LSM are always the most recent and valid ones. During the merging process, we iterate through both sorted lists, adding the smaller key to the result list. If a duplicate key appears in both the LSM and the Learned Index, we discard the key from the Learned Index, add the key from the LSM, and continue iterating until both lists are exhausted. Finally, we collect the key-value pairs within the specified range from the Value Log and return them to users.

Based on our experiments in Section 5.1, the range scan operations in LearnedKV can outperform pure RocksDB [3] by up to 4x for the same range of keys. We attribute this performance improvement to two main factors: (a) LearnedKV reduces the time required for searching keys level-by-level. Although the RocksDB iterator exposes keys in sorted order, these keys are still physically distributed across differ-

ent levels and files. Maintaining such a "MergingIterator" across these levels and files incurs non-negligible overhead compared to directly reading consecutive data chunks in the Learned Index. (b) Key-value pairs related to the Learned Index are stored contiguously in the Value Log. As discussed in Section 4.3, valid key-value pairs are appended to the Value Log in sorted order during the GC process. Simultaneously, these keys and their locations in the Value Log are used to construct the Learned Index. The sorted keys in the Key List directly map to the sorted key-value pairs in the compact Value Log, remaining unmodified until the next Learned Index construction. Therefore, when data chunks of the scan range in the Key List are loaded, they are already sorted by keys, as are the corresponding key-value pairs in the Value Log. In contrast, key-value pairs in the Value Log for the LSM are appended based on the timing of requests rather than sorted by keys. Consequently, key-value pairs within the same range can be scattered throughout a large portion of the Value Log file, leading to less efficient random reads and potential page fragmentation.

4.6 Optimizations

In the previous sections, we provide the general configuration of our design. However, there can be some optimizations to further improve our performance. Each of them is not a necessity for the design but can lead to some benefits in certain circumstances.

4.6.1 Range-query Assisted Conversion

Our general scheme is to passively trigger the conversion during a GC process because it will incur negligible extra cost for building the Learned Index and can avoid re-insertion in the LSM. However, in some circumstances where the GC is rarely triggered because the storage may be sufficiently over-provisioned, the general scheme may need to wait a long time until converting the LSM to the Learned Index. In this case, the benefit from the Learned Index can not be fully reflected. So, we design an optimization algorithm for proactive conversion in case the GC is rarely triggered. We call our add-on algorithm "Range-query Assisted Conversion".

In the circumstances where the passive conversion (during GC) is rarely triggered, we enable our proactive conversion, which is described below: (1) *Trigger Condition*: The proactive conversion is triggered when the size/number of levels of the LSM reaches to a certain threshold. Usually, at this point, the performance of the LSM begins to be degraded. (2) *Full range query*: Then we perform a range query covering the full key space in the LSM, and also the Learned Index. In the implementation of RocksDB [3], the range query is performed by continuously merging sort key-value pairs in SST files within different levels. Considering the Learned Index as an extra bottom level, the keys can be jointly merged

and sorted in the same process. (3) *Build new Learned Index*: Based on the sorted keys and their offsets in the Value Log, the new Learned Index can be easily built following the algorithm we discussed before. In the meantime, a new LSM and Value Log can be used to absorb the write operations as we did in the general conversion so that this conversion will not block any operations, either.

The advantage of this conversion is that it is light-weighted because it does not involve key-value pairs migration and it theoretically can be triggered at any time, even proactively by the user. However, building the learned index will incur some extra overhead while the space utilization is not improved.

4.6.2 In-memory Bloom Filter

Based on our experiments, even with a highly skewed workload (Zipfian distribution), approximately one-fifth of the read queries need to access the learned index. Due to our tiered index design, the most recently inserted keys always reside in the LSM tree, necessitating an initial check of the LSM even if the key may not be present in the LSM. Traversing an LSM level-by-level can be time-consuming, despite the relatively small size of the LSM and the read amplification mitigation techniques employed by RocksDB. Such false read attempts can accumulate and introduce a significant overhead to our index. To address this, we implemented a lightweight in-memory Bloom filter to reduce the likelihood of false read attempts.

In our design, we maintain an in-memory Bloom Filter for the keys currently residing in the LSM tree. For each new key, we record its existence in the Bloom Filter by marking a series of its representative bits simultaneously as we add it to the Memtable. For each read request, we always consult the in-memory Bloom Filter first. If the representative bits of the target key are not fully marked, it is guaranteed that the target key does not exist in the LSM, allowing us to skip the LSM and directly query the Learned Index. Otherwise, we proceed to query the LSM, accepting a false positive rate of less than 5%, as observed in our experiments, where the Bloom Filter indicates the key's presence when it is not there.

By default, we enable the in-memory Bloom Filter because it significantly reduces the rate of false read attempts and improves overall read throughput, with only negligible write cost and DRAM space usage. To provide a comprehensive understanding of this design choice, we also include a comparison of results from experiments with and without this optimization in Section 5.

5 Evaluation

To evaluate our LearnedKV, we compare our design with multiple state-of-the-art KV stores in various test environments. First, in order to show the effectiveness of our tiered design, we construct a micro-benchmark experiment to compare the

performance of the LearnedKV and the RocksDB [3] through YCSB workloads [5]. Then we broaden our comparison to various workloads, including a range scan experiment. Then, we further include several other state-of-the-art KV stores (HashKV [28] and B+-Tree [4]) into the comparison. Finally, we drill down our analysis to our design choice and multiple parameter settings.

To the best of our knowledge, there are few existing open-sourced projects that support the on-storage Learned Index with update operation. The one existing on-storage Learned Index project [25] only supports write operation as insertion, so it can not handle the case we need to insert duplicate keys into the KV store. As the prior work concluded, none of the existing on-storage Learned Index can beat the traditional B+-Tree in overall performance, we include the B+-Tree in our comparison instead.

KV separation and Garbage Collection Given that many modern realistic workloads typically use large-sized values [30], our goal is to design a KV store that operates efficiently under this assumption, incorporating the KV separation concept. In some state-of-the-art systems, such as Bourbon [13] and BlobDB [1] within RocksDB [3], there is either insufficient support for large values or no interface to limit storage space. Therefore, in these KV stores, we modified their implementation so that large key-value pairs are inserted into a file called the "value log," while the key and its offset in the "value log" are inserted into the index as with a normal insertion. Additionally, to restrict storage space usage and ensure a fair comparison, we equipped them with the same garbage collection (GC) mechanism as our LearnedKV, except they do not utilize a tiered Learned Index.

Evaluation Setup. We conduct our experiments on a 12-core Intel Xeon E5-2620 v3 2.40GHz CPU with 62GB of memory and an 854GB SSD. For computational convenience, unless otherwise specified, the key size and value size are set to 8 bytes and 1016 bytes, respectively, making each key-value pair 1 KB. Additionally, we over-provision storage space by 30% of the size of the key-value pairs by default. Applying this ratio, based on a prior study [28], ensures that the value log has a similar space allocation as the original RocksDB or LevelDB.

Workload. In our experiments, we divide the performance test into four phases (P0, P1, P2, and P3). In the first phase (P0), we load 1,000,000 unique key-value pairs into the KV store. In each subsequent phase (P1, P2, and P3), we perform 1,000,000 read or update operations. The number of read or update operations is based on the pre-configured read/write ratio of the workload, with requests following a Zipfian distribution by default. Unless otherwise specified, we collect the performance impact of the GC process. For experiments that do not involve any update or insert operations, we perform a GC once the loading phase (P0) is completed. This is because the loading phase only writes keys into the LSM, and

the GC process will not be passively triggered by read-only workloads. Therefore, we manually trigger a GC alongside the conversion from LSM to Learned Index. This procedure is applied uniformly across all competitors, allowing us to highlight the performance differences with and without our Learned Index design more clearly.

In this section, we present the evaluation of LearnedKV by answering the following questions:

- How does the tiered index design benefit the performance?
- How does the LearnedKV compare with other state-of-the-art KV Stores?
- What is the performance of the LearnedKV under different workloads?
- How does the performance get affected by different configurations (e.g. value size, storage over-provision ratio, error_bound)?
- How much does the performance benefit from our optimizations (e.g. In-memory Bloom Filter)?

5.1 Overall Performance Comparison

Experiment 1: Effect of Learned Index. We configure the YCSB workload to be read-write balanced (50% read and 50% write) following a Zipfian distribution with a Zipfian constant $s=0.99$. We first load 1,000,000 key-value pairs into the KV store and perform three phases of operations. Each phase of operations consists of 500,000 read operations and 500,000 update operations. Only the first phase will issue the Load operation (inserting new keys into the KV store) while the rest phases consist of read and update operations over the existing keys in the KV store.




Figure 8: Throughput Comparison between LearnedKV and RocksDB. (P0: Load; P1,P2,P3: Read and Update; Learned Index is built in the middle of P1; GC happens in P1,P2,P3)

Figure 8 shows the overall throughput comparison between LearnedKV and RocksDB over different phases. The load operation throughputs from the two KV stores are quite similar in Phase 0 because at this stage the Learned Index is not yet built and the LearnedKV worked almost the same as a RocksDB instance. In P1 (Phase 1), there are a total of 50,000

update operations. While we over-provided 30% of the storage space, the first 30,000 update operations will not trigger the GC process and they are processed in the same condition between the two KV stores. In the middle of P1, when the size of the value log reaches the storage space limit, it will trigger the GC process, and our LearnedKV will build a Learned Index at the same time. So, a portion (20K out of 50K) of the P1 operations will benefit from the acceleration of the Learned Index. During P1, the LearnedKV achieves 1.14x and 1.08x write and read throughput as of the RocksDB. When entering P2 and P3, the performance is more stable because from the Learned Index is already built in previous phases and all the operations in these stages can benefit from the tiered index in LearnedKV. As shown in the figure, in P2 and P3, LearnedKV can surpass the RocksDB by 1.31x and 1.32x in write and read throughput, respectively. The performance gap, in P2 and P3, can clearly show the difference between the KV stores with and without the Learned Index.

	LearnedKV	RocksDB
Key-Ptr Space		
LSM	4.2MB	23MB
key_array	7.7MB	-
model	8.0KB	-
Total	11.9MB	23MB
Key-Value Space		
vlog	978MB	978MB

Table 1: Comparison of storage sizes for LearnedKV and RocksDB.

Table 1 shows the comparison of storage space used by LearnedKV and RocksDB in the previous experiment. We collect the space statistics at the end of P3. The key-ptr space refers to the LSM tree together with the key_array and model files which contain keys and offsets in the vlog, while the full key-value pairs are stored in the vlog and contribute to the Key-Value Space. The Key-Value Space consumption is the same because we use the same workload and almost the same GC policy. Remarkably, when evaluating the LSM size, LearnedKV dramatically reduces it from 23M down to just 4.2M. This represents an impressively 82% reduction, which can significantly boost both read and write speeds. Also, as noted in the table, the model file is as small as comparable to page size. In our later experiments, we will show the trade-off between using different model parameters.

Experiment 2: Read Write Ratio. To fully investigate design impact, we further extend our Experiment 1 into the conditions where workloads have different read/write ratios. We categorize the workloads into four cases, including read-heavy (Read: Write = 7:3), read-write-balanced (Read: Write = 5:5), write-heavy (Read: Write = 3:7), and write-only. As we previously mentioned, we will first load the whole key-

value pairs into the KV store and then perform three phases of operations based on the above ratios. All the write operation mentioned above refers to an update to the existing key. We record the last phase to mitigate the impact of the GC process. We exclude the read-only workload because such workload cannot trigger GC and which, in such case, cannot show the key design of LearnedKV.




Figure 9: Performance of LearnedKV vs. RocksDB for Different Read: Write Ratios

Figure 9 shows that all the operations throughputs can be improved by our LearnedKV (from 1.22x to 1.43x). For the read-write-balanced workload, LearnedKV has the most overall performance gain among all these variables while it is not the best in either read or write throughput gain.

Experiment 3: Range Scan We also compare our range scan performance with the state-of-the-art RocksDB. Similar to previous experiments, we first load 1,000,000 key-value pairs into the KV store and perform 1,000 scan operations over the database. For the range scan, we did not pre-set the number of key-value pairs to be involved, as these numbers are impractical to pre-determine in real-world scenarios. Instead, we configured a *ScanRange*, and all KV stores were used to read all the key-value pairs within this range. To ensure a fair comparison, we modified the string keys used in RocksDB so that it could maintain the same order as integers. This ensured that the keys involved in each competitor were identical. Based on the experiment logs, each scan request in this experiment reads about 500KB of key-value pairs on average.

As shown in figure 10, our setup consists of three parts, using the same loading phase but with different workloads. "Scan without update" workloads consist solely of scan operations. In LearnedKV, after the GC process at the end of the loading phase, all valid key-value pairs are re-grouped and migrated to the Learned Index. Because there are no insert or update requests afterward, the LSM will not absorb any new keys, making the Learned Index the only active component in this tiered storage. Thus, this comparison effectively measures the performance difference between the Learned

Index and RocksDB. In this scenario, LearnedKV achieves up to 4.69x greater performance in range scans compared to RocksDB. However, such scenarios are rare. Therefore, we also conducted experiments on "Scan with Update" workloads. We included two sets of such workloads: "Set 1" contains 0.5M updates before the scan requests, while "Set 2" includes 1M update requests before the scan. These workloads make the LSM absorb some keys after the GC process, requiring LearnedKV to scan both the LSM and the Learned Index to obtain correct results. As expected, there is a 34% performance drop compared to the pure scan workload, but it still outperforms the state-of-the-art by 3.6x.




Figure 10: Performance Comparison of Range Scan

Experiment 4: Other KV Stores

HashKV: We also included some more KV stores aimed for fast on-storage performance and designed for large and variable-sized values. Inherited from the WiscKey [30], HashKV [28] leverages a hash function to partition the database into different groups and we choose it as it represents the state-of-the-art works in the field of KV separation. Since HashKV used LevelDB instead of RocksDB as its LSM data structure, for a fair comparison, we implemented another version of LearnedKV which co-operates with LevelDB. As shown in the figure 11, in the LevelDB-embedded environment, the LearnedKV can also outperform the HashKV 3.59x in write performance while achieving similar read performance as HashKV, which incorporates a Write Cache in memory.

B+-Tree: We used the on-storage B+-tree implementation as in the work [40] and because the original setup only supports 8-byte values, we implemented a similar KV separation process as in the LearnedKV. In our settings, we make all the leaf nodes and another two levels of inner nodes on storage, making the memory space consumption similar between the two indexes. Then, according to the results shown in figure 12, the LearnedKV can outperform the on-storage B+-Tree by more than 5x in both the read and write performance.




Figure 11: Comparison between LearnedKV and HashKV




Figure 12: Comparison between LearnedKV and B+_Tree

5.2 Drill-down Analysis

Experiment 5: Time breakdown. To fully investigate what is happening inside the LearnedKV, we break down the operations into multiple steps and record the time cost of each step. As shown in Table 2, we summarize the read and write operation numbers and their average time cost in the last phase (P3). The insertion process is quite simple and straightforward in our design. It only involves LSM's insertion and vlog append. So, we put our focus on the reading process and further analyze the time breakdown for read operations. During the whole 500K (nearly 500K) read operations, 26% of them will either skip the LSM or fail to read in the LSM. They will query through the Learned Index and the average time cost for them is about 37.5 μ s. Due to the in-memory Bloom Filter, not all of the read requests need to consult the RocksDB. However, because we are using the skewed request workloads, most of the requests target the frequently updated keys that should be residing in the RocksDB the most of time. So, more than 76% of the read requests still need to go through the RocksDB. And the average time cost of reading through the RocksDB is still 2.14x of the time of Learned Index, proving the advantage of Learned Index in read performance. The last is the load time to get the full key-value pair from the vlog. It is a necessary step for a read request because both the RocksDB and the Learned Index only store the key's offset of the vlog.

Experiment 6: In-memory Bloom Filter.

Figure 13 shows the performance comparison related to

Operation	Number	Avg Time Cost (μ s)
Write	500,377	165.584
Read	499,623	66.6561
Read Operation		
Read through LI	131,508	37.5138
Read through RD	383,256	58.0299
Load form vlog	499,623	11.6553

Table 2: Summary of operations and their time costs. (LI: Learned Index; RD: RocksDB)




Figure 13: Comparison of Throughput With and Without Bloom Filter

the in-memory Bloom Filter. After applying the in-memory Bloom Filter, there will be a 6% performance drop for write requests, because it can need extra maintenance when new keys get inserted and do not contribute to either LSM insertion or GC. However, the 31.73% gain on the read performance can be well worth the cost.

6 Future Work

As discussed in Section 4.4, the choice of the Learned Index model is an interesting topic and is orthogonal to our design of tiering the Learned Index and LSM. In this paper, we chose Piece-wise Linear Regression (PLR) due to its simplicity and efficiency. However, there are many other candidates that might also be suitable as on-storage learned indices. We leave the exploration of other possible combinations for future work.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose LearnedKV, an efficient tiered KV store that integrates an LSM tree with a Learned Index. By

decoupling these components, the LSM handles updates and inserts while the Learned Index accelerates read requests. This standalone design significantly reduces the size of the LSM, further enhancing both read and write performance. Based on a variety of experiments, LearnedKV outperforms state-of-the-art KV works by up to 1.32x in read requests and 1.31x in write performance.

References

- [1] Blobdb, 2023. <https://github.com/facebook/rocksdb/wiki/BlobDB>.
- [2] Leveldb: a fast key-value storage library written at google that provides an ordered mapping from string keys to string values, 2023. <https://github.com/google/leveldb>.
- [3] Rocksdb: A persistent key-value store for flash and ram storage, 2023. <https://rocksdb.org/>.
- [4] Stx b+, 2023. <https://panthema.net/2007/stx-btree/>.
- [5] Yahoo! cloud serving benchmark, 2023. <https://github.com/brianfrankcooper/YCSB>.
- [6] ABU-LIBDEH, H., ALTINBUKEN, D., BEUTEL, A., CHI, E. H., DOSHI, L., KRASKA, T., LI, X., LY, A., AND OLSTON, C. Learned indexes for a google-scale disk-based database. *ArXiv abs/2012.12501* (2020).
- [7] AHN, J.-S., SEO, C., MAYURAM, R., YASEEN, R., KIM, J.-S., AND MAENG, S. R. Forestdb: A fast key-value storage system for variable-length string keys. *IEEE Transactions on Computers* 65 (2016), 902–915.
- [8] ATIKOGLU, B., XU, Y., FRACHTENBERG, E., JIANG, S., AND PALECZNY, M. Workload analysis of a large-scale key-value store. In *Measurement and Modeling of Computer Systems* (2012).
- [9] CAO, Z., DONG, H., WEI, Y., LIU, S., AND DU, D. H.-C. Is-hbase: An in-storage computing optimized hbase with i/o offloading and self-adaptive caching in compute-storage disaggregated infrastructure. *ACM Transactions on Storage (TOS)* 18 (2022), 1 – 42.
- [10] CAO, Z., DONG, S., VEMURI, S., AND DU, D. H.-C. Characterizing, modeling, and benchmarking rocksdb key-value workloads at facebook. In *USENIX Conference on File and Storage Technologies* (2020).
- [11] CHEN, H., RUAN, C., LI, C., MA, X., AND XU, Y. Spandb: A fast, cost-effective lsm-tree based kv store on hybrid storage. In *USENIX Conference on File and Storage Technologies* (2021).
- [12] COOPER, B. F., SILBERSTEIN, A., TAM, E., RAMAKRISHNAN, R., AND SEARS, R. Benchmarking cloud serving systems with ycsb. In *ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing* (2010).
- [13] DAI, Y., XU, Y., GANESAN, A., ALAGAPPAN, R., KROTH, B., ARPACI-DUSSEAU, A. C., AND ARPACI-DUSSEAU, R. H. From wisckey to bourbon: A learned index for log-structured merge trees. In *USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation* (2020).
- [14] DAVIS, D. Ai unleashes the power of unstructured data. <https://www.cio.com/article/220347/ai-unleashes-the-power-of-unstructured-data.html>.
- [15] DEBNATH, B. K., SENGUPTA, S., AND LI, J. Flashstore: High throughput persistent key-value store. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 3 (2010), 1414–1425.
- [16] DECANDIA, G., HASTORUN, D., JAMPANI, M., KAKULAPATI, G., LAKSHMAN, A., PILCHIN, A., SIVASUBRAMANIAN, S., VOSSHALL, P., AND VOGELS, W. Dynamo: amazon’s highly available key-value store. In *Symposium on Operating Systems Principles* (2007).

- [17] DING, J., MINHAS, U. F., ZHANG, H., LI, Y., WANG, C., CHANDRAMOULI, B., GEHRKE, J., KOSSMANN, D., AND LOMET, D. B. Alex: An updatable adaptive learned index. *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data* (2019).
- [18] ELDAKIKY, H., AND DU, D. H.-C. Transkv: A networking support for transaction processing in distributed key-value stores. *2021 IEEE Seventh International Conference on Big Data Computing Service and Applications (BigDataService)* (2021), 41–49.
- [19] FERRAGINA, P., AND VINCIGUERRA, G. The pgm-index. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment 13* (2019), 1162–1175.
- [20] GALAKATOS, A., MARKOVITCH, M., BINNIG, C., FONSECA, R., AND KRASKA, T. Fiting-tree: A data-aware index structure. *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Management of Data* (2018).
- [21] KAIYRAKHMET, O., LEE, S. Y., NAM, B., NOH, S. H., AND RI CHOI, Y. Slm-db: Single-level key-value store with persistent memory. In *USENIX Conference on File and Storage Technologies* (2019).
- [22] KANG, Y., PITCHUMANI, R., MISHRA, P., KEE, Y.-S., LONDONO, F., OH, S., LEE, J., AND LEE, D. D. G. Towards building a high-performance, scale-in key-value storage system. *Proceedings of the 12th ACM International Conference on Systems and Storage* (2019).
- [23] KIPF, A., MARCUS, R., VAN RENEN, A., STOIAN, M., KEMPER, A., KRASKA, T., AND NEUMANN, T. Radixspline: a single-pass learned index. *Proceedings of the Third International Workshop on Exploiting Artificial Intelligence Techniques for Data Management* (2020).
- [24] KRASKA, T., BEUTEL, A., CHI, E. H., DEAN, J., AND POLYZOTIS, N. The case for learned index structures. *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Management of Data* (2017).
- [25] LAN, H., BAO, Z., CULPEPPER, J. S., AND BOROVIKA-GAJIC, R. Updatable learned indexes meet disk-resident dbms - from evaluations to design choices. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data 1* (2023), 1–22.
- [26] LEPERS, B., BALMAU, O., GUPTA, K., AND ZWAENEPOEL, W. Kvell: the design and implementation of a fast persistent key-value store. *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles* (2019).
- [27] LI, P., HUA, Y., JIA, J., AND ZUO, P. Finedex: A fine-grained learned index scheme for scalable and concurrent memory systems. *Proc. VLDB Endow. 15* (2021), 321–334.
- [28] LI, Y., CHAN, H. H. W., LEE, P. P. C., AND XU, Y. Enabling efficient updates in kv storage via hashing. *ACM Transactions on Storage (TOS) 15* (2018), 1–29.
- [29] LU, K., ZHAO, N., GUANG WAN, J., FEI, C., ZHAO, W., AND DENG, T. Tridentkv: A read-optimized lsm-tree based kv store via adaptive indexing and space-efficient partitioning. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems PP* (2021), 1–1.
- [30] LU, L., PILLAI, T. S., ARPACI-DUSSEAU, A. C., AND ARPACI-DUSSEAU, R. H. Wisckey: Separating keys from values in ssd-conscious storage. In *USENIX Conference on File and Storage Technologies* (2016).
- [31] O’NEIL, P. E., CHENG, E. Y. C., GAWLICK, D., AND O’NEIL, E. J. The log-structured merge-tree (lsm-tree). *Acta Informatica 33* (1996), 351–385.
- [32] TANG, C., GUANG WAN, J., AND XIE, C. Fencekv: Enabling efficient range query for key-value separation. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems 33* (2022), 3375–3386.
- [33] TANG, C., WANG, Y., DONG, Z., HU, G., WANG, Z., WANG, M., AND CHEN, H. Xindex: a scalable learned index for multicore data storage. *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming* (2020).
- [34] WU, F., YANG, M.-H., ZHANG, B., AND DU, D. H.-C. Ac-key: Adaptive caching for lsm-based key-value stores. In *USENIX Annual Technical Conference* (2020).
- [35] WU, J., ZHANG, Y., CHEN, S., WANG, J., CHEN, Y., AND XING, C. Updatable learned index with precise positions. *ArXiv abs/2104.05520* (2021).
- [36] WU, X., XU, Y., SHAO, Z., AND JIANG, S. Lsm-trie: An lsm-tree-based ultra-large key-value store for small data items. In *USENIX Annual Technical Conference* (2015).
- [37] XIE, Q., PANG, C., ZHOU, X., ZHANG, X., AND DENG, K. Maximum error-bounded piecewise linear representation for online stream approximation. *The VLDB Journal 23* (2014), 915–937.
- [38] ZHANG, B., AND DU, D. H.-C. Nvlsm: A persistent memory key-value store using log-structured merge tree with accumulative compaction. *ACM Trans. Storage 17* (2021), 23:1–23:26.
- [39] ZHANG, B., GONG, H., AND DU, D. H.-C. Pmdb: A range-based key-value store on hybrid nvme-storage systems. *IEEE Transactions on Computers 72* (2023), 1274–1285.
- [40] ZHANG, J., SU, K., AND ZHANG, H. Making in-memory learned indexes efficient on disk. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* (2024).