

A Practical Theory of Generalization in Selectivity Learning

Peizhi Wu
University of Pennsylvania
pagewu@cis.upenn.edu

Haoshu Xu
University of Pennsylvania
haoshuxu@sas.upenn.edu

Ryan Marcus
University of Pennsylvania
rcmarcus@cis.upenn.edu

Zachary G. Ives
University of Pennsylvania
zives@cis.upenn.edu

ABSTRACT

Query-driven machine learning models have emerged as a promising estimation technique for query selectivities. Yet, surprisingly little is known about the efficacy of these techniques from a theoretical perspective, as there exist substantial gaps between practical solutions and state-of-the-art (SOTA) theory based on the Probably Approximately Correct (PAC) learning framework. In this paper, we aim to bridge the gaps between theory and practice. First, we demonstrate that selectivity predictors induced by *signed measures* are learnable, which relaxes the reliance on *probability measures* in SOTA theory. More importantly, beyond the PAC learning framework (which only allows us to characterize how the model behaves when both training and test workloads are drawn from the *same* distribution), we establish, under mild assumptions, that selectivity predictors from this class exhibit favorable *out-of-distribution* (OOD) generalization error bounds.

These theoretical advances provide us with a better understanding of both the in-distribution and OOD generalization capabilities of query-driven selectivity learning, and facilitate the design of two general strategies to improve OOD generalization for existing query-driven selectivity models. We empirically verify that our techniques help query-driven selectivity models generalize significantly better to OOD queries both in terms of prediction accuracy and query latency performance, while maintaining their superior in-distribution generalization performance.

ACM Reference Format:

Peizhi Wu, Haoshu Xu, Ryan Marcus, and Zachary G. Ives. 2024. A Practical Theory of Generalization in Selectivity Learning. In *Proceedings of ACM Conference (Conference'17)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 14 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

We study the learning of selectivity functions for selection queries in database management systems (DBMSes). As the key to effective query optimization, selectivity estimation has continued to be one of the most important problems in DBMSes since the 1980s [35, 45]. The earliest approach was to collect basic statistics (such as histograms) for selectivity estimation, and then to make uniformity (within a bucket) and independence (among columns) assumptions. Although widely adopted in real DBMSes due to its simplicity, this approach is prone to large estimation errors [25, 31].

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

© 2024 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

More recently, selectivity estimation has been formulated as a machine learning (ML) problem, where the system learns from observed samples (data or queries) to make selectivity predictions for incoming queries. Proposals for learning-based selectivity estimation can be broadly categorized into *data-driven* and *query-driven* models (with a few exceptions in the form of hybrid models). Data-driven techniques [16, 21, 23, 29, 38, 54, 56, 58] build models of the data distribution by scanning the underlying data. Conversely, query-driven techniques either learn a regression model from query features to selectivity [15, 30], or model the data distribution from a set of observed queries and their selectivities [6].

In this paper, we focus on query-driven models [19, 24, 30, 32, 41, 43, 49] as they enjoy a smaller model size, faster training, and possibly faster inference (for example, regression models [19, 30, 32]) compared to data-driven models. In addition, they can also achieve much better performance than traditional histograms [30].

Importance of theoretical understanding of generalization.

In machine learning, *generalization* (“a central goal in pattern recognition [11]”) refers to a model’s ability to perform well on new, unseen data that was not part of the training set. With respect to query-driven selectivity learning, the large variability in queries seen in practice means that any training workload can only represent only a *tiny* subset of all possible queries. Therefore, it is crucial to accurately characterize the generalization ability of selectivity models, specifically how they perform on queries that were *not* seen during training. This understanding is essential to ensure reliable predictions in real-world applications. Yet, surprisingly, there is limited theoretical analysis of the generalizability of query-driven models. An initial and promising step towards such understanding [24] proves that selectivity functions are learnable using the Probably Approximately Correct (PAC) learning framework [27]. However, significant gaps remain in our understanding.

Limitations of prior results. The current SOTA result [24] assumes that *every selectivity predictor in the hypothesis class is induced by a probability measure*. Consequently, *learnability* (in-distribution generalization, to be formally introduced in § 3.4) results can be applied *only* to a small fraction of existing query-driven models (e.g., those that build histograms from queries [6]). Indeed, as we will see later in the paper, predictors from regression-based query-driven models, which achieve impressive empirical performance, are not induced by a probability measure. Therefore, existing learnability results [24] cannot be applied to these practical approaches. Given this gap between theory and practice, a natural question arises:

Question 1: *Is it feasible to reduce the reliance on probability measures, thereby broadening our theoretical understanding of selectivity learning models?*

Another challenge in applying the theoretical results to practical scenarios is that PAC learning, as a framework, *only* allows us to quantify the *in-distribution* generalization error, where both

training and test queries are drawn from the *same* distribution. This means that previous theory [24] based on PAC learning is *not* able to characterize generalization error for OOD scenarios. Nevertheless, in the real world, query workloads may shift constantly [40, 53]. This raises another, perhaps more challenging, question:

Question 2: *Given mild assumptions, is it feasible to quantify OOD generalization error in selectivity learning, thereby enhancing the practical relevance of theoretical results?*

Our first goal in this paper is to answer these two questions theoretically. Thereafter, based on the new generalization results, we design new learning paradigms/frameworks for improving selectivity estimation in practice, which leverage the theoretical results to provide formal guarantees.

A sketch of our results. The paper delivers two *positive and encouraging* theoretical results toward answering the two questions:

- Addressing Question 1, we introduce a new theoretical result of learnability (i.e., in-distribution generalization) that applies to selectivity functions/models whose predictions are induced by a *signed measure*, removing the positivity and sum-to-unity constraints that are required by prior work.
- More interestingly, under mild assumptions, we further establish *non-trivial* OOD generalization error bound for selectivity predictors that are induced by a signed measure. The new theoretical result, *beyond the PAC learning framework*, quantifies the generalization error when training and testing workloads do not follow the same distribution, hence answering Question 2. For a taste of our theory, our main theorem (Theorem 4.2) is simplified and summarized below.

Simplified Theorem 4.2. *For any selectivity estimator \hat{S} that is induced by a signed measure, if \hat{S} is trained under distribution Q with in-distribution generalization error $\text{er}_Q(\hat{S})$ upper bounded by ϵ with probability at least $1 - \delta$, then under a different testing distribution P , the out-of-distribution generalization error $\text{er}_P(\hat{S})$ satisfies*

$$\text{er}_P(\hat{S}) \leq O(\sqrt{\epsilon})$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$, under mild assumptions on distribution P and Q (see Theorem 4.2 for details).

A key implication of our result is that, for any class of selectivity predictors that is induced by signed measures, both our in-distribution and OOD generalization results apply *immediately*.

Improvement strategies inspired by our theory. From this aspect of our theory, we propose novel and practical methodologies for *improving existing query-driven selectivity learning models*.

- We propose a new modeling paradigm for query-driven selectivity estimation, NEUROCDF, which models the underlying cumulative distribution functions (CDFs) using a neural network. NEUROCDF can be proved to be induced by signed measures, and thus enjoys the theoretical guarantees provided by our theory, and still enjoys the superior empirical performance of deep learning. While NEUROCDF is hard to optimize using relative error (e.g., Qerror) as the loss function, it *provably* offers better generalization performance for OOD queries, compared to the common

modeling paradigm for selectivity estimation that targets the query selectivity directly.

- Inspired by the lessons learned from our theory and NEUROCDF, we propose a general training methodology for enhancing existing query-driven selectivity models. SECONCDF incorporates the idea of CDF modeling of NEUROCDF into query-driven models by enforcing model **Self-Consistency** with the learned Cumulative Distribution Functions. However, unlike NEUROCDF, SECONCDF keeps the original loss functions (Qerror or RMSE) of existing query-driven models, which allows for good in-distribution generalization with either relative or absolute loss functions. Moreover, the CDF self-consistency training of SECONCDF significantly enhances model OOD generalization ability.

Takeaways from the experiments. Note that the proposed improvement strategies are *orthogonal* to selectivity model architectures, making them applicable to various existing models. Our primary goal is *not* to outperform current SOTA query-driven selectivity learning models, but to validate the practicality of our theory by designing algorithms that improve the OOD generalization capabilities of existing models *with theoretical guarantees*. Thus, we focus our experimental evaluation on aspects in which our strategies are expected to provide improvements, and avoid complex scenarios such as 16-way joins. We leave scaling our approaches to such cases in future work. Indeed, this focused approach has yielded clear, compelling results: across both single- and multi-table datasets, our strategies can *significantly* improve the OOD generalization of existing selectivity learning models, in terms of both estimation accuracy (i.e., smaller Qerror and RMSE) and query running time performance (i.e., lower query latency).

Organization. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. § 2 introduces prior work on query-driven selectivity learning. We introduce definitions, preliminaries, and problem setup in § 3. We then present our new theory that addresses the two aforementioned questions in § 4, followed by two improvement strategies inspired by our theory in § 5 and § 6. We evaluate our algorithms in § 5.5 and § 7, and conclude and discuss future work in § 8.

2 PRIOR WORK

Selectivity estimation dates back to the beginning of query processing [45], where rather than computing intermediate results and then finding query plans [50], System-R instead used histograms and independence assumptions. Such techniques were refined to use queries themselves to compute histograms [6, 14, 33], query expression statistics [13] and adjustments to correlated predicates [37]. More recent *learned data-driven methods* [23, 56] do offline computation over samples of existing database instances, to build a model of correlations, selectivities in the presence of skew, etc. *Learned query-driven database systems* can learn or improve an ML model for a variety of database components, by using the execution log of a query workload [8–10, 32, 55]. More recently, there is active work on workload-aware cardinality predictors [30, 51, 52]. In this paper, we consider several families of selectivity estimation techniques.

Parametric Functions [15]. The very early and simple approach fits a parametric function (such as linear and polynomial) to the observed queries. The parametric function takes the range of a query as the input and outputs the corresponding selectivity estimate.

However, the performance of parametric functions is not as good as more recent approaches due to the limited model capacity.

Histograms [6, 36]. The type of methods (i.e., histograms-based models) is studied intensively in the database literature. Typically, they construct histograms from a query workload either by progressively creating and adjusting bucket frequencies to account for previous errors, or by finding a maximum entropy distribution consistent with the observed queries. Note that histograms-based models make two important assumptions – uniformity assumption (in the same bucket) and independence assumption among columns (or features), which could lead to large estimation errors.

LEO [47]. Intuitively, LEO can be seen as a combination of parametric functions and histograms – it learns the adjustment factors from observed queries to correct incorrect statistics such as histograms. Specifically, LEO collects a set of previous ratios $r = \frac{act_sel}{stat_sel}$ of actual selectivity (act_sel) and statistics estimate ($stat_sel$) from past queries. To estimate an incoming query, LEO uses the ratios to adjust the statistics estimate by multiplying it by a chosen adjustment ratio r . For example, consider a query asks for the range $\{x < 1\}$ and the selectivity estimate of the histogram for the query is $Hist(x < 1)$. LEO produces the adjusted estimate by $adjusted_sel = Hist(x < 1) * r(x < 1)$, where $r(x < 1)$ is the collected adjustment factor at $x = 1$. If there is no adjustment factor for $x = 1$, LEO computes the factor by linear interpolation.

Deep Learning Models [19, 30]. More recently, deep learning models have been proposed to learn the mapping from a query to its selectivity prediction. Deep learning models function as regression models in a way that is similar to parametric functions but has a larger model capacity and much better performance.

3 PRELIMINARIES AND PROBLEM SETUP

In this section, we first introduce basic definitions for selectivity estimation in § 3.1. Next, a brief introduction to measure theory is given in § 3.2 due to its connection with selectivity functions and the significance of signed measures in shaping our theory. Then we formulate the selectivity estimation as a learning problem in § 3.3 and overview the PAC learning framework in § 3.4. Existing theory results in the literature are given in § 3.5, followed by an empirical examination of the probability measure assumption (§ 3.6), which motivates the problem and goals of the paper.

3.1 Selectivity Functions of Range Queries

Range Space. Consider a d -dimensional dataset D . A range space is defined as $\Sigma = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{R})$. \mathcal{X} is a set of objects (e.g., tuples or data points in D). \mathcal{R} is a collection of ranges R , which is a *subset* of \mathcal{X} . For instance, \mathcal{R} can be a set of all d -dimensional hyper-rectangles.

Range Queries. A range query q is defined as a query q that asks for tuples in the range R_q . Thus in this paper a range query q and its querying range R_q are interchangeable. We focus on range selection queries in the paper, which corresponds to d -dimensional hyper-rectangles. Join queries can be viewed as range selection queries over the join result.

Selectivity (Cardinality) Functions. For a dataset D , let P_D be the data probability distribution over D , we define the selectivity functions as $S_D(R) = P_{x \sim P_D}(x \in R)$, or equivalently,

$$S_D(R) = \sum_{x \in R} P_D(x) \quad (1)$$

Another related term is cardinality which is the output size of a range query. Thus the relationship between cardinality $C_D(R)$ and selectivity of a range can be written as $C_D(R) = S_D(R) \cdot |T|$ where $|T|$ is the size of table T . In this paper, we will only focus on selectivity functions as they are fundamentally equivalent.

3.2 Measure Theory

A σ -algebra \mathcal{M} of “measurable” sets is a non-empty collection of subsets of \mathcal{X} closed under complements and countable unions and intersections. For all practical applications, it holds that $\mathcal{M} \supset \mathcal{R}$.

A function $\mu : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a *probability measure* on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M})$ if it satisfies

- C1.** Countable additivity: if E_1, E_2, \dots is a countable family of disjoint sets in \mathcal{M} , then $\mu(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(E_n)$.
- C2.** Positivity: $\mu(E) \geq 0$ for any $E \in \mathcal{M}$.
- C3.** Sum to unity: $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = 1$.

If μ only satisfies **C1** and **C2**, it is called a *measure*; if it only satisfies **C1**, then it is a *signed measure*. A signed measure is essentially the difference of two measures.

Given a signed measure μ , the *total variation* of μ , denoted by $|\mu|$, is defined by $|\mu|(E) = \sup \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\mu(E_n)|$ where the supremum is taken over all partitions of E , that is, over all countable unions $E = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n$, where the sets E_n are disjoint and belong to \mathcal{M} . One can show that the total variation $|\mu|$ of a signed measure μ is itself a measure that satisfies $\mu \leq |\mu|$.

A signed measure μ is said to be *absolutely continuous* with respect to the Lebesgue measure m if $\mu(E) = 0$ whenever $E \in \mathcal{M}$ and $m(E) = 0$. If μ is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, then there exists a *signed density* $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mu(E) = \int_E f(x)dx$ for any $E \in \mathcal{M}$. Specifically, when μ is a probability measure, then f must satisfy $f(x) \geq 0$ for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\int_{\mathcal{X}} f(x)dx = 1$.

A selectivity estimate $\hat{S} : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *induced* by a probability/signed measure if there exists a probability/signed measure, denoted by $\mu_{\hat{S}}$, that satisfies $\hat{S}(R) = \mu_{\hat{S}}(R)$ for all $R \in \mathcal{R}$.

We refer readers to [18] and [46] for details on measure theory.

3.3 ML Models as Selectivity Predictors

We formulate selectivity estimation as a machine learning problem. A learning algorithm or procedure \mathcal{A} learns an ML model M (which predicts the selectivity for a given query) from a set of n training sample $\{z_i = (q_i, w_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ (a collection of observed queries/ranges and their selectivities) by minimizing the mean of loss ℓ over the entire training set. The loss function ℓ can be defined as the squared error on training sample (q_i, w_i) : $\ell = (M(q_i) - w_i)^2$; or ℓ can be defined as the absolute error: $\ell = |M(q_i) - w_i|$. Another error function, Qerror [39] ($\max(\frac{M(q_i)}{w_i}, \frac{w_i}{M(q_i)})$), is commonly used in the literature since it better captures errors on selective queries.

3.4 PAC Learning Framework

Probably Approximately Correct (PAC) learning [27] is a framework for mathematical and rigorous analysis of *in-distribution* (In-Dist) generalization in machine learning. Readers who prefer a simpler explanation may refer to the end of this subsection for an intuitive summary of key concepts used in the paper.

PAC Learnability. In the PAC Learning framework, the learner \mathcal{A} receives a set of training samples $\{z_i = (q_i, w_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ from an unknown distribution $Q(z)$, and selects a hypothesis h (i.e., selectivity function in our scenario) from a hypothesis space \mathcal{H} (i.e., a family/class of selectivity functions in our scenario) that minimizes the empirical risk (training loss). The goal is that, given a sufficient amount of training data, with high probability δ , the chosen selectivity function will have low generalization error ϵ with respect to the distribution $Q(z)$. The learner \mathcal{A} must be able to learn the hypothesis given any arbitrary δ, ϵ , and distribution $Q(z)$.

Vapnik–Chervonenkis (VC) Dimension. The VC dimension is a measure of the size (or complexity) of a class of sets. Within the context of PAC learning of $\{0, 1\}$ -valued functions (or equivalently, classification functions), a family \mathcal{H} of classification functions is said to *shatter* a set of data points if for every assignment of labels to those points, there is a classification function in \mathcal{H} can realize the set of data points and their label assignment. The VC dimension of a \mathcal{H} is the maximum number of data points that can be shattered by \mathcal{H} . Blumer et.al [12] have proven that a $\{0, 1\}$ -valued function class is learnable if and only if its VC dimension is finite.

We can also define the VC-dimension $\text{VC-dim}(\Sigma)$ of a range space Σ to be the size of the largest subset of X that can be shattered by Σ . It is easy to prove that the VC-dimension of a range space of d -dimensional hyper-rectangles is $2d$ [27].

Fat-Shattering Dimension. Kearns and Schapire [26] extended VC-dimension to handle real-valued functions (or regression functions, e.g., selectivity functions) via the notion of fat-shattering dimension. We say that a hypothesis family \mathcal{H} γ -shatters a subset $V \subseteq X$ if there is a witness function $\sigma : V \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that for any possible subset $E \subseteq V$ (which corresponds to a bit sequence), there is a hypothesis/function $H_E \in \mathcal{H}$ that can realize: $H_E(x) \geq \sigma(x) + \gamma, \forall x \in E; H_E(x) \leq \sigma(x) - \gamma, \forall x \in V \setminus E$. We define the γ -fat shattering dimension $\text{fat}_{\mathcal{H}}(\gamma)$ to be the size of the largest subset of X that can be γ -shattered by \mathcal{H} . Kearns and Schapire [26] also proved that a real-valued function family/class is γ -learnable if and only if its γ -fat dimension is finite.

Uniform Convergence. The classical definition of PAC learnability requires an efficient learner \mathcal{A} that chooses the best hypothesis/function on the training set. However, such learners are hard to find for some hypothesis spaces (e.g., neural nets). Fortunately, uniform convergence (or specifically, Chernoff bound [22]) guarantees that if the hypothesis space \mathcal{H} has finite VC (or fat-shattering) dimension, the empirical risk is close to the true risk with high probability for all hypothesis $h \in \mathcal{H}$ provided the training set is sufficiently large. This does not require a learner to find the best hypothesis. This paper adopts this definition of learnability. For more details, see [7].

Limitation of the PAC Learning Framework. While PAC learnability and uniform convergence can be used to quantify the generalization error for hypothesis spaces with finite VC (or fat-shattering) dimension, they are applicable *solely to in-distribution generalization* where both training and test queries are drawn from the same distribution $Q(z)$.

Summary. We present the key concepts in the paper along with intuitive explanations in plain text in Table 1 for easy understanding.

Concept	Intuitive Explanation
Generalization	The model's capability to perform well on unseen queries that are <i>not</i> in the training workload.
Learnability/ In-Dist Generalization	Given sufficient training queries, the model's true error on unseen queries drawn from the <i>same distribution</i> with training queries is close to the training error.
OOD Generalization	Given sufficient training queries, the model's true error on unseen queries drawn from a <i>different distribution</i> from the training set is close to the training error.

Table 1: Key concepts and their intuitive explanations.

3.5 Existing Theoretical Results

For self-containment, in this section, we briefly review the main learnability results of selectivity functions from the literature [24], and point out the important assumptions made by the paper.

Overview of [24]. Since selectivity functions are real-valued, to prove their learnability it suffices to show that their fat-shattering dimension is bounded. Using the same terminology in [24], we cite the main Lemma [24].

LEMMA 3.1. Consider a range space $\Sigma = (X, \mathcal{R})$ and the hypothesis class \mathcal{S} of range functions over input query ranges $R \in \mathcal{R}$. For any $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$, the γ -fat shattering dimension of \mathcal{S} is $\tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\gamma^{\lambda+1}})^1$, where λ is the $\text{VC-dim}(\Sigma)$ of the range space.

Assumption. Note that the proof in [24] relies on an important condition on the hypothesis class: every range function $S \in \mathcal{S}$ is induced by a probability measure via (1). In other words, every $S \in \mathcal{S}$ corresponds to such a probability measure that can be used to define all the outputs (or predictions) of S via (1).




Figure 1: Left: data points and ranges/queries. Right Top: predictions from 4 range functions/models ($S_1 \sim S_4$) on the 4 ranges. Right Bottom: corresponding measures that induce the function predictions.

Example. Figure 1 (left) gives an illustration of three data points (A, B, C) and four possible ranges ($R_{AB}, R_{AC}, R_{BC}, R_{ABC}$), with four range functions and their selectivity predictions on the right. We also show the measures that induce the selectivity predictions of each range function in the bottom-right table. First, using Eq. 1 and basic linear algebra, one can see that S_1 is induced by a proper probability measure (e.g., $P(A) = 0.2, P(B) = 0.3, P(C) = 0.5$). However, this does not hold for the other range functions. Specifically, S_2 does

¹ $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ hides polylogarithm dependencies on $1/\gamma$ for constant λ

not satisfy the additivity constraint: $S_2(R_{AB}) + S_2(R_{AC}) + S_2(R_{BC}) \neq 2 \cdot S_2(R_{ABC})$, which indicates that S_2 cannot be induced by a probability measure or a signed measure. Additionally, S_3, S_4 can only be induced from a *signed* measure — S_3 violates C3 and S_4 violates C2 of a probability measure.

3.6 The Gap Between Theory and Practice

Recall from Section 2 that there are four broad categories of query-driven approaches for learning selectivity functions: (1) linear and polynomial parametric functions, (2) histograms generated at query-time, (3) LEO, which can be seen as a combination of parametric functions and histograms, (4) deep learning models such as Multi-Set Convolutional Network (MSCN) [30]. Among them, deep learning models achieve the best performance in practice. Therefore, in this section, we aim to empirically demonstrate that, the class of models does *not* learn selectivity functions induced by a probability measure, hence does *not* enjoy the theoretical results in § 3.5.

Two necessary conditions. One can show that if a learned selectivity function \hat{S} is induced by a probability measure, its model predictions (or the selectivity function learned) $\hat{S}(R)$ must satisfy **finite additivity** as well as **monotonicity** defined as follows.

- **Finite Additivity.** Countable additivity C1 implies that

$$\hat{S}(R_1) = \hat{S}(R_2) + \hat{S}(R_3) \quad (2)$$

whenever $R_1 = R_2 \cup R_3$ and $R_2 \cap R_3 = \emptyset$.

- **Monotonicity.** Let R_1 and R_2 be two union-compatible ranges over schema Σ , such that $R_1 \subseteq R_2$ for any instance of Σ . We refer to this as a case of *query containment* [5]. Then finite additivity (2) and positivity (C2) imply that $\hat{S}(R_1) \leq \hat{S}(R_2)$.

Empirical evaluation and takeaway. We first generate a collection of training queries (or ranges since each query corresponds to a specific range and vice versa) to train the four models on queries on a synthetic dataset sampled from a 10-dimensional highly correlated Gaussian distribution). After completing the training phase, we generate another set of test queries to test if the trained model obeys the two constraints. Specifically, for the monotonicity constraint, we use a set of test queries to extract the learned CDFs of a column conditional on other columns, and check if the learned CDFs are monotonically increasing. Next, for the finite additivity constraint (2), we generate a set of the range triples $\{(R_1, R_2, R_3)\}$ to check if (2) is satisfied.

We summarize the results in Table 2. Observe that except for histograms, *the learned selectivity functions from practical query-driven methods do not obey either additivity and monotonicity and therefore are not induced by any probability measure.* Unlike histograms (which are data models built from queries), the other three regression-like models essentially learn the direct mapping from query ranges to their selectivities. They are not guaranteed to be induced from probability measures.

Problem Formulation. We have shown that the selectivity functions learned by most query-driven models are not induced by probability measures, rendering the learnability results from previous work [24] inapplicable. Despite this, these models, such as MSCN, exhibit impressive practical performance, outperforming histograms on several benchmark datasets and query workloads [30].

	Parametric Functions	Histograms	LEO	Deep Models
Monotonicity	✗	✓	✗	✗
Additivity	✗	✓	✗	✗

Table 2: Learned selectivity functions from most query-driven methods are not induced by probability measures.

Additionally, the PAC learning framework fails to characterize generalization error for OOD test workloads, which are prevalent in real-world scenarios. Therefore, this paper aims to bridge the gap between theory and practice by

- relaxing the restrictions on the hypothesis class and deriving the corresponding PAC learnability results (**Goal 1**);
- exploring OOD generalization error beyond the PAC learning framework (**Goal 2**);
- leveraging the theoretical results to design new strategies for improving existing selectivity learning models (**Goal 3**).

4 A NEW GENERALIZATION THEORY

In this section, we propose a new generalization theory that addresses the first two goals of the Problem Definition. Note that the proofs in § 4.1 and § 4.2 require advanced knowledge of measure theory and probability theory introduced in § 3. **Readers who prefer a simpler explanation may refer to § 4.3.**

4.1 Learnability Under Signed Measures

We first demonstrate the learnability of the class of selectivity predictors induced by signed measures (*i.e.*, removing restrictions C2 and C3). The results will be applied to NEUROCDF and LEO in Section 5 after showing that their hypothesis classes are indeed induced by signed measures.

4.1.1 Learnability. Given a range space $\Sigma = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{R})$, let \mathcal{S}_{sgn} denote the hypothesis class that consists of all functions $\hat{S} : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that are induced by signed measures absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Recall the definition of $\mu_{\hat{S}}$ in Section 3.2, and define the hypothesis class $\mathcal{S}_{\text{sgn}}(C)$ for any $C \geq 0$ as follows.

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{sgn}}(C) := \{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{sgn}} : |\mu_{\hat{S}}| \leq C\}$$

Theorem 4.1 (In-Distribution Generalization Error Bound). *If $\text{VC-dim}(\Sigma) = \lambda$ where λ is some constant, then the fat-shattering dimension of $\mathcal{S}_{\text{sgn}}(C)$ is finite and satisfies:*

$$\text{fat}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{sgn}}(C); \gamma) = \tilde{O}\left(C \cdot (1/\gamma)^{\lambda+1}\right) \quad (3)$$

Then given n training queries, we have that with probability $1 - \delta$, for all learned selectivity predictors $S \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{sgn}}(C)$,

$$\text{er}(\hat{S}) \leq \text{er}^{\text{train}}(\hat{S}) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2n} (\ln \text{fat}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{sgn}}(C); \gamma) + \ln \frac{1}{\delta})} \quad (4)$$

PROOF. Without loss of generality, assume $C = 1$ since the general case follows from scaling. Set $\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{S}_{\text{sgn}}(1)$ to be the hypothesis class. Following [24], let $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{R}$ be a subset γ -shattered by \mathcal{S}

and partition \mathcal{T} based on the values of witnesses $\sigma(R)$:

$$\mathcal{T}_j = \{R \in \mathcal{T} : \sigma(R) \in [(j-1) \cdot \gamma, j \cdot \gamma]\}$$

for $j = -\lceil 1/\gamma \rceil, -\lceil 1/\gamma \rceil + 1, \dots, 0, \dots, \lceil 1/\gamma \rceil - 1, \lceil 1/\gamma \rceil$. Let $k_j := \lfloor \mathcal{T}_j \rfloor$.

First, Lemma 2.4 in [24] implies that there is an ordering of ranges in \mathcal{T}_j , denoted by $\pi_j = \langle R_1, \dots, R_{k_j} \rangle$, such that for any probability distribution D on \mathcal{X} , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim D} I_x = O\left(k_j^{1-1/\lambda} \log k_j\right) \quad (5)$$

where $I_x = \sum_{i=1}^{k_j-1} I_{i,x}$ and $I_{i,x} = \mathbb{1}(x \in R_i \oplus R_{i+1})$, \oplus being the set symmetric difference.

Next, define the subset $E_j = \{R_{2i} \mid 1 \leq i \leq \lfloor k_j/2 \rfloor\}$. One can check that Lemma 2.2 in [24] still holds and ensures the existence of some $\hat{S}_j \in \mathcal{S}$ such that for any pair $R \in E_j$ and $R' \in \mathcal{T}_j \setminus E_j$, we have

$$\hat{S}_j(R) - \hat{S}_j(R') > \gamma \quad (6)$$

With \hat{S}_j in hand, we define Δ_j according to whether k_j is odd or even as follows.

k_j is odd:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_j := & (\hat{S}_j(R_2) - \hat{S}_j(R_1)) + (\hat{S}_j(R_2) - \hat{S}_j(R_3)) + \dots + \\ & (\hat{S}_j(R_{k_j-1}) - \hat{S}_j(R_{k_j-2})) + (\hat{S}_j(R_{k_j-1}) - \hat{S}_j(R_{k_j})) \end{aligned}$$

k_j is even:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_j := & (\hat{S}_j(R_2) - \hat{S}_j(R_1)) + (\hat{S}_j(R_2) - \hat{S}_j(R_3)) + \dots + \\ & (\hat{S}_j(R_{k_j-2}) - \hat{S}_j(R_{k_j-3})) + (\hat{S}_j(R_{k_j-2}) - \hat{S}_j(R_{k_j-1})) + \\ & (\hat{S}_j(R_{k_j}) - \hat{S}_j(R_{k_j-1})) \end{aligned}$$

By definition of Δ_j above and (6), one has

$$\Delta_j \geq (k_j - 1)\gamma \quad (7)$$

Since \hat{S}_j is induced by a signed measure $\mu_{\hat{S}_j}$, denote by \hat{f}_j the signed density of $\mu_{\hat{S}_j}$. Then one can show that $|\hat{f}_j|$ is the density of $|\mu_{\hat{S}_j}|$ and that $|\hat{f}_j|/(|\mu_{\hat{S}_j}|(\mathcal{X}))$ is the density of the probability measure $|\mu_{\hat{S}_j}|/(|\mu_{\hat{S}_j}|(\mathcal{X}))$ on \mathcal{X} . Therefore, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_j & \leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} |\hat{f}_j(x)| I_x dx \\ & = |\mu_{\hat{S}_j}|(\mathcal{X}) \cdot \int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{|\hat{f}_j(x)|}{|\mu_{\hat{S}_j}|(\mathcal{X})} \cdot I_x dx \\ & \stackrel{(i)}{=} O\left(k_j^{1-1/\lambda} \log k_j\right) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Here (i) follows from (5) and the assumption that $C = 1$.

Finally, similar to [24], one can combine (7) and (8) to show that $k_j = \tilde{O}\left((1/\gamma)^\lambda\right)$ and $|\mathcal{T}| = \tilde{O}\left((1/\gamma)^{\lambda+1}\right)$. The proof is then complete. \square

4.1.2 Remark. Although the proof of learnability under signed measures is a natural extension of prior work [24], the result is crucial for developing a *practical* theory. It applies to a broader array of selectivity predictors beyond the probability measures used previously [24] (will be introduced in §5). Additionally, as will be presented in §4.2, under mild assumptions, these predictors can be shown to have bounded OOD generalization error. This means we

can predict their performance even when the test workload comes from a different distribution than the training workload, a common scenario in practice. **Moreover, it is important to note that proving OOD generalization is challenging, as it falls outside the scope of the PAC learning framework. Therefore, existing results (e.g., fat-shattering dimension and results in [24]) within the PAC learning framework cannot be reused.**

4.2 OOD Generalization Error

In this section, we target the second goal in Problem Definition – OOD generalization error beyond the PAC learning framework. **The main results appear in the callout for Theorem 4.2.**

The Theorem shows that under the realizable assumption, whenever a predictor \hat{S} is trained to (ϵ, δ) -learn using n i.i.d. samples from a training distribution Q , its generalization error on a different testing distribution P is automatically bounded above by $C\sqrt{\epsilon}$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for some constant C , assuming that Assumptions 4.1 through 4.3, as introduced later in Section 4.2.1, hold. As will be introduced in § 5, this result will theoretically demonstrate the potential advantage of modeling CDFs over selectivities in terms of out-of-distribution generalization error.

The assumptions are relatively mild. Intuitively, Assumption 4.1 requires only that \hat{S} is bounded and that the densities exist; Assumption 4.2 stipulates that the region covered by the testing distribution P must be contained within the region covered by the training distribution Q ; and Assumption 4.3 essentially requires sufficient diversity in the training ranges.

4.2.1 Theoretical Results. It is important to note that one cannot expect an algorithm trained on a distribution Q to generalize well to an arbitrary testing distribution P . To ensure provable robust generalization, we impose the following assumptions.

ASSUMPTION 4.1. *The learned selectivity \hat{S} is bounded such that there exists a constant C_1 for which $|\hat{S}(R)| \leq C_1$ for any $R \in \mathcal{R}$.*

Before proceeding, we introduce some additional notations. Let $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. We use Q and P to denote the training and testing distribution of $Z = (R, W) \in \mathcal{Z}$, respectively. Given the training distribution Q , let Q_R be the marginal distribution of R and define $\mathcal{X}_Q := \bigcup_{R \in \text{supp } Q_R} R$, which is a subset of \mathcal{X} . The marginal distribution P_R and the set \mathcal{X}_P are defined similarly for the testing distribution. With these notations established, we now introduce Assumption 4.2 and 4.3.

ASSUMPTION 4.2. *There exists a constant C_2 such that the marginal training and testing distributions Q_R and P_R satisfy*

$$P_{R \sim P_R}[x \in R] \leq C_2 \cdot P_{R \sim Q_R}[x \in R], \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Remark. Assumption 4.2 requires that the probability $P_{R \sim P_R}[x \in R]$, which represents the likelihood of x being sampled during testing, is upper-bounded by the probability $P_{R \sim Q_R}[x \in R]$, the likelihood of x being sampled during training, multiplied by some constant C_2 . An direct consequence of this assumption is that $\mathcal{X}_P \subset \mathcal{X}_Q$. This assumption is motivated by the observation that if the testing region \mathcal{X}_P includes some x that is not covered by any range during training, then one cannot expect to learn the selectivity around x accurately.

ASSUMPTION 4.3. *The true S_D and the learned selectivity \hat{S} are induced by signed measures that are absolutely continuous, with corresponding signed densities f_D, \hat{f} . Additionally, there exists a constant $c_3 > 0$ such that the marginal training distribution Q_R and the signed density \hat{f} satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{R \sim Q_R} \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} (\hat{f}(x) - f_D(x)) \mathbb{1}(x \in R) dx \right| \\ & \geq c_3 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{R \sim Q_R} \int_{\mathcal{X}} |\hat{f}(x) - f_D(x)| \mathbb{1}(x \in R) dx \end{aligned}$$

Remark. Assumption 4.3 relies on the validity of interchanging the order of integration and the absolute value. Intuitively, this assumption requires that the training distribution Q_R covers a diverse set of ranges rather than focusing on those ranges where the error $\hat{S}(R) - S_D(R)$ happens to be relatively small. A simple example illustrating a situation where Assumption 4.3 holds is provided below in Example 4.1.

EXAMPLE 4.1. *For $\mathcal{X} = [-1/2, 1/2]$, suppose the densities f_D and \hat{f} are defined as $f_D(x) = 1$ and $\hat{f}(x) = 1 + 2\delta_n x$, where δ_n is a parameter that quantifies how well \hat{f} approximates f_D . If the training distribution Q_R is uniformly distributed over intervals of length $1/4$ with centers located within the range $[-3/8, 3/8]$, then it can be verified by direct computation that Assumption 4.3 is satisfied with $c_3 = 1/2$ for any value of δ_n .*

Now, we are ready to present our OOD generalization error bound:

Theorem 4.2 (OOD Generalization Error Bound). *Suppose Assumption 4.1-4.3 hold. In addition, if the in-distribution generalization error of \hat{S} can be bounded by*

$$P_{Z_1^n \sim Q^{\otimes n}} [\text{er}_Q(\hat{S}) < \epsilon] \geq 1 - \delta \quad (9)$$

then the out-of-distribution generalization error $\text{er}_P(\hat{S})$ satisfies

$$P_{Z_1^n \sim Q^{\otimes n}} \left[\text{er}_P(\hat{S}) < \frac{(C_1 + 1)C_2}{c_3} \sqrt{\epsilon} \right] \geq 1 - \delta \quad (10)$$

To better understand the proof, consider the following sequence of inequalities:

$$\text{er}_P(\hat{S}) \stackrel{(a)}{\lesssim} \mathbb{E}_{R \sim P_R} |\hat{S}(R) - S_D(R)| \stackrel{(b)}{\lesssim} \mathbb{E}_{R \sim Q_R} |\hat{S}(R) - S_D(R)| \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} [\text{er}_Q(\hat{S})]^{1/2}$$

Here $a_n \lesssim b_n$ means $a_n = O(b_n)$. Step (a) follows from the upper-bound Assumption 4.1; (b) involves a change of measure from P_R to Q_R and connects through Assumptions 4.2 and 4.3; and (c) is based on the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality. The complete proof provides a detailed justification for each of these inequalities.

PROOF. To bound $\text{er}_P(\hat{S})$ in (10), note that one has

$$\begin{aligned} \text{er}_P(\hat{S}) &= \mathbb{E}_{R \sim P_R} (\hat{S}(R) - S_D(R))^2 \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} (C_1 + 1) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{R \sim P_R} |\hat{S}(R) - S_D(R)| \\ &\leq (C_1 + 1) \cdot \int_{\mathcal{X}} |\hat{f}(x) - f_D(x)| \cdot \left[\mathbb{E}_{R \sim P_R} \mathbb{1}(x \in R) \right] \cdot dx \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} (C_1 + 1) \cdot C_2 \underbrace{\int_{\mathcal{X}} |\hat{f}(x) - f_D(x)| \cdot \left[\mathbb{E}_{R \sim Q_R} \mathbb{1}(x \in R) \right] \cdot dx}_{(I)} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Here (i) follows from Assumption 4.1; (ii) is due to Assumption 4.2. Meanwhile, one can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} (I) &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{R \sim Q_R} \int_{\mathcal{X}} |\hat{f}(x) - f_D(x)| \mathbb{1}(x \in R) dx \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} c_3^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{R \sim Q_R} \int_{\mathcal{X}} (\hat{f}(x) - f_D(x)) \mathbb{1}(x \in R) dx \\ &= c_3^{-1} \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{R \sim Q_R} |\hat{S}(R) - S_D(R)|}_{(II)} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Here (i) follows from the Fubini's theorem, and (ii) is a result of Assumption 4.3.

Note that the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality implies that

$$(II) \leq \left[\mathbb{E}_{R \sim Q_R} (\hat{S}(R) - S_D(R))^2 \right]^{1/2} = [\text{er}_Q(\hat{S})]^{1/2}$$

Combine the above inequality with (9) implies

$$P \{ (II) < \sqrt{\epsilon} \} \geq 1 - \delta \quad (13)$$

Finally, combining (11), (12) and (13) gives (10). \square

4.2.2 OOD Scenarios. We define two OOD scenarios which naturally arise in real-world applications along with examples.

Scenario 1: Query Center Move refers to a shift in the predominant focus of queries, characterized by a change in the attribute values around which the queries are *concentrated*.

EXAMPLE 4.2 (CENTER MOVE). $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}$. Both training and test distribution Q_R, P_R are supported on intervals of length 2. For training distribution Q_R , the center of the interval is uniform on $[0, 1] \cup [1, 2]$ while for test distribution P_R , the center of the interval is uniform on $[1, 2]$. One can check that Assumption 4.2 holds with $C_2 = 2$.

Scenario 2: Query Granularity Shift refers to a change in the granularity of query selection predicates. Granularity pertains to the *specificity* or *broadness* of the data subsets accessed by queries.

EXAMPLE 4.3 (GRANULARITY SHIFT). $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}$. The training distribution Q_R is supported on intervals of fixed length 1 with center uniformly distributed on $[-2, 3]$, while the test distribution P_R is supported on intervals of fixed length 2 with center uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$. One can check that Assumption 4.2 holds with $C_2 = 5$.

4.3 Summary and Discussion

Combining the results from § 4.1 and § 4.2:

Summary of our results: If a selectivity learning model is induced by a *signed measure* and trained on a sufficient number of queries, it achieves both *bounded* in-distribution generalization error (when training and test queries are from the same distribution) and *bounded* out-of-distribution (OOD) generalization error (when training and test queries come from different distributions) under mild assumptions (Assumption 4.1-4.3).

The summary provides insights for designing improvement strategies for query-driven models: if we can show a class of selectivity learning models that are *provably* induced by signed measures, then the favorable in-distribution (Theorem 4.1) and OOD (Theorem 4.2) generalization results are immediately applicable.

5 MODELING CDFS WITH NEURAL NETS

Building on the insights in § 4.3, this section introduces the first strategy for enhancing query-driven selectivity learning models. We first consider this question: is it feasible to design a selectivity estimation paradigm that works well in practice *and* inherits our theoretical guarantees? Unfortunately, this is not easy. Although existing approaches developed from SOTA theory [24] achieve SOTA results *among selectivity predictors that are induced by probability measures*, they are not as effective (experimentally shown in § 7) as recent deep learning-based models in practice due to the limited model capacities of models induced by probability measures.

On the other hand, deep learning models, while lacking comprehensive theoretical backing, demonstrate remarkable efficacy in practice. Often, deep models can achieve both very small training and test errors when queries are drawn from the same distribution, which cannot be fully explained by existing theories like the PAC framework. This aligns with extensive well-known empirical evidence in the ML literature (see [57] for an overview).

Therefore, an ambitious goal is to combine the theoretical results from previous sections and the practicality of neural nets, so that the new selectivity estimation paradigm enjoys both theoretical guarantees and practical utility. In pursuit of this, we propose a novel selectivity estimation paradigm/framework, NEUROCDF.

5.1 Overview

High-Level Idea. NEUROCDF leverages the fact *that the selectivity of a rectangular query can be computed as a linear combination of the CDFs evaluated at its vertices.* (will be discussed in § 5.2). CDFs, in statistical terms, measure the probability that a random variable takes a value less than or equal to a specific point. Therefore, the key idea of NEUROCDF is that, instead of directly modeling the ultimate selectivities of input queries, *we use a neural network as the model to parameterize the underlying CDFs.* The query selectivity can be estimated by multiple calls to the *CDFs prediction model* \mathcal{M} and aggregating the results, as shown in Figure 2.

Why NEUROCDF? NEUROCDF combines the empirical strengths of neural nets with the theoretical guarantees of the CDF modeling paradigm. First, neural nets are known for achieving very low training error [20] due to their high model capacity. Second, as we will show in this section, our theory, which bounds both in-distribution




Figure 2: Left: relationship between a rectangle query and CDFs; Right: direct selectivity modeling v.s. NEUROCDF.

and OOD generalization errors, specifically apply to the CDF modeling paradigm used by NEUROCDF. This is because NEUROCDF, through its CDF modeling, is induced by signed measures — an advantage not present in methods that directly model selectivities.

Note that NEUROCDF does not offer generalization theories for neural networks *per se*, but it leverages their empirical success (e.g., low training error) alongside the formal guarantees of the CDF modeling paradigm permitted by our theory.

Model Choice for CDFs Prediction. In an n -dimensional data space, the input to NEUROCDF is a vector $[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^T$ of a real value variable \mathbf{x} , and the model output is estimated cumulative distribution function $\hat{F}(\mathbf{x}) = \hat{P}(X \leq \mathbf{x})$. As discussed before, NEUROCDF improves upon existing NN-based query-driven selectivity models, it can incorporate any query-driven model architecture by viewing the input vector as a query (i.e., we can turn every CDF into a one-sided query). For example, $F(b_1, b_2)$ can be viewed as a legitimate query $q : \{(x_1 \leq b_1) \wedge (x_2 \leq b_2)\}$. Thus, possible model choices include Multi-Set Convolution Networks [30], MLP with flattened query encoding [19], or more recent NN models [32, 43, 48].

5.2 Converting Queries to CDFs

Consider the case of 2-dimensional data shown in Figure 2 (left), one can verify that the selectivity of a query $q : \{(a_1 < x_1 \leq b_1) \wedge (a_2 < x_2 \leq b_2)\}$ (represented by the rectangle in blue) can be computed by aggregating the CDF values at the four vertices of the query rectangle,

$$S(q) = F(b_1, b_2) - F(a_1, b_2) - F(b_1, a_2) + F(a_1, a_2).$$

We can extend the formula to the general case of n -dimensional data, which is provided on page 197 of the book [18]. Let q be any range query (of hyper-rectangle) in the n dimensional space, i.e., $q = (a_1, b_1] \times \dots \times (a_n, b_n]$, and let V be the vertices of the hyper-rectangle representing query q , i.e., $V = \{a_1, b_1\} \times \dots \times \{a_n, b_n\}$. For any vertex $v \in V$, define $\#a(v)$ to be the number of a 's in v . In other words, $\#a(v)$ indicates how many left ends v contains. For example, in Figure 2 (left), $\#a([a_1, b_2]) = 1$. Then, for self-containment, we cite the general case formula as follows.

Theorem 5.1. Let $\text{sgn}(v) = (-1)^{\#a(v)}$. The selectivity of range query q in the n dimensional space can be computed by the aggregation of the CDF values at all vertices of the query hyper-rectangle using the

below formula,

$$S(q) = \sum_{v \in V} \text{sgn}(v)F(v) \quad (14)$$

PROOF SKETCH. This is a direct application of the inclusion-exclusion principle [44]. Readers may also refer to page 36 of the book [18] for more details. \square

5.3 Training and Using NEUROCDF

Training NEUROCDF from Queries. Training of NEUROCDF follows the forward- and backward-propagation paradigm of neural networks, with a minor variation. Traditional query-driven models directly predict the query selectivity using only one forward pass. In contrast, NEUROCDF needs to make *multiple* forward passes to the CDFs prediction model \mathcal{M} to obtain the selectivity estimate, as shown in Figure 2 (right). Specifically, each query q is converted into a set of CDFs, $F(v)$, at each vertex v of q . NEUROCDF then estimates the (necessary) values of CDFs, $F(v)$ using \mathcal{M} . The ultimate selectivity prediction $\hat{S}(q)$ is estimated via (14), which is used to compute the loss function, Mean Squared Error (MSE = $(\hat{S}(q) - S(q))^2$). The backward pass of NEUROCDF can be done by backpropagation and stochastic gradient descent (SGD) since the entire computation steps are *differentiable*.

Using NEUROCDF. Once trained, NEUROCDF can process incoming queries by executing multiple model calls and aggregating these results, mirroring the model’s forward pass during training.

Efficiency. One can prove the below theorem for NEUROCDF.

Theorem 5.2. *The number of calls to the CDFs prediction model \mathcal{M} for estimating a query selectivity is 2^{n_c} , where n_c is the number of columns involved in the query.*

PROOF. Any vertex v of the query’s hyper-rectangle has either 0 or 1 at columns that are not involved in the query. By the definition of CDFs, if any column value of v is 0, it directly implies $F(v) = 0$, eliminating the need for CDF estimations. Consequently, those CDFs requiring estimates from \mathcal{M} will always have their unqueried column values set to 1. Hence, the number of $F(v)$ requiring \mathcal{M} ’s estimates is 2^{n_c} , where n_c is the number of columns involved in the query. \square

5.4 Theoretical Analysis

Next, we prove that NEUROCDF, as a framework, is induced by a signed measure due to its CDF modeling paradigm. *This connects NEUROCDF to the two theoretical results in previous sections.* Surprisingly, this property applies to LEO as well.

Theorem 5.3. *Suppose \mathcal{R} consists of axis-aligned hyper-rectangles. Given a function $\hat{S} : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, suppose there exists a function $F_{\hat{S}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $R \in \mathcal{R}$, $\hat{S}(R) = \sum_{v \in V_R} \text{sgn}(v)F_{\hat{S}}(v)$ where V_R is the vertex set of R . Then \hat{S} is induced by a signed measure.*

PROOF SKETCH. This can be shown by a simple modification of the proof of Theorem 1.1.11 in [18]. \square

COROLLARY 5.4. *All predictions from NEUROCDF and LEO are induced by signed measures.*

PROOF SKETCH. One can directly check that NEUROCDF satisfies the assumptions in Theorem 5.3. The assumptions also hold for LEO by noticing that $\hat{F}_{LEO}(x) = F_{\text{hist}}(x) \cdot g_{\text{adjust}}(x)$, where $F_{\text{hist}}(x)$ is the CDFs modeled by the histograms that LEO works on, and $g_{\text{adjust}}(x)$ is the collected adjustment factor at x . The theorem then follows by applying Theorem 5.3 and Corollary 5.4. \square

With Corollary 5.4 in place, let $\mathcal{S}_{\text{NEUROCDF}}$ and \mathcal{S}_{LEO} denote the hypothesis class of NEUROCDF and LEO when the inducing signed measures are all absolute continuous. Then the learnability results for NEUROCDF and LEO are given as follows.

Theorem 5.5. *Let $\Sigma = (X, \mathcal{R})$ be a range space. If $\text{VC-dim}(\Sigma) = \lambda$ where λ is some constant, then the fat-shattering dimension of \mathcal{S} is finite and satisfies: $\text{fat}(\mathcal{S}; \gamma) = \tilde{O}((1/\gamma)^{\lambda+1})$ for any $\mathcal{S} \in \{\mathcal{S}_{\text{NEUROCDF}}, \mathcal{S}_{LEO}\}$.*

PROOF SKETCH. One can show that the predictions of NEUROCDF and LEO are bounded, and hence $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{S}_{\text{sgn}}(C)$ for some constant C . Then the theorem follows by applying Theorem 4.1. \square

Limitation of NEUROCDF. For now, NEUROCDF is not compatible with Qerror (e.g., $\max(\hat{S}(q)/S(q), \hat{S}(q)/S(q))$ or Mean Squared Logarithmic Error (e.g., $\text{MSLE} = (\log \hat{S}(q) - \log S(q))^2$, which is equivalent to optimizing Qerror). This is because NEUROCDF may produce negative selectivity estimates to which Qerror is not applicable, since the NN model may not learn valid CDFs. For example, the learned CDFs may fail to learn a monotonically increasing function, which is a basic property of CDFs and could cause the estimates from (14) to be negative. We attempted to address this issue by clipping negative estimates to a small value (e.g., $1/|T|$) or enforcing monotonicity in the model [34]. Unfortunately, we observed significant performance degradation in practice since 1) the clipping is not differentiable so the model learns nothing from queries whose estimates are clipped; 2) the enforcement of monotonicity would reduce model capacity and introduce noises into training. We leave training NEUROCDF with Qerror as future work.

5.5 Preliminary Evaluation of NEUROCDF

Model	In-Dis Generalization		OOD Generalization	
	RMSE	Qerror	RMSE	Qerror
LW-NN	★☆	★★	☆☆	☆☆
MSCN	★☆	★★	☆☆	☆☆
NEUROCDF (LW-NN)	★★	★☆	★☆	★★
NEUROCDF (MSCN)	★★	★☆	★☆	★★

Table 3: Generalization performance of different models

We implement it with LW-NN [19] and MSCN [30] to validate our improvement strategy (*i.e.*, *CDF modeling*). Despite that NEUROCDF is not compatible with Qerror, a major loss function used in recent query-driven models, we observe significant improvement in OOD generalization on both models, which further inspires us to design a more general improvement strategy in the next section.

Experimental Setups. We use the same experimental setting in § 3.6. Moreover, we use two types (In-distribution and OOD) of test queries to assess the model generalization capabilities.

NEUROCDF v.s. Direct Selectivity Modeling? We summarize the generalization performance of different models w.r.t two popular measures (RMSE and Qerror) in Table 3. We define three qualitative levels of generalization performance on test sets – (★★): $RMSE < 0.05$ or median Qerror < 2 ; (★☆): $0.05 < RMSE < 0.2$ or $2 < \text{median Qerror} < 10$; (☆☆): $RMSE > 0.2$ or median Qerror > 10 . From the table, we observe two important findings.

F1. It is not surprising to see all four models achieve very good in-distribution generalization performance w.r.t the metric they are optimized for. Specifically, both LW-NN and MSCN are optimized for Qerror, but after using the NEUROCDF paradigm, they are optimized for RMSE.

F2. LW-NN and MSCN perform poorly on OOD queries both in terms of Qerror and RMSE. More importantly, NEUROCDF can help them achieve much better OOD generalization performance even with Qerror. This matches the theoretical results regarding OOD generalization error in § 4.2, and more importantly, inspires us to explore the idea of CDF modeling using a bigger picture, as we will show in the next section.

6 TRAINING WITH CDF SELF-CONSISTENCY

Motivated by the theoretical results and the limitation observed in NEUROCDF, this section introduces a new training framework, SECONCDF, for query-driven selectivity models.

6.1 High-level Idea

In the previous section, we noted that direct query selectivity modeling is effective for in-distribution generalization with respect to arbitrary measures or loss functions. However, the CDF modeling paradigm used in NEUROCDF provides superior OOD generalization but does not support arbitrary loss functions, such as Qerror. This raises a key question: *Can we combine the advantages of direct query selectivity modeling and CDF modeling to achieve both strong in-distribution generalization with arbitrary loss functions and improved OOD generalization?*

Recall that the CDF modeling paradigm imposes a *hard* constraint on a signed measure, ensuring that *all* predictions from NEUROCDF are *coherently* derived from a signed measure. However, this approach is limited by its incompatibility with arbitrary loss functions due to the possibility of negative outputs. SECONCDF seeks to address this limitation by employing direct query selectivity modeling and introducing a *soft* constraint on the signed measure, as opposed to the *hard* constraint used in NEUROCDF.

We implement the *soft* constraint through *CDF self-consistency regularization* into the training process. We again leverage the fundamental fact that every CDF represents a one-sided rectangle query. By extracting the CDFs learned by the selectivity model \mathcal{M} through these one-sided CDF queries, we can ensure that the CDFs are consistent with the model’s predictions on any queries through loss functions. The intuition is that if the model’s predictions align with the CDFs learned by the model across *all* possible queries, the model can be considered to be induced by a signed measure. This approach allows the model to leverage the strengths of both paradigms, enabling robust OOD generalization while maintaining flexibility with arbitrary loss functions.

6.2 CDF Self-Consistency Regularization




Figure 3: Training a selectivity model \mathcal{M} with SECONCDF.

Workflow. Figure 3 presents the workflow of training a selectivity model \mathcal{M} with SECONCDF. In each batch, SECONCDF calculates the loss value for the query batch and back-propagates the loss to compute the gradients and update the model weights. The final loss comprises of three components. First, SECONCDF maintains \mathcal{M} ’s original prediction loss (Qerror, or equivalently, MSLE) calculated from the query workload.

Additionally, SECONCDF introduces two additional losses – **CDF prediction loss** $\mathcal{L}_{CDFPred}$ and **consistency loss** $\mathcal{L}_{Consistent}$. These two regularization losses serve as the key to incorporating CDF self-consistency regularization into the query selectivity model. Hence, the final loss is defined as

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{OriPred} + \omega_1 \mathcal{L}_{CDFPred} + \omega_2 \mathcal{L}_{Consistent}, \quad (15)$$

where ω_1, ω_2 are hyper-parameters controlling the balance among the three losses. We empirically tune them from four candidate values $\{0.1, 1, 10, 100\}$.

CDF Prediction Loss. For each query q in the training workload, the CDF prediction loss is computed using the same procedure of NEUROCDF. Specifically, SECONCDF converts the query into a set of CDFs that require estimation. SECONCDF then turns them into the corresponding one-sided queries and obtains the predictions from the query selectivity model. The final prediction is computed by following (14), and $\mathcal{L}_{CDFPred}$ is defined as the RMSE between the prediction from learned CDFs and the true label. This forces the model \mathcal{M} to learn the underlying CDFs from the *training workload*, aside from the direct mapping from queries to selectivities.

Consistency Loss. The consistency loss begins with a query generator that samples queries from a distribution. In this paper, we use random sampling, but other sampling methods can also be applied within the SECONCDF framework. The purpose of the consistency loss is to ensure that the model’s predictions are consistent with the CDFs extracted from the model itself across a wide range of queries. By enforcing this consistency, the loss helps align the model’s predictions with the learned CDFs.

Remark. SECONCDF does not change the model architecture or inference procedure of the model \mathcal{M} . Additionally, computing the two losses does not require true cardinalities for any queries or CDFs, and the additional computational cost is much more efficient than running actual queries on a DBMS.

7 EXPERIMENTS OF SECONCDF

In this section, we implement SECONCDF and integrate it into two recent deep learning-based query-driven proposals – LW-NN [19]

and MSCN [30]. Both models utilize an MLP as the learning framework; however, they adopt distinct methodologies for query encoding. LW-NN employs a flattened query encoding mechanism, while MSCN stands for multi-set convolutional network. We aim to answer three research questions as follows. 1) While existing query-driven models perform well for in-distribution generalization, are they robust to OOD generalization? 2) Can SECONCDF improve their OOD generalization performance while maintaining their in-distribution performance, in terms of both prediction accuracy and query latency performance? Note that while we implement SECONCDF with two query-driven models, it is general and applicable to any loss-based deep learning models.

7.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets. We conducted experiments using one single-table dataset, Census, and two multi-table datasets: IMDb [31] and DSB [17]. The Census dataset comprises the basic population characteristics in US, with approximately 49K tuples across 13 attributes. We use this single-table dataset for prediction accuracy experiments since a few relevant approaches (as will be introduced later) only support single-table queries. The IMDb dataset is derived from the Internet Movie Database. Previous studies [31] show that IMDb is highly correlated and skewed. The DSB dataset serves as an extension of the TPC-DS benchmark [42], characterized by more complex data distributions and demanding query templates. We populated a 50GB DSB database using the default physical design configuration. Our analyses primarily focused on star joins, which involve 6 and 5 relations in the IMDb and DSB datasets, respectively.

Workloads. Since the primary goal of this section is to assess both the in-distribution (In-Dis) and OOD generalization capabilities of query-driven models, we focus on the two OOD scenarios as outlined in § 4.2.2. Specifically, in each OOD scenario, models are trained on queries drawn from a specific query distribution, and then their performance is evaluated in two aspects: first, on unseen queries from the same distribution to assess In-Dis generalization; and second, on unseen queries from a different distribution to evaluate OOD generalization. To generate such workloads, for each dataset, we initially create a set of candidate queries. For the IMDb dataset, we directly leverage the training queries from [28] with up to 5 joins and diversified join graphs. For DSB and Census, we sample candidate queries by randomly sampling join graphs (for DSB), the number of filters, and triples of $\langle \text{attribute, operator (from } \{\leq, =, \geq\}), \text{literal} \rangle$ sequentially. After this, we obtained 50K, 60K, and 70K candidate queries for Census, DSB, and IMDb, respectively. From the candidate queries, we can simulate training and test workloads for both two OOD scenarios.

To simulate out-of-distribution (OOD) scenarios, we designate a 'shifting attribute' a , for each dataset: age for the Census dataset, $t.production_year$ for IMDb, and $ss.ss_list_price$ for the DSB dataset. Although these attributes are not fixed, varying them does not alter the observed trends. In both OOD scenarios, models are trained on queries with the attribute a normalized within specific bounds (c_a for query centers and l_a for range lengths). For in-distribution (In-Dis) generalization, models are evaluated on queries matching training conditions. For OOD generalization, they are tested on queries where c_a or l_a falls outside these bounds. We ensure that training and test queries are kept strictly non-overlapping.

Compared Approaches. We implemented LW-NN [19] ourselves as no open-source code is available. For MSCN, we used the code from [3]. We evaluate MSCN and LW-NN trained with SECONCDF, referred to as MSCN+CDF and LW-NN+CDF. We also include two query-driven approaches, PtsHist and QuadHist, which are based on SOTA theory [24], to demonstrate the limitations of the PAC-learning framework. We directly use the code from the authors [4]. Additionally, we include QUICKSEL [41] in our comparison. The three query-driven models are induced from *probability measures* where our OOD generalization result (Thm 4.2) is also applicable. For data-driven approaches, we use PostgreSQL (multi-dimensional histograms) and uniform sampling (Sampling) as baselines. We do not include other data-driven approaches since this paper focuses on query-driven models. Note that PtsHist, QuadHist, QUICKSEL, and the LW-NN we implemented do not support joins, so we evaluate them on the single-table Census dataset. For a fair comparison, we exclude data information (e.g., bitmaps) from LW-NN or MSCN, since the query-driven models only utilize query information. We turn on the bitmaps in multi-table experiments.

It is important to note that the goal of the experiments is *not* to beat the SOTA query-driven models but to validate the *practicality* of our theory. Specifically, we aim to show that SECONCDF, which is designed based on our theory, *reliably* improves upon existing NN-based query-driven models, and *consistently* outperforms the models derived from SOTA theory.

Evaluation Metrics. For prediction accuracy, we use both Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) and Qerror as the metrics. While our generalization results assume absolute error as the loss function, we also evaluate Qerror (which is considered more critical in query optimization [39]) to demonstrate the effectiveness of SECONCDF. For query latency performance, we report the query running time.

Hardware. We train all deep learning models on an Amazon SageMaker ml.g4dn.xlarge node, and perform end-to-end performance experiments on an EC2 r5d.2xlarge node (8 core CPUs, 3.1GHz, 64G memory) for the IMDb dataset and on an EC2 c5.9xlarge node (36 core CPUs, 3.1GHz, 72G memory) for the DSB dataset.

7.2 Accuracy




Figure 4: Accuracy on Census with granularity shifts.

Figure 4 and Table 4 present the prediction accuracy on single-table and multi-table datasets, respectively. First, deep query-driven models (MSCN and LW-NN) demonstrate superior performance for In-Dis generalization across all datasets and consistently outperform all compared data-driven approaches on multi-table datasets.

Model	Multi-table Dataset: IMDb ; OOD Scenario: Query Center Move						Multi-table Dataset: IMDb ; OOD Scenario: Query Granularity Shift					
	In-Distribution Generalization			OOD Generalization			In-Distribution Generalization			OOD Generalization		
	RMSE	Q-err - Med.	Q-err - 90	RMSE	Q-err - Med.	Q-err - 90	RMSE	Q-err - Med.	Q-err - 90	RMSE	Q-err - Med.	Q-err - 90
PostgreSQL	0.042	6.3	669	0.086	4.2	549	0.045	6.1	921	0.124	3.7	297
Sampling	0.175	31	2513	0.196	35	1951	0.180	29	3536	0.197	21	3152
MSCN	0.020	1.6	6.5	0.700	4283	2479537	0.021	1.5	8.6	0.763	1759	1735356
MSCN + CDF	0.022	1.9	7.3	0.035	2.0	10	0.024	1.8	11	0.047	1.7	7.0

Model	Multi-table Dataset: DSB ; OOD Scenario: Query Center Move						Multi-table Dataset: DSB ; OOD Scenario: Query Granularity Shift					
	In-Distribution Generalization			OOD Generalization			In-Distribution Generalization			OOD Generalization		
	RMSE	Q-err - Med.	Q-err - 90	RMSE	Q-err - Med.	Q-err - 90	RMSE	Q-err - Med.	Q-err - 90	RMSE	Q-err - Med.	Q-err - 90
PostgreSQL	0.033	1.6	6.6	0.068	1.9	14	0.050	1.6	5.2	0.098	2.8	15
Sampling	0.121	3.7	38	0.186	9.2	82	0.143	4.7	75	0.194	12	64
MSCN	0.057	1.4	3.6	0.283	5.0	78	0.027	1.2	1.8	0.345	1715	1317490
MSCN + CDF	0.061	1.6	5.3	0.158	2.1	17	0.029	1.3	1.8	0.121	2.5	73

Table 4: Prediction accuracy on two multi-table datasets: IMDb and DSB with two OOD Scenarios.




Figure 5: Query latency performance on IMDb.




Figure 7: Query latency performance on DSB.




Figure 6: Query latency performance on Job-light.

They perform comparably to PostgreSQL on single-table queries, where PostgreSQL is already effective. For PtsHist and QuadHist, despite that they outperform QuickSel and theoretically benefit from the SOTA theory, they fail to match the empirical performance of the two deep query-driven models due to their limited model capacity, especially for Qerror (Figure 4b) since they are optimized specifically for absolute errors such as RMSE. *These findings confirm the In-Dist generalization capability of deep learning-based query-driven models.*

However, they also demonstrate limited robustness to OOD queries, especially in complex multi-table datasets with intricate joins and skewed distributions. For example, MSCN achieves strong in-distribution accuracy on IMDb and DSB, with median Qerror below 2 and 90th percentile values in single digits. Yet, it struggles with OOD generalization on IMDb, where it exhibits an RMSE of about 0.7 and median Qerror in four-digit, significantly underperforming compared to PostgreSQL and Sampling. On DSB, MSCN shows less vulnerability to query center shifts. This is likely due to less skewed data distributions, allowing easier adaptation of selectivity functions across different data regions. PtsHist, QuadHist, and QuickSel do not exhibit such drastic drops in OOD performance, because they are data models constructed from queries and are induced from probability measures. This supports our OOD generalization theory as signed measures are a superset of probability measures and thus fall within the scope of our theory.

More importantly and perhaps not surprisingly, the integration of SeConCDF significantly enhances the OOD generalization capabilities of query-driven models like MSCN, without compromising their In-Dist generalization. For instance, in the first OOD scenario

(query center move), SECONCDF training reduces MSCN's median and 90-percentile Qerror from 4283 and a seven-digit value to just 2 and 10, respectively. Similar dramatic improvements are evident in the second OOD scenario. Moreover, SECONCDF does not adversely affect the model's performance on In-Dist generalization. Note that we also explored how model performance changes by varying the "distance" between training and testing distributions. Despite varying distances, SECONCDF consistently helps deep models outperform all other compared query-driven approaches. Due to page limitations, these results are not included in this version.

7.3 Query Latency Performance

In this subsection, we showcase the improved generalization capabilities from SECONCDF can result in a better end-to-end (running time) performance. All end-to-end experiments are conducted with a modified PostgreSQL 13.1 that can accept injected cardinalities estimates [1, 2]. We exclude Sampling in the experiments since its running time is much longer than others. We compare MSCN+CDF to the original MSCN, PostgreSQL (an important baseline upon which learned cardinality estimation should improve), and True cardinalities. For each OOD scenario over each dataset, we randomly sample 30 queries from both the In-Dist test queries and the OOD test queries, respectively, to conduct the query latency experiments. The results are shown in Figure 5 and Figure 7 for IMDB and DSB, respectively. Additionally, for IMDB, we also employ the Job-light benchmark [31] to evaluate the model's OOD generalization capabilities in the two OOD scenarios, since Job-light queries differ significantly from the queries used during training.

The results yield three key insights. First, both the MSCN and MSCN+CDF demonstrate notably efficient running times for In-Dist queries, significantly surpassing PostgreSQL on the IMDB dataset and matching its performance on DSB. Indeed, they are close to True cardinalities on both datasets. Second, *the inaccurate cardinality estimates by MSCN for OOD queries lead to considerably poorer query latency performance compared to In-Dist queries*. Notably, MSCN's query latency performance is significantly worse than PostgreSQL for both IMDB OOD queries and Job-light. Third, the integration of SECONCDF significantly enhances MSCN+CDF's OOD latency performance, bringing it on par with PostgreSQL. This demonstrates that the improved accuracy from SECONCDF for OOD generalization can translate into enhanced runtime performance.

7.4 Efficiency

SECONCDF employs pre-loading and asynchronous query sampling to minimize idle time during model training. We evaluated the efficiency of these strategies compared to a conventional sequential training approach. For the IMDB and DSB datasets, the naive training strategy required 305s and 250s per epoch, respectively. With the implementation of our efficient training methods, these times were significantly reduced to 50s for IMDB and 26s for DSB per epoch, representing an over 80% reduction in training time.

8 CONCLUSIONS AND OPEN PROBLEMS

In this paper, we proved the theory: selectivity predictors induced by a signed measure are learnable, and under mild assumptions, they

exhibit **bounded OOD generalization error**. Based on the theory, we propose a new selectivity estimation paradigm NEUROCDF, and a principled training framework SECONCDF to enhance OOD generalization capabilities for *any* NN-based existing query-driven selectivity models. We empirically demonstrate that SECONCDF improves query-driven models' OOD generalization performance in terms of accuracy and query latency performance.

We believe this work opens up many promising research directions. First, exploring the generalization bounds beyond signed measures could yield interesting insights and inspire new model/algorithm designs. Second, replacing the loss function (e.g., absolute error) used in the theoretical results with Qerror is intriguing and challenging. Additionally, enforcing CDF self-consistency through model design represents a promising direction for future research. Furthermore, applying our theory to guide the generation of queries for efficient and effective training poses an interesting opportunity.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ceb. <https://github.com/learnedsystems/CEB/tree/main>.
- [2] Modified postgresql. <https://github.com/waltercai/pqo-opensource>.
- [3] Mscn. <https://github.com/andreaskipf/learnedcardinalities>.
- [4] Ptshist. <https://github.com/huxiao2010/Selectivity/>.
- [5] ABITEBOUL, S., HULL, R., AND VIANU, V. *Foundations of databases*, vol. 8. Addison-Wesley Reading, 1995.
- [6] ABOULNAGA, A., AND CHAUDHURI, S. Self-tuning histograms: Building histograms without looking at data. *ACM SIGMOD Record* 28, 2 (1999), 181–192.
- [7] ALON, N., BEN-DAVID, S., CESA-BIANCHI, N., AND HAUSSLER, D. Scale-sensitive dimensions, uniform convergence, and learnability. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* 44, 4 (1997), 615–631.
- [8] ANAGNOSTOPOULOS, C., AND TRIANTAFILLOU, P. Learning set cardinality in distance nearest neighbours. In *2015 IEEE international conference on data mining (2015)*, IEEE, pp. 691–696.
- [9] ANAGNOSTOPOULOS, C., AND TRIANTAFILLOU, P. Learning to accurately count with query-driven predictive analytics. In *2015 IEEE international conference on big data (big data)* (2015), IEEE, pp. 14–23.
- [10] ANAGNOSTOPOULOS, C., AND TRIANTAFILLOU, P. Query-driven learning for predictive analytics of data subspace cardinality. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)* 11, 4 (2017), 1–46.
- [11] BISHOP, C. M. *Pattern recognition and machine learning*. springer, 2006.
- [12] BLUMER, A., EHRENFUECHT, A., HAUSSLER, D., AND WARMUTH, M. K. Learnability and the vapnik-chervonenkis dimension. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* 36, 4 (1989), 929–965.
- [13] BRUNO, N., AND CHAUDHURI, S. Exploiting statistics on query expressions for optimization. In *Proceedings of the 2002 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data* (2002), pp. 263–274.
- [14] BRUNO, N., CHAUDHURI, S., AND GRAVANO, L. Stholes: a multidimensional workload-aware histogram. In *SIGMOD* (2001), pp. 211–222.
- [15] CHEN, C. M., AND ROUSSOPOULOS, N. Adaptive selectivity estimation using query feedback. In *Proceedings of the 1994 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data* (1994), pp. 161–172.
- [16] DEEDS, K. B., SUCIU, D., AND BALAZINSKA, M. Safebound: A practical system for generating cardinality bounds. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 1, 1 (2023), 1–26.
- [17] DING, B., CHAUDHURI, S., GEHRKE, J., AND NARASAYYA, V. Dsb: A decision support benchmark for workload-driven and traditional database systems. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 14, 13 (2021), 3376–3388.
- [18] DURRETT, R. *Probability: theory and examples*, vol. 49. Cambridge university press, 2019.
- [19] DUTT, A., WANG, C., NAZI, A., KANDULA, S., NARASAYYA, V., AND CHAUDHURI, S. Selectivity estimation for range predicates using lightweight models. *VLDB* 12, 9 (2019), 1044–1057.
- [20] HE, K., ZHANG, X., REN, S., AND SUN, J. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition* (2016), pp. 770–778.
- [21] HEDDES, M., NUNES, I., GIVARGIS, T., AND NICOLAU, A. Convolution and cross-correlation of count sketches enables fast cardinality estimation of multi-join queries. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 2, 3 (2024), 1–26.
- [22] HELLMAN, M., AND RAVIV, J. Probability of error, equivocation, and the chernoff bound. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 16, 4 (1970), 368–372.
- [23] HILPRECHT, B., SCHMIDT, A., KULESSA, M., MOLINA, A., KERSTING, K., AND BINNIG, C. Deepdb: Learn from data, not from queries! vol. 13, VLDB Endowment,

- pp. 992–1005.
- [24] HU, X., LIU, Y., XIU, H., AGARWAL, P. K., PANIGRAHI, D., ROY, S., AND YANG, J. Selectivity functions of range queries are learnable. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data* (2022), pp. 959–972.
- [25] IOANNIDIS, Y. E., AND CHRISTODOULAKIS, S. On the propagation of errors in the size of join results. In *Proceedings of the 1991 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of data* (1991), pp. 268–277.
- [26] KEARNS, M. J., AND SCHAPIRE, R. E. Efficient distribution-free learning of probabilistic concepts. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 48, 3 (1994), 464–497.
- [27] KEARNS, M. J., AND VAZIRANI, U. *An introduction to computational learning theory*. MIT press, 1994.
- [28] KIM, K., JUNG, J., SEO, I., HAN, W.-S., CHOI, K., AND CHONG, J. Learned cardinality estimation: An in-depth study. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data* (2022), pp. 1214–1227.
- [29] KIM, K., LEE, S., KIM, I., AND HAN, W.-S. Asm: Harmonizing autoregressive model, sampling, and multi-dimensional statistics merging for cardinality estimation. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 2, 1 (2024), 1–27.
- [30] KIPF, A., KIPF, T., RADKE, B., LEIS, V., BONCZ, P., AND KEMPER, A. Learned cardinalities: Estimating correlated joins with deep learning. In *CIDR* (2019).
- [31] LEIS, V., GUBICHEV, A., MIRCHEV, A., BONCZ, P., KEMPER, A., AND NEUMANN, T. How good are query optimizers, really? *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 9, 3 (2015), 204–215.
- [32] LI, P., WEI, W., ZHU, R., DING, B., ZHOU, J., AND LU, H. Alece: An attention-based learned cardinality estimator for spj queries on dynamic workloads. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 17, 2 (2023), 197–210.
- [33] LIM, L., WANG, M., AND VITTEK, J. S. Sash: A self-adaptive histogram set for dynamically changing workloads. In *Proceedings 2003 VLDB Conference* (2003), Elsevier, pp. 369–380.
- [34] LIU, X., HAN, X., ZHANG, N., AND LIU, Q. Certified monotonic neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 15427–15438.
- [35] LYNCH, C. A. Selectivity estimation and query optimization in large databases with highly skewed distribution of column values. In *VLDB* (1988), pp. 240–251.
- [36] MARKL, V., HAAS, P. J., KUTSCH, M., MEGIDDO, N., SRIVASTAVA, U., AND TRAN, T. M. Consistent selectivity estimation via maximum entropy. *The VLDB journal* 16, 1 (2007), 55–76.
- [37] MARKL, V., LOHMAN, G. M., AND RAMAN, V. Leo: An autonomic query optimizer for db2. *IBM Systems Journal* 42, 1 (2003), 98–106.
- [38] MENG, Z., CAO, X., AND CONG, G. Selectivity estimation for queries containing predicates over set-valued attributes. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 1, 4 (2023), 1–26.
- [39] MOERKOTTE, G., NEUMANN, T., AND STEIDL, G. Preventing bad plans by bounding the impact of cardinality estimation errors. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 2, 1 (2009), 982–993.
- [40] NEGI, P., WU, Z., KIPF, A., TATBUL, N., MARCUS, R., MADDEN, S., KRASKA, T., AND ALIZADEH, M. Robust query driven cardinality estimation under changing workloads. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 16, 6 (2023), 1520–1533.
- [41] PARK, Y., ZHONG, S., AND MOZAFARI, B. Quicksel: Quick selectivity learning with mixture models. In *SIGMOD* (2020), pp. 1017–1033.
- [42] PÖESS, M., SMITH, B., KOLLAR, L., AND LARSON, P. Tpc-ds, taking decision support benchmarking to the next level. In *Proceedings of the 2002 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data* (2002), pp. 582–587.
- [43] REINER, S., AND GROSSNIKLAS, M. Sample-efficient cardinality estimation using geometric deep learning. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* (2023).
- [44] ROBERTS, F., AND TESMAN, B. *Applied combinatorics*. CRC Press, 2009.
- [45] SELINGER, P. G., ASTRAHAN, M. M., CHAMBERLIN, D. D., LORIE, R. A., AND PRICE, T. G. Access path selection in a relational database management system. In *Proceedings of the 1979 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data* (1979), pp. 23–34.
- [46] STEIN, E. M., AND SHAKARCHI, R. *Real analysis: measure theory, integration, and Hilbert spaces*. Princeton University Press, 2009.
- [47] STILLGER, M., LOHMAN, G. M., MARKL, V., AND KANDIL, M. Leo-db2’s learning optimizer. In *VLDB* (2001), vol. 1, pp. 19–28.
- [48] SUN, J., AND LI, G. An end-to-end learning-based cost estimator. *VLDB* 13, 3 (2019), 307–319.
- [49] WANG, F., YAN, X., YIU, M. L., LI, S., MAO, Z., AND TANG, B. Speeding up end-to-end query execution via learning-based progressive cardinality estimation. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 1, 1 (2023), 1–25.
- [50] WONG, E., AND YOUSSEFI, K. Decomposition—a strategy for query processing. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS)* 1, 3 (1976), 223–241.
- [51] WU, C., JINDAL, A., AMIZADEH, S., PATEL, H., LE, W., QIAO, S., AND RAO, S. Towards a learning optimizer for shared clouds. *VLDB* 12, 3 (2018), 210–222.
- [52] WU, P., AND CONG, G. A unified deep model of learning from both data and queries for cardinality estimation. In *Proceedings of the 2021 International Conference on Management of Data* (2021), pp. 2009–2022.
- [53] WU, P., AND IVES, Z. G. Modeling shifting workloads for learned database systems. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 2, 1 (2024), 1–27.
- [54] WU, Z., NEGI, P., ALIZADEH, M., KRASKA, T., AND MADDEN, S. Factorjoin: a new cardinality estimation framework for join queries. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 1, 1 (2023), 1–27.
- [55] XIU, H., AGARWAL, P. K., AND YANG, J. PARQO: Penalty-aware robust plan selection in query optimization. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 17, 13 (2024).
- [56] YANG, Z., KAMSETTY, A., LUAN, S., LIANG, E., DUAN, Y., CHEN, X., AND STOICA, I. Neurocard: One cardinality estimator for all tables. *PVLDB* (2021).
- [57] ZHANG, C., BENGIO, S., HARDT, M., RECHT, B., AND VINYALS, O. Understanding deep learning (still) requires rethinking generalization. *Communications of the ACM* 64, 3 (2021), 107–115.
- [58] ZHANG, K., WANG, H., LU, Y., LI, Z., SHU, C., YAN, Y., AND YANG, D. Duet: efficient and scalable hybrid neural relation understanding. In *2024 IEEE 40th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)* (2024), IEEE, pp. 56–69.