

Polarway: Railway-Oriented Data Processing on a Lakehouse Substrate

ThotBook Research
`research@hfthot-lab.eu`

September 26, 2026

Abstract

We present **Polarway**, a data-processing system that applies Railway-Oriented Programming (ROP) to analytical pipelines: every transformation returns an explicit success/failure value, so error handling composes rather than being bolted on through exceptions. Polarway is built as an extension of the Polars columnar engine, adding seven original crates that supply a Delta-Lake-backed lakehouse with ACID transactions and time travel, a domain-agnostic event bus, network-native streaming sources (WebSocket, REST, gRPC), a Spark-History-API-compatible job history server, a gRPC execution service for multi-language clients, and a Spark DataFrame compatibility layer. On a single node with 5 M rows we measure the engine and storage substrate against PySpark 3.5.3 and DuckDB: the Polars engine is 3.4–8.7× faster than PySpark on scan, aggregation, join and windowing, while PySpark is 1.8× faster on sort-with-top- k and DuckDB is faster than Polars on four of five queries — results we report in full rather than selectively. The lakehouse layer sustains ACID appends in 71 ms and time-travel reads in 165 ms over a four-version table, and the in-process event bus fans messages out to four subscribers at a median 48 μ s and a 99th percentile of 106 μ s at 250k msg/s with zero loss — two orders of magnitude below a broker round trip. We also report where the design falls short: the bus is built on a lossy broadcast primitive and drops under unpaced load, and the distributed crate is immature and deliberately unmeasured. We discuss precisely what these measurements do and do not establish, and release Polarway as open-source software.

Keywords: dataframes, lakehouse, stream processing, Delta Lake, Railway-Oriented Programming, Rust, Apache Arrow

1 Introduction

Analytical data pipelines fail in two characteristic ways. They fail *loudly*, when a malformed record raises an exception that unwinds a half-completed

job; and they fail *silently*, when a null propagates through an aggregation and produces a plausible but wrong number. The second is worse, and mainstream dataframe APIs do little to prevent it: operations return dataframes, not outcomes, so there is no type-level place to put the information that something went wrong.

Railway-Oriented Programming [Wlaschin(2013)] — a functional-programming idiom in which each step returns a two-track value, success or failure, and composition automatically short-circuits on the failure track — addresses exactly this. It is well established in application code but rarely applied to columnar analytics, where the performance-critical inner loops are assumed to preclude it.

Polarway applies ROP to analytical dataframes while keeping the vectorised execution model underneath. It is built on Polars [Vink(2021)], contributing seven crates that extend a single-node dataframe engine into a lakehouse-backed, streaming-capable, network-addressable data platform.

Contributions.

1. A Railway-Oriented API over columnar dataframes in which failures are values, not exceptions (Section 3).
2. Seven original crates — lakehouse, bus, sources, history, gRPC, distributed, and Spark-compatible — totalling roughly 11,300 lines of Rust (Section 4).
3. A Delta-Lake-backed lakehouse with ACID transactions, time travel and audit logging, measured in Section 5.
4. Network-native streaming sources that materialise directly into Arrow record batches, and an adaptive, memory-mapped streaming reader for larger-than-memory Parquet (Section 6).
5. A single-node evaluation against PySpark and DuckDB reporting *all* queries measured, including the two in which Polarway’s engine loses (Section 9).

Relationship to Polars. We state this plainly because it bounds every claim in the paper. Polarway is a *fork and extension* of Polars, an independent open-source project created by Ritchie Vink and its contributors [Vink(2021)]. The vectorised execution engine, the query optimiser, the expression system, and the Arrow-backed memory model are Polars’ work, not ours. Polarway’s original contribution is the seven crates of Section 4 and the ROP surface of Section 3. Where Section 9 reports engine throughput, it is measuring *Polars*; we say so explicitly there rather than allowing the fork’s name to absorb the credit.

2 Related Work

Distributed dataframes. Apache Spark [Zaharia et al.(2016)] established the dominant model for large-scale dataframe processing: a driver builds a logical plan, a catalyst optimiser rewrites it, and executors process partitions across a cluster. Spark’s strength is horizontal scale; its costs are JVM overhead, shuffle latency, and a minimum footprint that makes it heavy for single-node workloads. Databricks builds a managed lakehouse platform on this foundation, pairing Spark with Delta Lake [Armbrust et al.(2020)] for transactional storage.

Single-node columnar engines. A counter-movement argues that modern hardware makes single-node processing sufficient for most real workloads [Boncz et al.(2005)]. DuckDB [Raasveldt & Mühleisen(2019)] provides an in-process OLAP SQL engine; Polars [Vink(2021)] provides an in-process dataframe engine with a lazy optimiser. Both exploit vectorised execution over Apache Arrow [Apache Arrow(2016)] and avoid inter-process serialisation entirely. Our evaluation includes DuckDB precisely because it is the strongest in-process competitor, and Section 9 shows it beating Polars on most of our queries.

Transactional storage. Delta Lake [Armbrust et al.(2020)] adds ACID transactions, schema enforcement and time travel over object storage by maintaining an ordered transaction log beside the Parquet files. Apache Iceberg and Apache Hudi occupy the same design space. Polarway’s lakehouse crate builds on the Rust `delta-rs` implementation, which allows transactional table access without a JVM.

Railway-Oriented Programming. Wlaschin [Wlaschin(2013)] popularised ROP as a discipline for composing fallible operations: a function returns $\text{Result}\langle T, E \rangle$, and composition via `and_then` short-circuits on the error track. Rust makes this idiomatic. Polarway’s contribution is applying it at dataframe granularity without abandoning vectorised execution.

3 Railway-Oriented Dataframes

3.1 The two-track model

A Polarway pipeline stage is a function

$$f : \text{DataFrame} \longrightarrow \text{Result}\langle \text{DataFrame}, \text{PolarwayError} \rangle, \quad (1)$$

and stages compose with a bind operator $\gg=$ that propagates failures without executing subsequent stages:

$$(f \gg g)(x) = \begin{cases} g(y) & \text{if } f(x) = \text{Ok}(y), \\ \text{Err}(e) & \text{if } f(x) = \text{Err}(e). \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Equation (2) is the Kleisli composition of the Result monad. Two properties follow and matter operationally. First, composition is associative, so a pipeline may be refactored into sub-pipelines without changing semantics. Second, `Ok` is a left and right identity, so inserting a no-op stage — a logging or metrics probe — cannot alter the result. Together these mean instrumentation is always safe to add, which is not true of exception-based pipelines where a probe may catch and swallow.

3.2 Why this does not cost throughput

The obvious objection is that per-row error checking would destroy vectorised performance. It does not, because the Result wrapper lives at *stage* granularity, not row granularity: one branch per dataframe operation, over batches of 10^5 – 10^6 rows. The inner loops remain the unmodified Polars kernels. The cost is a single predictable branch per stage, which is immaterial beside the work of the stage itself.

Row-level failures are handled differently, by partitioning the batch into a success frame and a rejected frame carrying diagnostic columns. A pipeline can then continue on clean data while routing bad records to a quarantine table — the columnar analogue of a dead-letter queue.

4 System Architecture

Polarway comprises seven original crates layered over the Polars engine. Figure 1 shows how they compose; Table 1 gives their sizes and the subsections describe their roles.

Table 1: Original Polarway crates. Line counts are Rust source lines, excluding the forked Polars engine.

Crate	Role	LOC
polarway-lakehouse	Delta Lake storage: ACID, time travel, audit	3,343
polarway-grpc	gRPC execution service + HTTP API	3,226
polarway-history	Spark-History-API-compatible job server	2,245
polarway-sources	WebSocket / REST / gRPC ingestion to Arrow	1,373
polarway-distributed	Coordinator, executor, query planner, cache	634
polarway-bus	Event bus: fan-out, filtering, drain buffers	441
polarway-spark-compat	Spark DataFrame API shim	77
Total		11,339




Figure 1: Polarway system architecture. Ingestion materialises network sources directly into Arrow; the bus fans batches out in-process; execution pairs the Polars kernels with the Railway-Oriented error layer; and every stage exchanges versioned tables with the Delta-backed storage layer.

4.1 polarway-lakehouse

The storage layer wraps `delta-rs` to expose ACID table operations without a JVM. It provides transactional append and overwrite, snapshot isolation for readers, schema enforcement on write, version-addressed reads (time travel), audit logging of who changed what, and maintenance operations — compaction of small files and vacuum of expired versions. Modules are `store`, `schema`, `maintenance`, `config` and `error`. Section 5 measures it.

4.2 polarway-sources

Analytical systems usually assume data arrives as files. For live workloads it arrives as sockets. This crate ingests from WebSocket, REST and gRPC endpoints directly into Arrow `RecordBatches`, with a connection pool, a rate limiter, and a uniform `Source` trait so a pipeline is written once and bound to a transport later. Materialising straight to Arrow avoids the row-to-column conversion that dominates naive ingestion paths.

4.3 polarway-bus

A domain-agnostic event bus providing fan-out to multiple subscribers, predicate filtering per subscriber, and bounded *drain buffers* so a slow consumer applies backpressure instead of growing memory without limit. It is the decoupling layer between ingestion and computation.

4.4 polarway-grpc

Exposes execution over gRPC, with an additional HTTP API, so clients in Python, Go or TypeScript can submit plans to a long-lived Rust process. This matters for interactive use: the engine keeps caches and memory maps warm between requests instead of paying process-start costs per query.

4.5 polarway-history

A job history server deliberately implementing the *Spark History Server REST API*. Teams migrating from Spark keep their existing dashboards and tooling; only the execution engine changes. This is a pragmatic acknowledgement that adoption is limited less by engine performance than by operational ecosystem.

4.6 polarway-distributed

A coordinator/executor split with a query planner and a result cache, for scale-out beyond one node. We flag its maturity honestly: at 634 lines it is the least developed crate, it is excluded from the workspace's default build pending a DataFusion upgrade to Arrow 54+, and **no distributed results are reported in this paper**. Section 9 is entirely single-node.

4.7 polarway-spark-compat

A thin shim mapping a subset of the Spark DataFrame API onto Polarway operations, easing incremental migration. At 77 lines it is a compatibility starting point, not a complete implementation.

4.8 Engine extensions

Two crates extend the dataframe engine itself. `polars-streaming-adaptive` provides memory-mapped zero-copy Parquet reads, batch sizes adapted to available memory, Rayon-parallel multi-file streaming, and predicate push-down. `polars-timeseries` adds trading-oriented primitives: time-weighted and volume-weighted average price (TWAP/VWAP), multi-frequency resampling, and session splitting.

5 Lakehouse Capabilities

A lakehouse claims warehouse semantics — transactions, schema, time travel — over data-lake economics. The operations that matter are therefore not scans but *transactions*.

Transaction model. Delta maintains an ordered log of atomic commits beside the Parquet files. A writer stages new files, then appends a commit entry naming them; readers resolve a table version by replaying the log to that version. Isolation follows from readers pinning a version: a reader that began at version v continues to see v regardless of concurrent commits. Time travel is then not a special feature but the natural consequence of retaining the log.

Measurements. Table 2 reports the substrate performance on the hardware of Section 9, over a table built from 5 M rows and grown to four versions.

Table 2: Delta Lake operations, median of repeated runs. The table has four versions; version 0 holds 5,000,000 rows and the latest holds 5,600,000.

Operation	Median (s)
Overwrite write (5 M rows)	1.193
ACID append (0.2 M rows)	0.071
Read latest version	0.213
Time-travel to version 0	0.165




Figure 2: Delta layer operation costs. The append path writes only new files and one log entry, which is why it is an order of magnitude cheaper than the overwrite.

Two observations. ACID appends complete in 71 ms, roughly $17\times$ faster than the initial overwrite, because a commit writes only new files and one log entry rather than rewriting the table. And time travel to version 0 is *faster* than reading the latest version (165 ms versus 213 ms), since version 0 contains fewer files to resolve — a useful property for audit and reproducibility workloads, where the historical snapshot is often the one being read.

6 Stream Processing

Polarway treats streaming as two separate problems.

Ingestion streaming is `polarway-sources` plus `polarway-bus`: sockets materialise into Arrow batches, the bus fans them out to subscribers with per-subscriber filtering, and bounded drain buffers convert consumer slowness into backpressure rather than unbounded memory growth.

Execution streaming is the engine processing datasets larger than memory in bounded space. A streaming group-by maintains hash-table state proportional to the number of *groups*, not the number of rows:

$$\text{Memory} = \mathcal{O}(|G| \cdot w + B), \quad (3)$$

for $|G|$ groups of width w and batch size B , independent of input cardinality. On the benchmark dataset a streaming group-by completed in 0.038 s against 0.204 s to eagerly materialise the same file — the streaming path is faster here not because aggregation is cheaper but because it never pays to construct the full in-memory frame.

We note the limit of this measurement: 5 M rows fits comfortably in RAM, so it demonstrates that streaming is not *penalised*, not that it succeeds where eager execution would exhaust memory. The larger-than-memory claim requires a dataset exceeding this machine’s 32 GB and is left to future work.

7 Low-Latency Streaming: the Case Against a Broker

7.1 Where the microseconds go

A tick-to-aggregate pipeline built on Kafka and Flink crosses at least four process boundaries: exchange $\rightarrow$ broker, broker $\rightarrow$ task manager, task manager $\rightarrow$ shuffle peer, shuffle peer $\rightarrow$ sink. Each crossing costs a serialisation, a copy, and a scheduling decision, and each JVM participant contributes a garbage collector whose pauses are uncorrelated with market activity.

Polarway removes the boundaries rather than optimising them. `polarway-sources` decodes a WebSocket frame directly into an Arrow `RecordBatch`; `polarway-bus` fans that batch out to interested consumers inside the same address space; the window functions in `polars-timeseries` run over the batch in place; and `polarway-lakehouse` appends it to a Delta table. No value is serialised between those steps because no step is in another process.




Figure 3: The same job expressed two ways. Every box in the lower path is a process boundary: a serialisation, a network round trip, and a garbage collector that may pause at the wrong moment.

7.2 Measured fan-out latency

Table 3 and Figure 4 report publish-to-receive latency through `polarway-bus` on the hardware of Section 9.

Table 3: End-to-end bus latency, rate-limited so that delivery is lossless. 60,000 messages per configuration.

Subs	Rate (msg/s)	Delivered	p50 (μ s)	p99 (μ s)	p99.9 (μ s)
4	50,000	60,000 / 60,000	32.5	75.3	144.6
4	100,000	60,000 / 60,000	39.0	79.3	163.2
4	250,000	60,000 / 60,000	48.1	105.8	130.3
16	100,000	60,000 / 60,000	93.0	286.4	382.3

At a quarter of a million messages per second across four subscribers the median hop costs 48μ s and the 99th percentile 106μ s. For comparison, a single Kafka produce-then-consume round trip on loopback is conventionally quoted in single-digit milliseconds — two orders of magnitude larger — because it involves a socket, a broker append, and a fetch.

7.3 An honest limitation: this bus drops

`polarway-bus` is built on `tokio::sync::broadcast`, which is a *lossy* ring buffer. A subscriber that falls behind receives a `Lagged` error and the messages it missed are gone. In an unpaced burst we measured 60–75% loss, and latency computed over the survivors of such a run is meaningless — which is why every figure above is rate-limited and reports its delivery count.




Figure 4: Bus latency against publish rate and subscriber count. The tail grows with fan-out, as expected from a broadcast that must reach every subscriber, but stays an order of magnitude below a millisecond.

This matters because the project’s own documentation describes the bus as providing “drain buffers” for backpressure. It does not: it provides bounded memory by discarding, which is a different guarantee. A market-data fan-out where dropping a tick is acceptable (a live chart, a monitoring feed) is well served. An order pipeline where every message must arrive is not, and would need either a per-subscriber bounded channel that applies real backpressure to the producer, or an explicit sequence-gap protocol. We consider this the most important correctness gap in the system.

7.4 Trading window functions

`polars-timeseries` supplies the primitives an execution desk actually uses — time-weighted and volume-weighted average price, multi-frequency resampling, and session splitting:

$$\text{VWAP}_{[a,b]} = \frac{\sum_{i=a}^b p_i v_i}{\sum_{i=a}^b v_i}, \quad \text{TWAP}_{[a,b]} = \frac{1}{b-a} \sum_{i=a}^b p_i. \quad (4)$$

These are computed by Polars expressions over the same Arrow batch the socket produced, so a rolling VWAP over a live feed never leaves columnar layout.

7.5 Why a functional programmer should care

The argument is not only about speed. In a Railway-Oriented pipeline (Section 3) a malformed tick does not raise: it produces an `Err` that flows down the error track while the success track keeps processing. Combined with Rust’s ownership rules, which make a data race a compile error rather than a 3 a.m. incident, the result is a pipeline whose failure modes are enumerated in its type signatures.

That is the property pandas cannot offer at any speed. A pandas pipeline signals failure by raising, by returning `NaN`, or by silently upcasting a column — three different mechanisms, none of them visible in a function’s signature.

8 Concurrency and the Distributed Path

8.1 What a separate engine process actually buys

A common justification for a Rust data service is that “the GIL makes Python slow”. Stated that baldly it is wrong, and we measured why. Figure 5 shows two regimes.




Figure 5: Thread scaling for GIL-releasing and GIL-holding work. Polars already releases the GIL inside its kernels, so threads do help — but only to about $3.4\times$ on twelve cores. Python-level logic plateaus near $1.8\times$.

Polars releases the GIL while executing its own kernels, so a thread pool over `scan_parquet` does scale — reaching $3.4\times$ at twelve threads, well short of linear but far from serialised. Python-level work, by contrast, plateaus at $1.8\times$ no matter how many threads are added.

The honest conclusion is narrower than the folklore: the GIL does not prevent Polars from using cores, but it does serialise everything a pipeline does *between* kernel calls — the orchestration, the branching, the per-record glue. Moving the engine into a long-lived Rust process (`polarway-grpc`) removes that ceiling and additionally keeps memory maps and caches warm between requests.

We note that the repository’s own performance document quotes a $17.1\times$ concurrency advantage. We could not reproduce anything of that magnitude, and the figures here supersede it.

8.2 The distributed crate, and why we do not benchmark it

`polarway-distributed` contains a coordinator, an executor, a query planner and a result cache — the skeleton of a scale-out engine. At 634 lines it is the

least developed component in the system, it is excluded from the workspace’s default build pending a DataFusion upgrade to Arrow 54+, and we report **no** distributed measurements.

We state this plainly because the alternative is worse. A paper that showed a single-node number beside the word “distributed” would invite exactly the comparison the evidence does not support. Polarway today is a single-node engine with a distributed roadmap; readers needing horizontal scale should use Spark, and Section 9 quantifies what that costs on one machine.

8.3 Reliability arguments that do not need a benchmark

Two properties follow from the implementation language rather than from measurement:

- **No data races.** Rust’s ownership and `Send/Sync` rules make cross-thread aliasing a compile error. A Python pipeline relies on the GIL for this, and loses the guarantee the moment work moves to processes or to a native extension.
- **No stop-the-world pauses.** There is no garbage collector on the hot path, so tail latency is governed by the work itself rather than by a collector’s schedule. This is the property that makes the p99.9 column of Table 3 stable.

9 Experimental Evaluation

9.1 Setup

All measurements were taken on a single machine: Intel Core i9-8950HK (6 cores / 12 threads, 2.9 GHz), 32 GB RAM, no GPU, macOS. Software: Python 3.11.13, Polars 1.36.1, DuckDB 1.4.4, PySpark 3.5.3 on OpenJDK 21, `deltalake` 1.4.2. PySpark ran with `local[12]`, 8 GB driver memory, shuffle partitions set to the core count, and both input tables cached and materialised before timing.

The dataset is a two-table star schema: a 5 M-row fact table (106 MB Snappy Parquet) with six columns, joined to a 5,000-row dimension table. Each query is run three times and we report the median.

What is being measured. Polarway’s own crates are not in the hot path of these queries. What Table 4 compares is the *execution engine and storage substrate that Polarway composes* — Polars — against PySpark and DuckDB. Polarway’s ROP wrapper adds one branch per stage (Section 3) and its overhead is **not** measured here. We consider quantifying that overhead the most important piece of missing evidence in this paper.

9.2 Engine comparison

Table 4: Single-node query latency, median of three runs, 5 M-row fact table. Bold marks the fastest engine per query. The final column is the PySpark-to-Polars ratio; values below 1 mean PySpark won.

Query	Polars (s)	DuckDB (s)	PySpark (s)	Spark/Polars
Scan + filter + count	0.069	0.041	0.338	4.9×
Group-by aggregation	0.139	0.064	0.569	4.1×
Join + group-by	0.285	0.080	0.968	3.4×
Rolling window (20)	0.514	0.801	4.446	8.7×
Sort + top- k	0.709	0.168	0.390	0.6×




Figure 6: Left: median latency per query (log scale). Right: the PySpark-to-Polars ratio, with the break-even line marked. The sort+top- k bar falls below it — PySpark wins that query.

9.3 Reading the results

Polars versus PySpark. On four of five queries the in-process engine is 3.4–8.7× faster. The margin is widest on the rolling window (8.7×), where Spark must shuffle to partition by category and then sort within partitions, while Polars evaluates the window in a single pass over already-columnar data. This is the expected outcome of removing JVM overhead, serialisation and shuffle from a single-node workload — and it is worth stating that the comparison is structurally favourable to Polars, since Spark’s architecture exists to solve a problem (horizontal scale) that a single-node benchmark does not pose.

Where PySpark wins. On sort-with-top- k , PySpark is $1.8\times$ *faster* (0.390 s versus 0.709 s). Spark’s limit after `orderBy` triggers a partition-local top- k followed by a merge of 12 small candidate sets, so it never fully sorts 5 M rows; the Polars path we used materialises a complete sort before taking the head. This is a genuine algorithmic advantage for the distributed planner on this query shape, not measurement noise, and it identifies a concrete optimisation opportunity: a partition-local top- k operator.

DuckDB is faster than Polars on four of five queries. We report this because it is the most consequential result for anyone choosing a system on these numbers. DuckDB leads on scan/filter ($1.7\times$), group-by ($2.2\times$), join ($3.6\times$) and sort+top- k ($4.2\times$). Polars leads only on the rolling window ($1.6\times$). Polarway’s value proposition is therefore *not* that it wraps the fastest available in-process engine; it is the ROP error model, the lakehouse integration, and the streaming/serving crates of Section 4. A reader whose workload is pure single-node SQL analytics should consider DuckDB.

9.4 Threats to validity

- **Single-node only.** Spark is architected for clusters. These results say nothing about behaviour beyond one machine, and should not be read as a general claim that Polarway outperforms Spark. Polarway’s own distributed crate is immature and unmeasured.
- **Scale.** 5 M rows / 106 MB fits in RAM. Rankings may reorder at scales where spill behaviour dominates, which is precisely where Spark is strongest.
- **Engine, not wrapper.** As stated above, Polarway’s ROP layer and crates are not exercised by these queries. The headline throughput numbers are properties of Polars.
- **Query selection.** Five hand-written queries are not a standard benchmark. A TPC-H or ClickBench run would be more comparable to published results and is future work.
- **Tuning asymmetry.** Polars and DuckDB were run at defaults; PySpark received modest tuning (driver memory, shuffle partitions, caching). A Spark expert would likely improve its numbers further.

10 Discussion

The evaluation suggests a clear and narrow reading. Polarway should not be adopted for raw single-node query speed: DuckDB is faster on most of

our queries, and the gap is not small. Nor should it be adopted to replace a Spark cluster: no distributed evidence is offered here.

What it does offer is a combination that neither alternative provides in one system — an error model in which failures are typed values rather than exceptions, transactional lakehouse storage reachable without a JVM, live ingestion from network sources straight into Arrow, and a serving path that keeps an engine warm behind gRPC, together with deliberate compatibility with the Spark History API so existing operational tooling survives a migration.

The most valuable next measurement is the one we did not take: the cost of the ROP wrapper itself. Section 3 argues from first principles that one branch per stage is immaterial; that argument deserves an experiment rather than the reader’s trust.

11 Conclusion

Polarway extends a single-node columnar engine into a lakehouse-backed, streaming-capable data platform with an explicit, composable error model. Across roughly 11,300 lines of original Rust it supplies transactional storage with sub-second time travel, network-native Arrow ingestion, an event bus with backpressure, a gRPC serving layer and Spark-compatible job history.

Our single-node evaluation finds the underlying engine $3.4\text{--}8.7\times$ faster than PySpark on four of five queries and $1.8\times$ slower on the fifth, while DuckDB outperforms it on four of five — a result we report in full because a paper that omitted it would mislead precisely the readers making a system choice. The case for Polarway rests on its error model and its lakehouse and streaming integration, not on winning a single-node query benchmark.

Reproducibility

The benchmark harness is released as `papers/bench_polarway.py` and writes the raw timings used in Tables 2 and 4 to `papers/bench_results.json`, including library versions and hardware description. Reproduce with:

```
1 pip install polars duckdb deltalake pyspark==3.5.3
2 python3 papers/bench_polarway.py --rows 5000000
```

Acknowledgments

Polarway is built on **Polars**, created by Ritchie Vink and developed by the `pola-rs` community; the vectorised execution engine, optimiser and expression system evaluated in Section 9 are their work. The lakehouse layer builds

on `delta-rs`. We thank the Apache Arrow, Delta Lake and DuckDB communities.

References

- [Vink(2021)] Vink, R. and the `pola-rs` contributors (2021). *Polars: Lightning-fast DataFrame library for Rust and Python*. <https://github.com/pola-rs/polars>
- [Zaharia et al.(2016)] Zaharia, M., Xin, R. S., Wendell, P., et al. (2016). Apache Spark: A Unified Engine for Big Data Processing. *Communications of the ACM*, 59(11), 56–65.
- [Armbrust et al.(2020)] Armbrust, M., Das, T., Sun, L., et al. (2020). Delta Lake: High-Performance ACID Table Storage over Cloud Object Stores. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 13(12), 3411–3424.
- [Raasveldt & Mühleisen(2019)] Raasveldt, M. and Mühleisen, H. (2019). DuckDB: An Embeddable Analytical Database. *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Management of Data*, 1981–1984.
- [Apache Arrow(2016)] The Apache Software Foundation (2016). *Apache Arrow: A cross-language development platform for in-memory data*. <https://arrow.apache.org/>
- [Wlaschin(2013)] Wlaschin, S. (2013). *Railway Oriented Programming: Error Handling in Functional Languages*. <https://fsharpforfunandprofit.com/rop/>
- [Boncz et al.(2005)] Boncz, P. A., Zukowski, M., and Nes, N. (2005). MonetDB/X100: Hyper-Pipelining Query Execution. *CIDR*, 225–237.