

Grid[®] Report for Key Value Databases | Winter 2022



Key Value Databases

Contenders									Leaders
Niche									High Performers

Market Presence

Satisfaction

G2 Grid[®] Scoring

(Key Value Databases continues on next page)

Key Value Databases (continued)

Key Value Databases Definition

Key value databases save data as associative arrays where a single value is associated together with a key used as a signifier for the value. No two keys necessarily need the same structure, so data is simply accumulated into a single, large table. Database administrators can quickly pull the data by identifying a specific key. A query language is not necessary when retrieving data, which provides convenience for users who are lacking query language knowledge. Key value databases can also be used for web caches. Key value databases are a type of NoSQL database and are the least structured of the schemaless data stores. Other types of NoSQL tools include [document database](#) tools, [graph database](#) tools, [object-orientated database](#) tools and more. Those who need a solution at no cost can look at [free database software](#).

To qualify for inclusion in the Key-Value Store category, a product must:

- ▶ Provide data storage
- ▶ Store data as a singular value associated with a key
- ▶ Allow users to retrieve the data

Key Value Databases Grid® Scoring Description

Products shown on the Grid® for Key Value Databases have received a minimum of 10 reviews/ratings in data gathered by November 23, 2021. Products are ranked by customer satisfaction (based on user reviews) and market presence (based on market share, seller size, and social impact) and placed into four categories on the Grid®:

- ▶ Products in the Leader quadrant are rated highly by G2 users and have substantial Market Presence scores. Leaders include: [Amazon DynamoDB](#), [Amazon ElastiCache](#), [Redis](#), [Couchbase Server](#), [Aerospike](#), [Hbase](#), and [Azure Table Storage](#)
- ▶ High Performing products have high customer Satisfaction scores and low Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. High Performers include: [ArangoDB](#), [InterSystems IRIS](#), [Redis Enterprise](#), and [Memcached](#)
- ▶ Contender products have relatively low customer Satisfaction scores and high Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. While they may have positive reviews, they do not have enough reviews to validate those ratings. Contenders include: [Azure Redis Cache](#) and [Azure Cosmos DB](#)
- ▶ Niche products have relatively low Satisfaction scores and low Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. While they may have positive reviews, they do not have enough reviews to validate those ratings. Niche products include: [DataStax](#), [BoltDB](#), [Oracle NoSQL Database Cloud](#), and [Pivotal Gemfire](#)



Grid® Scores for Key Value Databases

The table below shows the Satisfaction and Market Presence scores that determine seller placement on the Grid®. To learn more about each of the products, please see the product profile section.

Leaders

	# of Reviews	Satisfaction	Market Presence	G2 Score
Amazon DynamoDB	40	82	95	89
Amazon ElastiCache	42	84	81	83
Redis	102	81	75	78
Couchbase Server	63	79	72	75
Aerospike	80	89	52	70
Hbase	101	71	68	69
Azure Table Storage	12	54	67	60

High Performers

ArangoDB	36	85	33	59
InterSystems IRIS	14	65	46	56
Redis Enterprise	21	65	32	48
Memcached	16	57	14	36

Contenders

Azure Redis Cache	18	23	66	45
Azure Cosmos DB	13	29	55	42

Niche

DataStax	13	30	41	36
BoltDB	18	49	15	32
Oracle NoSQL Database Cloud	11	5	44	25
Pivotal GemFire	10	12	6	9

* Products are ordered by G2 Score. Satisfaction score is used as a tiebreaker if two products have the same G2 Score.



Grid[®] Methodology

Grid[®] Rating Methodology

The Grid[®] represents the democratic voice of real software users, rather than the subjective opinion of one analyst. G2 rates products from the Key Value Databases category algorithmically based on data sourced from product reviews shared by G2 users and data aggregated from online sources and social networks.

Technology buyers can use the Grid[®] to help them quickly select the best products for their businesses and to find peers with similar experiences. For sellers, media, investors, and analysts, the Grid[®] provides benchmarks for product comparison and market trend analysis.

Grid[®] Scoring Methodology

G2 rates products and sellers based on reviews gathered from our user community, as well as data aggregated from online sources and social networks. We apply a unique algorithm (v3.0) to this data to calculate the Satisfaction and Market Presence scores in real time. The Grid[®] Report for Key Value Databases | Winter 2022 is based on scores calculated using the G2 algorithm v3.0 from reviews collected through November 23, 2021. To view the Key Value Databases Grid[®] with the most recent data, please visit the [Key Value Databases](#) page.

Satisfaction

The Satisfaction rating is affected by the following (in order of importance):

- ▶ Customer satisfaction with end user-focused product attributes based on user reviews
- ▶ Popularity and statistical significance based on the number of reviews received by G2
- ▶ Quality of reviews received (reviews that are more thoroughly completed will be weighted more heavily)
- ▶ Age of reviews (more-recent reviews provide relevant and up-to-date information that is reflective of the current state of a product)
- ▶ Customers' satisfaction with administration-specific product attributes based on user reviews
- ▶ Overall customer satisfaction and Net Promoter Score[®] (NPS) based on ratings by G2 users

Note: The customer satisfaction score is normalized for each Grid[®], meaning the scores are relative.

(Grid[®] Methodology continues on next page)

**Net Promoter, Net Promoter System, Net Promoter Score, NPS and the NPS-related emoticons are registered trademarks of Bain & Company, Inc., Fred Reichheld and Satmetrix Systems, Inc.

Grid® Methodology (continued)

Market Presence

The Market Presence score is affected by the following (in order of importance):

- ▶ Market presence is a combination of 15 metrics from G2's reviews, publicly available information, and third-party sources
- ▶ Both the software sellers and the individual products are measured on various criteria. The criteria are listed in order of importance. Products metric receive greater weight than seller metrics

Criteria	Measured For		Metrics
	Product	Seller	
Number of Employees	✓	✓	Employee Count (based on social networks and public sources)
Reviews	✓		Review Count (weighted by recency)
Web Presence	✓	✓	
Social Presence	✓	✓	
Growth	✓	✓	Employee Growth, Web Presence Growth
Seller Age		✓	
Employee Satisfaction and Engagement		✓	

- ▶ Each input is normalized by category and segment. This means that scores are relative to other products in the category/segment and may change from segment to segment
- ▶ The scores are then scaled from 0-100

Grid® Categorization Methodology

Making G2 research relevant and easy for people to use as they evaluate and select business software products is one of our most important goals. In support of that goal, organizing products and software companies in a well-defined structure that makes capturing, evaluating, and displaying reviews and other research in an orderly manner is a critical part of the research process.

To manage the process of categorizing the software products and the related reviews in the G2 community, G2 follows a publicly available [categorization methodology](#). All products appearing on the Grid® have passed through G2's categorization methodology and meet G2's category standards.

Many terms that appear regularly across G2 and are used to aid in product categorization warrant a definition to facilitate buyer understanding. These terms may be included within reviews from the G2 community or in executive summaries for products included on the Grid®. A [list of standard definitions](#) is available to G2 users to eliminate confusion and ease the buying process.

(Grid® Methodology continues on next page)



Grid® Methodology (continued)

Rating Changes and Dynamics

The ratings in this report are based on a snapshot of the user reviews and social data collected by G2 up through November 23, 2021. The ratings may change as the products are further developed, the sellers grow, and as additional opinions are shared by users. G2 updates the ratings on its website in real time as additional data is received, and this report will be updated as significant data is received. By improving their products and support and/or by having more satisfied customer voices heard, Contenders may become Leaders and Niche sellers may become High Performers.

Trust

Keeping our ratings unbiased is our top priority. We require the use of a LinkedIn account or verified business email address to validate a G2 user's identity and employer. We also validate users by partnering with sellers and organizations to securely authenticate users through select platforms. We do not allow users to review their current or former employers' products, or those of their employers' competitors. Additionally, all reviews are manually checked by our team after our algorithm filters out reviews that don't meet our submission requirements. All reviews must pass our moderation process before they are published.

Our G2 staff does not add any subjective input to the ratings, which are determined algorithmically based on data aggregated from publicly available online sources and social networks. Sellers cannot influence their ratings by spending time or money with us. Only the opinion of real users and data from public sources factor into the ratings.


Grid® Inclusion Criteria

All products in a G2 category that have at least 10 reviews from real users of the product are included on the Grid®. Inviting other users, such as colleagues and peers, to join G2 and share authentic product reviews will accelerate this process.

If a product is not yet listed on G2 and it fits the market definition above, then users are encouraged to [suggest its addition](#) to our [Key Value Databases category](#).

Product Profiles

Product profiles and detailed charts are included for products with 10 or more reviews.




Amazon DynamoDB

4.2 ★★★★★ (182)




Amazon DynamoDB has been named a Leader based on receiving a high customer Satisfaction score and having a large Market Presence. Amazon DynamoDB has the largest Market Presence among products in Key Value Databases. 95% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 94% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Amazon DynamoDB at a rate of 87%. Amazon DynamoDB is also in the Database as a Service (DBaaS) and Document Databases categories.


Satisfaction Ratings




Top Industries Represented



Highest-Rated Features



Lowest-Rated Features



Ownership
AWS



HQ Location
Seattle, WA



Year Founded
2006



Total Revenue
\$177,866 (USD MM)



Employees (Listed On LinkedIn™)
104892



Company Website
aws.amazon.com




Amazon ElastiCache

4.6 ★★★★★ (54)




Amazon ElastiCache has been named a Leader based on receiving a high customer Satisfaction score and having a large Market Presence. 100% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 96% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Amazon ElastiCache at a rate of 92%. Amazon ElastiCache is also in the Data Replication and Database as a Service (DBaaS) categories.


Satisfaction Ratings




Top Industries Represented



Highest-Rated Features



Lowest-Rated Features



Ownership
AWS



HQ Location
Seattle, WA



Year Founded
2006



Total Revenue
\$177,866 (USD MM)



Employees (Listed On LinkedIn™)
104892



Company Website
aws.amazon.com




Redis

4.5 ★★★★★ (112)




Redis has been named a Leader based on receiving a high customer Satisfaction score and having a large Market Presence. 98% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 84% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Redis at a rate of 90%. Redis is also in the Graph Databases and Document Databases categories.

Satisfaction Ratings




Top Industries Represented



Highest-Rated Features



Lowest-Rated Features



Ownership
Redis Labs




HQ Location
Mountain View, CA



Employees (Listed On LinkedIn™)
609



Company Website
redislabs.com




Couchbase Server

4.4 ★★★★★ (93)




Couchbase Server has been named a Leader based on receiving a high customer Satisfaction score and having a large Market Presence. 92% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 85% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Couchbase Server at a rate of 87%. Couchbase Server is also in the Document Databases category.


Satisfaction Ratings




Top Industries Represented



Highest-Rated Features



Lowest-Rated Features



Ownership
Couchbase



HQ Location
Mountain View, CA



Year Founded
2009



Employees (Listed On LinkedIn™)
691



Company Website
www.couchbase.com




Aerospike

4.4 ★★★★★ (83)




Aerospike has been named a Leader based on receiving a high customer Satisfaction score and having a large Market Presence. Aerospike received the highest Satisfaction score among products in Key Value Databases. 98% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 92% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Aerospike at a rate of 89%.


Satisfaction Ratings




Top Industries Represented



Highest-Rated Features



Lowest-Rated Features



Ownership
Aerospike



HQ Location
Mountain View, CA



Year Founded
2009



Employees (Listed On LinkedIn™)
176



Company Website
www.aerospike.com




Hbase

4.2 ★★★★★ (114)




Hbase has been named a Leader based on receiving a high customer Satisfaction score and having a large Market Presence. 93% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 86% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Hbase at a rate of 84%. Hbase is also in the Columnar Databases category.


Satisfaction Ratings




Top Industries Represented



Highest-Rated Features



Lowest-Rated Features



Ownership
The Apache
Software Foundation



HQ Location
Wakefield, MA




Year Founded
1999



**Employees (Listed On
LinkedIn™)**
2016



Company Website
www.apache.org




Azure Table Storage

4.1 ★★★★★ (12)




Azure Table Storage has been named a Leader based on receiving a high customer Satisfaction score and having a large Market Presence. 83% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 78% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Azure Table Storage at a rate of 82%. Azure Table Storage is also in the Columnar Databases category.


Satisfaction Ratings




Top Industries Represented



Highest-Rated Features



Lowest-Rated Features



Ownership
Microsoft



HQ Location
Redmond, WA



Year Founded
1975



Total Revenue
\$143,015 (USD MM)



Employees (Listed On LinkedIn™)
215505



Company Website
clarity.microsoft.com




ArangoDB

4.7 ★★★★★ (65)




ArangoDB has been named a High Performer product based on having high customer Satisfaction scores and a low Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. 97% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 100% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend ArangoDB at a rate of 94%. ArangoDB is also in the Enterprise Search Software, Graph Databases, Document Databases, and Database as a Service (DBaaS) categories.


Satisfaction Ratings




Top Industries Represented



Highest-Rated Features



Lowest-Rated Features



Ownership
ArangoDB



HQ Location
San Francisco, CA



Year Founded
2014



Employees (Listed On LinkedIn™)
70



Company Website
www.arangodb.com




InterSystems IRIS

4.4 ★★★★★ (34)




InterSystems IRIS has been named a High Performer product based on having high customer Satisfaction scores and a low Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. 93% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 90% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend InterSystems IRIS at a rate of 89%. InterSystems IRIS is also in the Database Management Systems (DBMS), Document Databases, Relational Databases, Object-Oriented Databases, and XML Databases categories.

Satisfaction Ratings




Top Industries Represented




*N/A is displayed when fewer than five responses were received for the question.

Highest-Rated Features



Lowest-Rated Features



<p>Ownership InterSystems</p>	<p>HQ Location Cambridge, MA</p>	<p>Year Founded 1978</p>	<p>Employees (Listed On LinkedIn™) 1589</p>	<p>Company Website www.intersystems.com</p>
--	---	-------------------------------------	--	--




Redis Enterprise

4.3 ★★★★★ (34)




Redis Enterprise has been named a High Performer product based on having high customer Satisfaction scores and a low Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. 100% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 79% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Redis Enterprise at a rate of 89%. Redis Enterprise is also in the Time Series Databases, Database Monitoring, Web Hosting, Graph Databases, and Document Databases categories.


Satisfaction Ratings




Top Industries Represented



Highest-Rated Features



Lowest-Rated Features



Ownership
Redis Labs



HQ Location
Mountain View, CA



Employees (Listed On LinkedIn™)
609



Company Website
redislabs.com




Memcached

4.7 ★★★★★ (17)




Memcached has been named a High Performer product based on having high customer Satisfaction scores and a low Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. 100% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 71% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Memcached at a rate of 94%.

Satisfaction Ratings



*N/A is displayed when fewer than five responses were received for the question.


Top Industries Represented



Highest-Rated Features



Lowest-Rated Features




Ownership
Memcached



Employees (Listed On LinkedIn™)
2



Company Website
memcached.org




Azure Redis Cache


3.6 ★★★★★ (21)

Azure Redis Cache has been named a Contender product based on having a relatively low customer Satisfaction score and large Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. While they may have positive reviews, they do not have enough reviews to validate those ratings. 67% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 79% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Azure Redis Cache at a rate of 72%. Azure Redis Cache is also in the Data Replication and Database as a Service (DBaaS) categories.


Satisfaction Ratings




Top Industries Represented



Highest-Rated Features



Lowest-Rated Features



Ownership
Microsoft



HQ Location
Redmond, WA



Year Founded
1975




Total Revenue
\$143,015 (USD MM)



Employees (Listed On LinkedIn™)
215505



Company Website
clarity.microsoft.com




Azure Cosmos DB


4.1 ★★★★★ (54)

Azure Cosmos DB has been named a Contender product based on having a relatively low customer Satisfaction score and large Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. While they may have positive reviews, they do not have enough reviews to validate those ratings. 92% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 70% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Azure Cosmos DB at a rate of 86%. Azure Cosmos DB is also in the Columnar Databases, Graph Databases, Document Databases, and Database as a Service (DBaaS) categories.

Satisfaction Ratings



Top Industries Represented




*N/A is displayed when fewer than five responses were received for the question.

Highest-Rated Features



Lowest-Rated Features



 Ownership Microsoft	 HQ Location Redmond, WA	 Year Founded 1975	 Total Revenue \$143,015 (USD MM)	 Employees (Listed On LinkedIn™) 215505	 Company Website clarity.microsoft.com
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------	--	--	---




DataStax


4.2 ★★★★★ (14)

DataStax has been named a Niche product based on having a relatively low Satisfaction score and low Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. While they may have positive reviews, they do not have enough reviews to validate those ratings. 92% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 82% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend DataStax at a rate of 84%. DataStax is also in the Event Stream Processing, Graph Databases, Document Databases, Database as a Service (DBaaS), Time Series Databases, Database Monitoring, Data Replication, and Columnar Databases categories.

Satisfaction Ratings




Top Industries Represented



Highest-Rated Features



Lowest-Rated Features



Ownership
DataStax



HQ Location
Santa Clara, CA




Year Founded
2010



Employees (Listed On LinkedIn™)
645



Company Website
www.datastax.com




BoltDB

4.4 ★★★★★ (18)


BoltDB has been named a Niche product based on having a relatively low Satisfaction score and low Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. While they may have positive reviews, they do not have enough reviews to validate those ratings. 94% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 100% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend BoltDB at a rate of 87%.

Satisfaction Ratings




*N/A is displayed when fewer than five responses were received for the question.


Top Industries Represented



Highest-Rated Features



Lowest-Rated Features



Ownership
BoltDB



Employees (Listed On LinkedIn™)
2



Company Website
github.com


Oracle NoSQL Database Cloud




4.0 ★★★★★ (11)

Oracle NoSQL Database Cloud has been named a Niche product based on having a relatively low Satisfaction score and low Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. While they may have positive reviews, they do not have enough reviews to validate those ratings. 91% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 88% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Oracle NoSQL Database Cloud at a rate of 79%. Oracle NoSQL Database Cloud is also in the Document Databases and Database as a Service (DBaaS) categories.

Satisfaction Ratings




Top Industries Represented




*N/A is displayed when fewer than five responses were received for the question.

Highest-Rated Features



Lowest-Rated Features



Ownership
Oracle



HQ Location
Redwood Shores, CA



Year Founded
1977



Total Revenue
\$39,068 (USD MM)



Employees (Listed On LinkedIn™)
212924



Company Website
www.oracle.com




Pivotal Gemfire

4.2 ★★★★★ (11)


Pivotal Gemfire has been named a Niche product based on having a relatively low Satisfaction score and low Market Presence compared to the rest of the category. While they may have positive reviews, they do not have enough reviews to validate those ratings. 80% of users rated it 4 or 5 stars, 67% of users believe it is headed in the right direction, and users said they would be likely to recommend Pivotal GemFire at a rate of 83%.

Satisfaction Ratings



*N/A is displayed when fewer than five responses were received for the question.


Top Industries Represented



Highest-Rated Features



Lowest-Rated Features



Ownership
Pivotal



HQ Location
San Francisco, CA



Employees (Listed On LinkedIn™)
463



Company Website
www.pivotal.io

Satisfaction Ratings for Key Value Databases

G2 reviewers rated software sellers' ability to satisfy their needs as shown in the table below.

	Satisfaction		Satisfaction by Category						Net Promoter Score (NPS)
	Likelihood to Recommend	Product Going in Right Direction?	Meets Requirements	Ease of Admin	Ease of Doing Business With	Quality of Support	Ease of Setup	Ease of Use	Net Promoter Score (NPS) (Range from -100 to +100)
Amazon DynamoDB	87%	94%	89%	97%	93%	87%	89%	88%	52
Amazon ElastiCache	92%	96%	93%	89%	91%	86%	91%	93%	76
Redis	90%	84%	90%	82%	88%	80%	87%	90%	64
Couchbase Server	87%	85%	86%	85%	84%	83%	85%	85%	55
Aerospike	89%	92%	89%	85%	93%	90%	88%	88%	63
Hbase	84%	86%	84%	73%	83%	79%	76%	79%	33
Azure Table Storage	82%	78%	89%	89%	89%	81%	91%	87%	33
ArangoDB	94%	100%	93%	92%	94%	90%	92%	90%	80
InterSystems IRIS	89%	90%	88%	N/A	N/A	95%	N/A	83%	64
Redis Enterprise	89%	79%	91%	88%	92%	83%	92%	89%	61
Memcached	94%	71%	96%	N/A	N/A	89%	N/A	95%	81
Azure Redis Cache	72%	79%	82%	69%	74%	82%	83%	83%	16
Azure Cosmos DB	86%	70%	86%	N/A	N/A	91%	N/A	78%	46
DataStax	84%	82%	91%	69%	86%	81%	81%	82%	46
BoltDB	87%	100%	89%	86%	N/A	87%	91%	88%	61
Oracle NoSQL Database Cloud	79%	88%	78%	N/A	N/A	77%	N/A	81%	9
Pivotal GemFire	83%	67%	86%	N/A	N/A	71%	N/A	78%	40
Average	86%	85%	88%	84%	88%	84%	87%	86%	52

*N/A is displayed when fewer than five responses were received for the question.

**Net Promoter Score ranges from -100 to +100

Feature Comparison for Key Value Databases

G2 users have evaluated the following products by feature. Feature ratings are representative of reviewers' overall satisfaction with each feature and do not necessarily take into account the breadth of individual product features. The results are shown below.

Database Features

	Storage	Availability	Stability	Scalability	Security	Data Manipulation	Query Language
Amazon DynamoDB	96%	95%	98%	95%	90%	72%	68%
Amazon ElastiCache	91%	96%	94%	96%	98%	87%	87%
Redis	87%	91%	90%	82%	77%	82%	72%
Couchbase Server	87%	89%	82%	89%	77%	78%	77%
Aerospike	91%	92%	91%	93%	81%	79%	79%
Hbase	88%	86%	82%	89%	79%	75%	71%
Azure Table Storage	90%	91%	89%	91%	90%	82%	75%
ArangoDB	93%	92%	89%	92%	90%	94%	95%
InterSystems IRIS	81%	88%	93%	93%	88%	88%	95%
Redis Enterprise	91%	96%	92%	90%	87%	89%	84%
Memcached	93%	97%	96%	96%	81%	76%	76%
Azure Redis Cache	81%	86%	89%	81%	87%	78%	83%
Azure Cosmos DB	93%	95%	91%	95%	95%	86%	78%
DataStax	87%	87%	89%	95%	83%	80%	86%
BoltDB	88%	93%	92%	68%	70%	78%	69%
Oracle NoSQL Database Cloud	88%	84%	84%	89%	71%	82%	73%
Pivotal GemFire	71%	92%	92%	94%	86%	77%	68%
Average	88%	91%	90%	90%	84%	81%	79%

*N/A is displayed when fewer than five responses were received for the question.

**A blank box indicates that a seller has selected that they do not offer that feature.

Additional Data for Key Value Databases

The table below includes a breakdown of the customer segments for each product, as represented by G2 reviewers.

Customers by Size

	Small Business (50 or fewer emp.)	Mid-Market (51-1000 emp.)	Enterprise (>1000 emp.)
Amazon DynamoDB	35%	25%	40%
Amazon ElastiCache	31%	38%	31%
Redis	53%	27%	20%
Couchbase Server	30%	29%	41%
Aerospike	21%	45%	34%
Hbase	24%	26%	50%
Azure Table Storage	42%	25%	33%
ArangoDB	61%	19%	19%
InterSystems IRIS	64%	21%	14%
Redis Enterprise	48%	43%	10%
Memcached	69%	19%	13%
Azure Redis Cache	33%	44%	22%
Azure Cosmos DB	62%	8%	31%
DataStax	23%	15%	62%
BoltDB	72%	11%	17%
Oracle NoSQL Database Cloud	9%	36%	55%
Pivotal GemFire	30%	10%	60%
Average	42%	26%	32%

(Additional Data for Key Value Databases continues on next page)

*N/A is displayed when fewer than five responses were received for the question or when data is not publicly available.

Additional Data for Key Value Databases (continued)

The table below highlights implementation and deployment data as indicated in real user reviews on G2.

Implementation

	Deployment		Implementation Method		
	Cloud	On-Premises	In-House Team	Seller Services Team	Third-Party Consultant
Amazon DynamoDB	100%	0%	79%	14%	0%
Amazon ElastiCache	87%	13%	92%	8%	0%
Redis	66%	34%	96%	0%	4%
Couchbase Server	56%	44%	88%	12%	0%
Aerospike	58%	42%	94%	6%	0%
Hbase	50%	50%	86%	11%	0%
Azure Table Storage	N/A	N/A	80%	0%	20%
ArangoDB	48%	52%	95%	0%	0%
InterSystems IRIS	N/A	N/A	63%	13%	13%
Redis Enterprise	100%	0%	82%	9%	0%
Memcached	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Azure Redis Cache	83%	17%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Azure Cosmos DB	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
DataStax	50%	50%	N/A	N/A	N/A
BoltDB	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Oracle NoSQL Database Cloud	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pivotal GemFire	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

(Additional Data for Key Value Databases continues on next page)

*N/A is displayed when fewer than five responses were received for the question or when data is not publicly available.

Additional Data for Key Value Databases (continued)

The table below highlights third-party market presence data used to inform the G2's Market Presence Score that highlights each product's impact and influence in the category..

Market Presence

	Seller Name	Year Founded	Revenue (\$MM)	Employees on LinkedIn (Seller)	LinkedIn Followers	Twitter Followers (Seller)	Glassdoor Rating	Alexa Web Traffic Rank
Amazon DynamoDB	AWS	2006	\$177,866	104,892	6,381,177	1,967,498	4.3	11
Amazon ElastiCache	AWS	2006	\$177,866	104,892	6,381,177	1,967,498	4.3	11
Redis	Redis Labs		N/A	609	68,830	33	4.4	174,299
Couchbase Server	Couchbase	2009	N/A	691	27,037	147,703	4.7	53,048
Aerospike	Aerospike	2009	N/A	176	9,833	7,222	4.2	225,893
Hbase	The Apache Software Foundation	1999	N/A	2,016	50,642	61,779	2.6	2,039
Azure Table Storage	Microsoft	1975	\$143,015	215,505	15,619,729	9,973,958	4.4	20
ArangoDB	ArangoDB	2014	N/A	70	3,276	12,694	3.9	151,268
InterSystems IRIS	InterSystems	1978	N/A	1,589	42,184	50,294	4.2	85,384
Redis Enterprise	Redis Labs		N/A	609	68,830	33	4.4	174,299
Memcached	Memcached		N/A	1	1	958	N/A	297,413
Azure Redis Cache	Microsoft	1975	\$143,015	215,505	15,619,729	9,973,958	4.4	20
Azure Cosmos DB	Microsoft	1975	\$143,015	215,505	15,619,729	9,973,958	4.4	20
DataStax	DataStax	2010	N/A	645	37,093	102,690	4.0	50,235
BoltDB	BoltDB		N/A	1	1	365	N/A	92
Oracle NoSQL Database Cloud	Oracle	1977	\$39,068	212,924	7,488,765	786,227	3.8	448
Pivotal GemFire	Pivotal		N/A	463	84,767	378	4.4	141,399

*N/A is displayed when fewer than five responses were received for the question or when data is not publicly available.