



Chapter 15 : Concurrency Control

Database System Concepts, 6th Ed.

©Silberschatz, Korth and Sudarshan
See www.db-book.com for conditions on re-use



Outline

- Lock-Based Protocols
- Timestamp-Based Protocols
- Validation-Based Protocols
- Multiple Granularity
- Multiversion Schemes
- Insert and Delete Operations
- Concurrency in Index Structures



Lock-Based Protocols

- A lock is a mechanism to control concurrent access to a data item
- Data items can be locked in two modes :
 1. *exclusive (X) mode*. Data item can be both read as well as written. X-lock is requested using **lock-X** instruction.
 2. *shared (S) mode*. Data item can only be read. S-lock is requested using **lock-S** instruction.
- Lock requests are made to the concurrency-control manager by the programmer. Transaction can proceed only after request is granted.



Lock-Based Protocols (Cont.)

- **Lock-compatibility matrix**

	S	X
S	true	false
X	false	false

- A transaction may be granted a lock on an item if the requested lock is compatible with locks already held on the item by other transactions
- Any number of transactions can hold shared locks on an item,
 - But if any transaction holds an exclusive on the item no other transaction may hold any lock on the item.
- If a lock cannot be granted, the requesting transaction is made to wait till all incompatible locks held by other transactions have been released. The lock is then granted.



Lock-Based Protocols (Cont.)

- Example of a transaction performing locking:

```
 $T_2$ : lock-S( $A$ );  
      read ( $A$ );  
      unlock( $A$ );  
      lock-S( $B$ );  
      read ( $B$ );  
      unlock( $B$ );  
      display( $A+B$ )
```

- Locking as above is not sufficient to guarantee serializability — if A and B get updated in-between the read of A and B , the displayed sum would be wrong.
- A **locking protocol** is a set of rules followed by all transactions while requesting and releasing locks. Locking protocols restrict the set of possible schedules.



The Two-Phase Locking Protocol

- This protocol ensures conflict-serializable schedules.
- Phase 1: Growing Phase
 - Transaction may obtain locks
 - Transaction may not release locks
- Phase 2: Shrinking Phase
 - Transaction may release locks
 - Transaction may not obtain locks
- The protocol assures serializability. It can be proved that the transactions can be serialized in the order of their **lock points** (i.e., the point where a transaction acquired its final lock).



The Two-Phase Locking Protocol (Cont.)

- There can be conflict serializable schedules that cannot be obtained if two-phase locking is used.
- However, in the absence of extra information (e.g., ordering of access to data), two-phase locking is needed for conflict serializability in the following sense:
 - Given a transaction T_i that does not follow two-phase locking, we can find a transaction T_j that uses two-phase locking, and a schedule for T_i and T_j that is not conflict serializable.



Lock Conversions

- Two-phase locking with lock conversions:
 - First Phase:
 - can acquire a lock-S on item
 - can acquire a lock-X on item
 - can convert a lock-S to a lock-X (upgrade)
 - Second Phase:
 - can release a lock-S
 - can release a lock-X
 - can convert a lock-X to a lock-S (downgrade)
- This protocol assures serializability. But still relies on the programmer to insert the various locking instructions.



Automatic Acquisition of Locks

- A transaction T_i issues the standard read/write instruction, without explicit locking calls.
- The operation **read**(D) is processed as:
 - if** T_i has a lock on D
 - then**
 - read(D)
 - else begin**
 - if necessary wait until no other transaction has a **lock-X** on D
 - grant T_i a **lock-S** on D ;
 - read(D)
 - end**



Automatic Acquisition of Locks (Cont.)

- **write(D)** is processed as:
 if T_i has a **lock-X** on D
 then
 write(D)
 else begin
 if necessary wait until no other transaction has any lock on D ,
 if T_i has a **lock-S** on D
 then
 upgrade lock on D to **lock-X**
 else
 grant T_i a **lock-X** on D
 write(D)
 end;
- All locks are released after commit or abort



Deadlocks

- Consider the partial schedule

T_3	T_4
lock-x (B)	
read (B)	
$B := B - 50$	
write (B)	
	lock-s (A)
	read (A)
	lock-s (B)
lock-x (A)	

- Neither T_3 nor T_4 can make progress — executing **lock-S(B)** causes T_4 to wait for T_3 to release its lock on B , while executing **lock-X(A)** causes T_3 to wait for T_4 to release its lock on A .
- Such a situation is called a **deadlock**.
 - To handle a deadlock one of T_3 or T_4 must be rolled back and its locks released.



Deadlocks (Cont.)

- Two-phase locking *does not* ensure freedom from deadlocks.
- In addition to deadlocks, there is a possibility of **starvation**.
- **Starvation** occurs if the concurrency control manager is badly designed. For example:
 - A transaction may be waiting for an X-lock on an item, while a sequence of other transactions request and are granted an S-lock on the same item.
 - The same transaction is repeatedly rolled back due to deadlocks.
- Concurrency control manager can be designed to prevent starvation.



Deadlocks (Cont.)

- The potential for deadlock exists in most locking protocols. Deadlocks are a necessary evil.
- When a deadlock occurs there is a possibility of cascading roll-backs.
- Cascading roll-back is possible under two-phase locking. To avoid this, follow a modified protocol called **strict two-phase locking** -- a transaction must hold all its exclusive locks till it commits/aborts.
- **Rigorous two-phase locking** is even stricter. Here, *all* locks are held till commit/abort. In this protocol transactions can be serialized in the order in which they commit.




Implementation of Locking

- A **lock manager** can be implemented as a separate process to which transactions send lock and unlock requests
- The lock manager replies to a lock request by sending a lock grant messages (or a message asking the transaction to roll back, in case of a deadlock)
- The requesting transaction waits until its request is answered
- The lock manager maintains a data-structure called a **lock table** to record granted locks and pending requests
- The lock table is usually implemented as an in-memory hash table indexed on the name of the data item being locked



Lock Table



- Dark blue rectangles indicate granted locks; light blue indicate waiting requests
- Lock table also records the type of lock granted or requested
- New request is added to the end of the queue of requests for the data item, and granted if it is compatible with all earlier locks
- Unlock requests result in the request being deleted, and later requests are checked to see if they can now be granted
- If transaction aborts, all waiting or granted requests of the transaction are deleted
 - lock manager may keep a list of locks held by each transaction, to implement this efficiently



Deadlock Handling

- System is deadlocked if there is a set of transactions such that every transaction in the set is waiting for another transaction in the set.
- **Deadlock prevention** protocols ensure that the system will *never* enter into a deadlock state. Some prevention strategies :
 - Require that each transaction locks all its data items before it begins execution (predeclaration).
 - Impose partial ordering of all data items and require that a transaction can lock data items only in the order specified by the partial order.



More Deadlock Prevention Strategies

- Following schemes use transaction timestamps for the sake of deadlock prevention alone.
- **wait-die** scheme — non-preemptive
 - older transaction may wait for younger one to release data item. (older means smaller timestamp) Younger transactions never wait for older ones; they are rolled back instead.
 - a transaction may die several times before acquiring needed data item
- **wound-wait** scheme — preemptive
 - older transaction *wounds* (forces rollback) of younger transaction instead of waiting for it. Younger transactions may wait for older ones.
 - may be fewer rollbacks than *wait-die* scheme.



Deadlock prevention (Cont.)

- Both in *wait-die* and in *wound-wait* schemes, a rolled back transactions is restarted with its original timestamp. Older transactions thus have precedence over newer ones, and starvation is hence avoided.
- **Timeout-Based Schemes:**
 - a transaction waits for a lock only for a specified amount of time. If the lock has not been granted within that time, the transaction is rolled back and restarted,
 - Thus, deadlocks are not possible
 - simple to implement; but starvation is possible. Also difficult to determine good value of the timeout interval.




Deadlock Detection


- Deadlocks can be described as a *wait-for graph*, which consists of a pair $G = (V, E)$,
 - V is a set of vertices (all the transactions in the system)
 - E is a set of edges; each element is an ordered pair $T_i \rightarrow T_j$.
- If $T_i \rightarrow T_j$ is in E , then there is a directed edge from T_i to T_j , implying that T_i is waiting for T_j to release a data item.
- When T_i requests a data item currently being held by T_j , then the edge $T_i \rightarrow T_j$ is inserted in the wait-for graph. This edge is removed only when T_j is no longer holding a data item needed by T_i .
- The system is in a deadlock state if and only if the wait-for graph has a cycle. Must invoke a deadlock-detection algorithm periodically to look for cycles.



Deadlock Detection (Cont.)



Wait-for graph without a cycle



Wait-for graph with a cycle



Deadlock Recovery

- When deadlock is detected :
 - Some transaction will have to rolled back (made a victim) to break deadlock. Select that transaction as victim that will incur minimum cost.
 - Rollback -- determine how far to roll back transaction
 - 4 **Total rollback**: Abort the transaction and then restart it.
 - 4 More effective to roll back transaction only as far as necessary to break deadlock.
 - Starvation happens if same transaction is always chosen as victim. Include the number of rollbacks in the cost factor to avoid starvation




Multiple Granularity

- Allow data items to be of various sizes and define a hierarchy of data granularities, where the small granularities are nested within larger ones
- Can be represented graphically as a tree.
- When a transaction locks a node in the tree *explicitly*, it *implicitly* locks all the node's descendents in the same mode.
- **Granularity of locking** (level in tree where locking is done):
 - fine granularity (lower in tree): high concurrency, high locking overhead
 - coarse granularity (higher in tree): low locking overhead, low concurrency



Example of Granularity Hierarchy



The levels, starting from the coarsest (top) level are

- *database*
- *area*
- *file*
- *record*



Intention Lock Modes

- In addition to S and X lock modes, there are three additional lock modes with multiple granularity:
 - ***intention-shared*** (IS): indicates explicit locking at a lower level of the tree but only with shared locks.
 - ***intention-exclusive*** (IX): indicates explicit locking at a lower level with exclusive or shared locks
 - ***shared and intention-exclusive*** (SIX): the subtree rooted by that node is locked explicitly in shared mode and explicit locking is being done at a lower level with exclusive-mode locks.
- intention locks allow a higher level node to be locked in S or X mode without having to check all descendent nodes.



Compatibility Matrix with Intention Lock Modes

- The compatibility matrix for all lock modes is:

	IS	IX	S	SIX	X
IS	true	true	true	true	false
IX	true	true	false	false	false
S	true	false	true	false	false
SIX	true	false	false	false	false
X	false	false	false	false	false



Multiple Granularity Locking Scheme

- Transaction T_i can lock a node Q , using the following rules:
 1. The lock compatibility matrix must be observed.
 2. The root of the tree must be locked first, and may be locked in any mode.
 3. A node Q can be locked by T_i in S or IS mode only if the parent of Q is currently locked by T_i in either IX or IS mode.
 4. A node Q can be locked by T_i in X, SIX, or IX mode only if the parent of Q is currently locked by T_i in either IX or SIX mode.
 5. T_i can lock a node only if it has not previously unlocked any node (that is, T_i is two-phase).
 6. T_i can unlock a node Q only if none of the children of Q are currently locked by T_i .
- Observe that locks are acquired in root-to-leaf order, whereas they are released in leaf-to-root order.
- **Lock granularity escalation**: in case there are too many locks at a particular level, switch to higher granularity S or X lock



Timestamp-Based Protocols

- Each transaction is issued a timestamp when it enters the system. If an old transaction T_i has time-stamp $TS(T_i)$, a new transaction T_j is assigned time-stamp $TS(T_j)$ such that $TS(T_i) < TS(T_j)$.
- The protocol manages concurrent execution such that the time-stamps determine the serializability order.
- In order to assure such behavior, the protocol maintains for each data Q two timestamp values:
 - **W-timestamp**(Q) is the largest time-stamp of any transaction that executed **write**(Q) successfully.
 - **R-timestamp**(Q) is the largest time-stamp of any transaction that executed **read**(Q) successfully.



Timestamp-Based Protocols (Cont.)

- The timestamp ordering protocol ensures that any conflicting **read** and **write** operations are executed in timestamp order.
- Suppose a transaction T_i issues a **read**(Q)
 1. If $TS(T_i) \leq \mathbf{W}\text{-timestamp}(Q)$, then T_i needs to read a value of Q that was already overwritten.
 - Hence, the **read** operation is rejected, and T_i is rolled back.
 2. If $TS(T_i) \geq \mathbf{W}\text{-timestamp}(Q)$, then the **read** operation is executed, and $\mathbf{R}\text{-timestamp}(Q)$ is set to $\mathbf{max}(\mathbf{R}\text{-timestamp}(Q), TS(T_i))$.



Timestamp-Based Protocols (Cont.)

- Suppose that transaction T_i issues **write**(Q).
 1. If $TS(T_i) < R\text{-timestamp}(Q)$, then the value of Q that T_i is producing was needed previously, and the system assumed that that value would never be produced.
 - Hence, the **write** operation is rejected, and T_i is rolled back.
 2. If $TS(T_i) < W\text{-timestamp}(Q)$, then T_i is attempting to write an obsolete value of Q .
 - Hence, this **write** operation is rejected, and T_i is rolled back.
 3. Otherwise, the **write** operation is executed, and $W\text{-timestamp}(Q)$ is set to $TS(T_i)$.



Example Use of the Protocol


A partial schedule for several data items for transactions with timestamps 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

T_1	T_2	T_3	T_4	T_5
read (Y)	read (Y)	write (Y) write (Z)		read (X)
read (X)	read (Z) abort	write (W) abort	read (W)	read (Z)
				write (Y) write (Z)



Correctness of Timestamp-Ordering Protocol

- The timestamp-ordering protocol guarantees serializability since all the arcs in the precedence graph are of the form:



Thus, there will be no cycles in the precedence graph

- Timestamp protocol ensures freedom from deadlock as no transaction ever waits.
- But the schedule may not be cascade-free, and may not even be recoverable.



Recoverability and Cascade Freedom

- Problem with timestamp-ordering protocol:
 - Suppose T_i aborts, but T_j has read a data item written by T_i
 - Then T_j must abort; if T_j had been allowed to commit earlier, the schedule is not recoverable.
 - Further, any transaction that has read a data item written by T_j must abort
 - This can lead to cascading rollback --- that is, a chain of rollbacks
- Solution 1:
 - A transaction is structured such that its writes are all performed at the end of its processing
 - All writes of a transaction form an atomic action; no transaction may execute while a transaction is being written
 - A transaction that aborts is restarted with a new timestamp
- Solution 2: Limited form of locking: wait for data to be committed before reading it
- Solution 3: Use commit dependencies to ensure recoverability



Thomas' Write Rule

- Modified version of the timestamp-ordering protocol in which obsolete **write** operations may be ignored under certain circumstances.
- When T_i attempts to write data item Q , if $TS(T_i) < W\text{-timestamp}(Q)$, then T_i is attempting to write an obsolete value of $\{Q\}$.
 - Rather than rolling back T_i as the timestamp ordering protocol would have done, this **{write}** operation can be ignored.
- Otherwise this protocol is the same as the timestamp ordering protocol.
- Thomas' Write Rule allows greater potential concurrency.
 - Allows some view-serializable schedules that are not conflict-serializable.



Validation-Based Protocol

- Execution of transaction T_i is done in three phases.
 1. **Read and execution phase:** Transaction T_i writes only to temporary local variables
 2. **Validation phase:** Transaction T_i performs a "validation test" to determine if local variables can be written without violating serializability.
 3. **Write phase:** If T_i is validated, the updates are applied to the database; otherwise, T_i is rolled back.
- The three phases of concurrently executing transactions can be interleaved, but each transaction must go through the three phases in that order.
 - Assume for simplicity that the validation and write phase occur together, atomically and serially
 - 4 I.e., only one transaction executes validation/write at a time.
- Also called as **optimistic concurrency control** since transaction executes fully in the hope that all will go well during validation



Validation-Based Protocol (Cont.)

- Each transaction T_i has 3 timestamps
 - $\text{Start}(T_i)$: the time when T_i started its execution
 - $\text{Validation}(T_i)$: the time when T_i entered its validation phase
 - $\text{Finish}(T_i)$: the time when T_i finished its write phase
- Serializability order is determined by timestamp given at validation time; this is done to increase concurrency.
 - Thus, $\text{TS}(T_i)$ is given the value of $\text{Validation}(T_i)$.
- This protocol is useful and gives greater degree of concurrency if probability of conflicts is low.
 - because the serializability order is not pre-decided, and
 - relatively few transactions will have to be rolled back.



Validation Test for Transaction T_j

- If for all T_i with $TS(T_i) < TS(T_j)$ either one of the following condition holds:
 - **finish**(T_i) < **start**(T_j)
 - **start**(T_j) < **finish**(T_i) < **validation**(T_j) **and** the set of data items written by T_i does not intersect with the set of data items read by T_j .then validation succeeds and T_j can be committed. Otherwise, validation fails and T_j is aborted.
- *Justification*: Either the first condition is satisfied, and there is no overlapped execution, or the second condition is satisfied and
 - the writes of T_j do not affect reads of T_i since they occur after T_i has finished its reads.
 - the writes of T_i do not affect reads of T_j since T_j does not read any item written by T_i .



Schedule Produced by Validation

- Example of schedule produced using validation

T_{25}	T_{26}
read (B)	read (B) $B := B - 50$ read (A) $A := A + 50$
read (A) $\langle \text{validate} \rangle$ display ($A + B$)	$\langle \text{validate} \rangle$ write (B) write (A)



Multiversion Schemes

- Multiversion schemes keep old versions of data item to increase concurrency.
 - Multiversion Timestamp Ordering
 - Multiversion Two-Phase Locking
- Each successful **write** results in the creation of a new version of the data item written.
- Use timestamps to label versions.
- When a **read**(Q) operation is issued, select an appropriate version of Q based on the timestamp of the transaction, and return the value of the selected version.
- **reads** never have to wait as an appropriate version is returned immediately.



Multiversion Timestamp Ordering

- Each data item Q has a sequence of versions $\langle Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_m \rangle$. Each version Q_k contains three data fields:
 - **Content** -- the value of version Q_k .
 - **W-timestamp**(Q_k) -- timestamp of the transaction that created (wrote) version Q_k
 - **R-timestamp**(Q_k) -- largest timestamp of a transaction that successfully read version Q_k
- When a transaction T_i creates a new version Q_k of Q , Q_k 's W-timestamp and R-timestamp are initialized to $TS(T_i)$.
- R-timestamp of Q_k is updated whenever a transaction T_j reads Q_k , and $TS(T_j) > R\text{-timestamp}(Q_k)$.



Multiversion Timestamp Ordering (Cont)

- Suppose that transaction T_i issues a **read**(Q) or **write**(Q) operation. Let Q_k denote the version of Q whose write timestamp is the largest write timestamp less than or equal to $TS(T_i)$.
 1. If transaction T_i issues a **read**(Q), then the value returned is the content of version Q_k .
 2. If transaction T_i issues a **write**(Q)
 1. if $TS(T_i) < \text{R-timestamp}(Q_k)$, then transaction T_i is rolled back.
 2. if $TS(T_i) = \text{W-timestamp}(Q_k)$, the contents of Q_k are overwritten
 3. else a new version of Q is created.
- Observe that
 - Reads always succeed
 - A write by T_i is rejected if some other transaction T_j that (in the serialization order defined by the timestamp values) should read T_i 's write, has already read a version created by a transaction older than T_i .
- Protocol guarantees serializability



Multiversion Two-Phase Locking

- Differentiates between read-only transactions and update transactions
- *Update transactions* acquire read and write locks, and hold all locks up to the end of the transaction. That is, update transactions follow rigorous two-phase locking.
 - Each successful **write** results in the creation of a new version of the data item written.
 - Each version of a data item has a single timestamp whose value is obtained from a counter **ts-counter** that is incremented during commit processing.
- *Read-only transactions* are assigned a timestamp by reading the current value of **ts-counter** before they start execution; they follow the multiversion timestamp-ordering protocol for performing reads.



Multiversion Two-Phase Locking (Cont.)

- When an update transaction wants to read a data item:
 - it obtains a shared lock on it, and reads the latest version.
- When it wants to write an item
 - it obtains X lock on; it then creates a new version of the item and sets this version's timestamp to ∞ .
- When update transaction T_i completes, commit processing occurs:
 - T_i sets timestamp on the versions it has created to **ts-counter** + 1
 - T_i increments **ts-counter** by 1
- Read-only transactions that start after T_i increments **ts-counter** will see the values updated by T_i .
- Read-only transactions that start before T_i increments the **ts-counter** will see the value before the updates by T_i .
- Only serializable schedules are produced.



MVCC: Implementation Issues

- Creation of multiple versions increases storage overhead
 - Extra tuples
 - Extra space in each tuple for storing version information
- Versions can, however, be garbage collected
 - E.g. if Q has two versions Q5 and Q9, and the oldest active transaction has timestamp > 9 , then Q5 will never be required again



Snapshot Isolation

- Motivation: Decision support queries that read large amounts of data have concurrency conflicts with OLTP transactions that update a few rows
 - Poor performance results
- Solution 1: Give logical “snapshot” of database state to read only transactions, read-write transactions use normal locking
 - Multiversion 2-phase locking
 - Works well, but how does system know a transaction is read only?
- Solution 2: Give snapshot of database state to every transaction, updates alone use 2-phase locking to guard against concurrent updates
 - Problem: variety of anomalies such as lost update can result
 - Partial solution: snapshot isolation level (next slide)
 - 4 Proposed by Berenson et al, SIGMOD 1995
 - 4 Variants implemented in many database systems
 - E.g. Oracle, PostgreSQL, SQL Server 2005



Snapshot Isolation

- A transaction T1 executing with Snapshot Isolation
 - takes snapshot of committed data at start
 - always reads/modifies data in its own snapshot
 - updates of concurrent transactions are not visible to T1
 - writes of T1 complete when it commits
 - **First-committer-wins rule:**
 - 4 Commits only if no other concurrent transaction has already written data that T1 intends to write.

T1	T2	T3
W(Y := 1) Commit		
	Start R(X) \square 0 R(Y) \square 1	
		W(X:=2) W(Z:=3) Commit
	R(Z) \square 0 R(Y) \square 1 W(X:=3) Commit-Req Abort	

Concurrent updates not visible
 Own updates are visible
 Not first-committer of X
 Serialization error, T2 is rolled back



Snapshot Read

- Concurrent updates invisible to snapshot read

$X_0 = 100, Y_0 = 0$

T_1 deposits 50 in Y	T_2 withdraws 50 from X
$r_1(X_0, 100)$ $r_1(Y_0, 0)$ $w_1(Y_1, 50)$ $r_1(X_0, 100)$ (update by T_2 not seen) $r_1(Y_1, 50)$ (can see its own updates)	$r_2(Y_0, 0)$ $r_2(X_0, 100)$ $w_2(X_2, 50)$ $r_2(Y_0, 0)$ (update by T_1 not seen)

$X_2 = 50, Y_1 = 50$





Snapshot Write: First Committer Wins

$X_0 = 100$

T_1 deposits 50 in X	T_2 withdraws 50 from X
$r_1(X_0, 100)$ $w_1(X_1, 150)$ $commit_1$	$r_2(X_0, 100)$ $w_2(X_2, 50)$ $commit_2$ (Serialization Error T_2 is rolled back)

$X_1 = 150$

- Variant: “**First-updater-wins**”
 - 4 Check for concurrent updates when write occurs by locking item
 - But lock should be held till all concurrent transactions have finished
 - 4 (Oracle uses this plus some extra features)
 - 4 Differs only in when abort occurs, otherwise equivalent



Benefits of SI

- Reading is *never* blocked,
 - and also doesn't block other txns activities
- Performance similar to Read Committed
- Avoids the usual anomalies
 - No dirty read
 - No lost update
 - No non-repeatable read
 - Predicate based selects are repeatable (no phantoms)
- Problems with SI
 - SI does not always give serializable executions
 - 4 Serializable: among two concurrent txns, one sees the effects of the other
 - 4 In SI: neither sees the effects of the other
 - Result: Integrity constraints can be violated



Snapshot Isolation

- E.g. of problem with SI
 - T1: $x := y$
 - T2: $y := x$
 - Initially $x = 3$ and $y = 17$
 - 4 Serial execution: $x = ??, y = ??$
 - 4 if both transactions start at the same time, with snapshot isolation: $x = ??, y = ??$
- Called **skew write**
- Skew also occurs with inserts
 - E.g.:
 - 4 Find max order number among all orders
 - 4 Create a new order with order number = previous max + 1



Snapshot Isolation Anomalies

- SI breaks serializability when txns modify *different* items, each based on a previous state of the item the other modified
 - Not very common in practice
 - 4 E.g., the TPC-C benchmark runs correctly under SI
 - 4 when txns conflict due to modifying different data, there is usually also a shared item they both modify too (like a total quantity) so SI will abort one of them
 - But does occur
 - 4 Application developers should be careful about write skew
- SI can also cause a read-only transaction anomaly, where read-only transaction may see an inconsistent state even if updaters are serializable
 - We omit details
- Using snapshots to verify primary/foreign key integrity can lead to inconsistency
 - Integrity constraint checking usually done outside of snapshot



SI In Oracle and PostgreSQL

- **Warning:** SI used when isolation level is set to serializable, by Oracle, and PostgreSQL versions prior to 9.1
 - PostgreSQL's implementation of SI (versions prior to 9.1) described in Section 26.4.1.3
 - Oracle implements “first updater wins” rule (variant of “first committer wins”)
 - 4 concurrent writer check is done at time of write, not at commit time
 - 4 Allows transactions to be rolled back earlier
 - 4 Oracle and PostgreSQL < 9.1 do not support true serializable execution
 - PostgreSQL 9.1 introduced new protocol called “Serializable Snapshot Isolation” (SSI)
 - 4 Which guarantees true serializability including handling predicate reads (coming up)



SI In Oracle and PostgreSQL

- Can sidestep SI for specific queries by using **select .. for update** in Oracle and PostgreSQL
 - E.g.,
 1. **select max(orderno) from orders for update**
 2. read value into local variable maxorder
 3. insert into orders (maxorder+1, ...)
 - Select for update (SFU) treats all data read by the query as if it were also updated, preventing concurrent updates
 - Does not always ensure serializability since phantom phenomena can occur (coming up)
- In PostgreSQL versions < 9.1, SFU locks the data item, but releases locks when the transaction completes, even if other concurrent transactions are active
 - Not quite same as SFU in Oracle, which keeps locks until all
 - concurrent transactions have completed



Insert and Delete Operations

- If two-phase locking is used :
 - A **delete** operation may be performed only if the transaction deleting the tuple has an exclusive lock on the tuple to be deleted.
 - A transaction that inserts a new tuple into the database is given an X-mode lock on the tuple
- Insertions and deletions can lead to the **phantom phenomenon**.
 - A transaction that scans a relation
 - 4 (e.g., find sum of balances of all accounts in Perryridge)and a transaction that inserts a tuple in the relation
 - 4 (e.g., insert a new account at Perryridge)(conceptually) conflict in spite of not accessing any tuple in common.
 - If only tuple locks are used, non-serializable schedules can result
 - 4 E.g. the scan transaction does not see the new account, but reads some other tuple written by the update transaction



Insert and Delete Operations (Cont.)

- The transaction scanning the relation is reading information that indicates what tuples the relation contains, while a transaction inserting a tuple updates the same information.
 - The conflict should be detected, e.g. by locking the information.
- One solution:
 - Associate a data item with the relation, to represent the information about what tuples the relation contains.
 - Transactions scanning the relation acquire a shared lock in the data item,
 - Transactions inserting or deleting a tuple acquire an exclusive lock on the data item. (Note: locks on the data item do not conflict with locks on individual tuples.)
- Above protocol provides very low concurrency for insertions/deletions.
- Index locking protocols provide higher concurrency while preventing the phantom phenomenon, by requiring locks on certain index buckets.



Index Locking Protocol

- Index locking protocol:
 - Every relation must have at least one index.
 - A transaction can access tuples only after finding them through one or more indices on the relation
 - A transaction T_i that performs a lookup must lock all the index leaf nodes that it accesses, in S-mode
 - 4 Even if the leaf node does not contain any tuple satisfying the index lookup (e.g. for a range query, no tuple in a leaf is in the range)
 - A transaction T_i that inserts, updates or deletes a tuple t_i in a relation r
 - 4 must update all indices to r
 - 4 must obtain exclusive locks on all index leaf nodes affected by the insert/update/delete
 - The rules of the two-phase locking protocol must be observed
- Guarantees that phantom phenomenon won't occur



Next-Key Locking

- Index-locking protocol to prevent phantoms required locking entire leaf
 - Can result in poor concurrency if there are many inserts
- Alternative: for an index lookup
 - Lock all values that satisfy index lookup (match lookup value, or fall in lookup range)
 - Also lock next key value in index
 - Lock mode: S for lookups, X for insert/delete/update
- Ensures that range queries will conflict with inserts/deletes/updates
 - Regardless of which happens first, as long as both are concurrent



Concurrency in Index Structures

- Indices are unlike other database items in that their only job is to help in accessing data.
- Index-structures are typically accessed very often, much more than other database items.
 - Treating index-structures like other database items, e.g. by 2-phase locking of index nodes can lead to low concurrency.
- There are several index concurrency protocols where locks on internal nodes are released early, and not in a two-phase fashion.
 - It is acceptable to have nonserializable concurrent access to an index as long as the accuracy of the index is maintained.
 - 4 In particular, the exact values read in an internal node of a B^+ -tree are irrelevant so long as we land up in the correct leaf node.



Concurrency in Index Structures (Cont.)

- Example of index concurrency protocol:
- Use **crabbing** instead of two-phase locking on the nodes of the B^+ -tree, as follows.
During search/insertion/deletion:
 - First lock the root node in shared mode.
 - After locking all required children of a node in shared mode, release the lock on the node.
 - During insertion/deletion, upgrade leaf node locks to exclusive mode.
 - When splitting or coalescing requires changes to a parent, lock the parent in exclusive mode.
- Above protocol can cause excessive deadlocks
 - Searches coming down the tree deadlock with updates going up the tree
 - Can abort and restart search, without affecting transaction
- Better protocols are available; see Section 16.9 for one such protocol, the B-link tree protocol
 - Intuition: release lock on parent before acquiring lock on child
 - 4 And deal with changes that may have happened between lock release and acquire



Weak Levels of Consistency

- **Degree-two consistency:** differs from two-phase locking in that S-locks may be released at any time, and locks may be acquired at any time
 - X-locks must be held till end of transaction
 - Serializability is not guaranteed, programmer must ensure that no erroneous database state will occur]
- **Cursor stability:**
 - For reads, each tuple is locked, read, and lock is immediately released
 - X-locks are held till end of transaction
 - Special case of degree-two consistency



Weak Levels of Consistency in SQL

- SQL allows non-serializable executions
 - **Serializable**: is the default
 - **Repeatable read**: allows only committed records to be read, and repeating a read should return the same value (so read locks should be retained)
 - 4 However, the phantom phenomenon need not be prevented
 - T1 may see some records inserted by T2, but may not see others inserted by T2
 - **Read committed**: same as degree two consistency, but most systems implement it as cursor-stability
 - **Read uncommitted**: allows even uncommitted data to be read
- In many database systems, read committed is the default consistency level
 - has to be explicitly changed to serializable when required
 - 4 **set isolation level serializable**



Transactions across User Interaction

- Many applications need transaction support across user interactions
 - Can't use locking
 - Don't want to reserve database connection per user
- Application level concurrency control
 - Each tuple has a version number
 - Transaction notes version number when reading tuple
 - 4 **select** r.balance, r.version **into** :A, :version
from r **where** acctId = 23
 - When writing tuple, check that current version number is same as the version when tuple was read
 - 4 **update** r **set** r.balance = r.balance + :deposit
where acctId = 23 **and** r.version = :version
- Equivalent to **optimistic concurrency control without validating read set**
- Used internally in Hibernate ORM system, and manually in many applications
- Version numbering can also be used to support first committer wins check of snapshot isolation
 - Unlike SI, reads are not guaranteed to be from a single snapshot



End of Module 16



Deadlocks

- Consider the following two transactions:

T_1 :	write (X)	T_2 :	write(Y)
	write(Y)		write(X)

- Schedule with deadlock

T_1	T_2
lock-X on A write (A)	
	lock-X on B write (B) wait for lock-X on A
wait for lock-X on B	