2PL - no difference on invocation - objects are locked by his - to enforce isolation, must keep objects locked until commit (STRICT) - if isolation is not entered, cascading about may occur. Traders - delayed unlocking - us-delay on commit & complexity of casc about. TSO - non-strict - tx may be rejected as too late if timestamp (ts) less than latest conflicting in so cartain to - otherwise proceeds immediate The tx system must their manage cascading aborts and undo affected operation invocations. Objects need to have a commit operation strict TSO: will still reject if too late. If timestamp is OK- will delay until previous conflicting operation is committed - so object, as before, needs a commit operation. (25) Tradeoff is whether to delay to on invocation or on commit OCC - tx's work on "shadow copies" ie. different object verkons If the system used atomic commitment such shadows would be of committed state - so isolation enforced in implementation. But Atomic commitment is not "optimistic" - we may need fast access to objects + conflict many be v. rare. OCC - validation of a tx when commit is requested: (i) are its set of object versions consistent! - look at time stamps and time shadows were taken.

(ii) have conflicting updates been made to the objects Since the shadows were taken? Trade of - ig (1) is false (isocaluni nor enforced) about to - time waster Vs. immediate access OCC-commitment Committed his values / version of objects applied with timestamp at commut. State (object rusions after commit) $T_1(A, B, C, D, E) \rightarrow (A_1 B_1 C_1 D_1 E_1)$ (the discussion $T_2(B_1 C_2 D_2 E_1)$ may use such an $T_3(A, C, E) \rightarrow (A_3 B_2 C_3 D_2 E_3)$ example). T_4 (C, D) \rightarrow ($A_3 B_2 C_4, D_4 E_3$)

Concurrent deptems 2001 dolutioni

has used are committed by prior transactions.

(2)

Isolation: naively: a tx may not see uncommitted state. (STRICT)

in practice: a 1x may not commit until all the object value it