

- (a) ~~(b)~~ (b) (c)
- D & I single object tx's.
inconsistent behaviour if
D before I for some & not others
- 2PL has no effect.
- inconsistency can only be corrected outside scheduler

- D & T. eg:
- 2 T: check(A, £1000) → OK
2 D: debit(A, £1000)
1 T: debit(A, £1000) → RED
etc
- 2PL: $T < D$
A can still go red
 $T > D$ T aborts.
- correct outside scheduler

- I & T.
- 2 T: check(A, £1000) → OK
2 T: debit(A, £1000)
2 I: interest(A) } interest loan
1 I: interest(B) } on £1000 in transit
1 T: credit(B, £1000)
- 2PL can delay I but customer can still lose interest
- correct outside scheduler

- (a) (b)
- T & T. assume checks OK
- 2 Tx: debit(A, £1000)
2 Ty: debit(B, £200)
3 Tx: credit(B, £1000)
Ty: ~~credit~~ (A, £200)
- 2PL could deadlock
- Tx: lock(A)
Ty: lock(B)
Tx: debit(A, £1000)
Ty: debit(B, £200)
Tx: lock(B) - fail
Ty: lock(A) - fail

- 2 c) if we can say that debit and credit do not conflict there is no need to lock & the deadlock detection ~~was~~ unnecessary.

(20) We have assumed that object operations such as debit/credit can be made atomic.