

1.

- A. (If doing serial T1 then T2, switching 6 and 7 gives a conflict; if doing serial T2 then T1, if switch 3 and 7, it gives a conflict and T2 would not be in the correct order) (it also has a cycle- ex: R1(X) to W2(X) and R2(X) to W1(X)).

| T1 | T2 |
|------|------|
| R(X) | |
| R(Y) | |
| | R(X) |
| | R(Y) |
| | W(Y) |
| | R(X) |
| W(X) | |
| | R(Y) |
| | W(X) |
| | R(Z) |
| | W(Z) |

B. No, I do not believe so, as it does not make sense to have a transaction for a single query. We hold ACID when there are a series of operations, and it would not be very useful or important to apply these rules (beginning and end, isolated behavior) on one operation (aka the single query statement) in a transaction, as it is guaranteed to satisfy ACID. It would only make sense to me if this schedule was trying to represent each transaction as individual customers/ individuals, and one individual only read X (R(X)) for their whole transaction/interaction.