

- b) Two of the three battleships of the Italian Vittorio Veneto class — Vittorio Veneto and Italia — were launched in 1940; the third ship of that class, Roma, was launched in 1942. Each had nine 15-inch guns and a displacement of 41,000 tons. Insert these facts into the database.
- c) Delete from **Ships** all ships sunk in battle.
- d) Modify the **Classes** relation so that gun bores are measured in centimeters (one inch = 2.5 centimeters) and displacements are measured in metric tons (one metric ton = 1.1 tons).
- e) Delete all classes with fewer than three ships.

## 6.6 Transactions in SQL

To this point, our model of operations on the database has been that of one user querying or modifying the database. Thus, operations on the database are executed one at a time, and the database state left by one operation is the state upon which the next operation acts. Moreover, we imagine that **operations are carried out** in their entirety (“**atomically**”). That is, we assumed it is impossible for the hardware or software to fail in the middle of a modification, leaving the database in a state that cannot be explained as the result of the operations performed on it.

Real life is often considerably more complicated. We shall first consider what can happen to leave the database in a state that doesn’t reflect the operations performed on it, and then we shall consider the tools SQL gives the user to assure that these problems do not occur.

### 6.6.1 Serializability

In applications like Web services, banking, or airline reservations, hundreds of operations per second may be performed on the database. The operations initiate at any of thousands or millions of sites, such as desktop computers or automatic teller machines. It is entirely possible that we could have **two operations affecting the same bank account** or flight, and for those operations to overlap in time. If so, they might interact in strange ways.

Here is an example of what could go wrong if the DBMS were completely unconstrained as to the order in which it operated upon the database. This example involves a database interacting with people, and it is intended to illustrate why it is important to control the sequences in which interacting events can occur. However, a DBMS would not control events that were so “large” that they involved waiting for a user to make a choice. The event sequences controlled by the DBMS involve only the execution of SQL statements.

**Example 6.40:** The typical airline gives customers a Web interface where they can choose a seat for their flight. This interface shows a map of available

seats, and the data for this map is obtained from the airline's database. There might be a relation such as:

```
Flights(fltNo, fltDate, seatNo, seatStatus)
```

upon which we can issue the query:

```
SELECT seatNo
FROM Flights
WHERE fltNo = 123 AND fltDate = DATE '2008-12-25'
      AND seatStatus = 'available';
```

The flight number and date are example data, which would in fact be obtained from previous interactions with the customer.

When the customer clicks on an empty seat, say 22A, that seat is reserved for them. The database is modified by an update-statement, such as:

```
UPDATE Flights
SET seatStatus = 'occupied'
WHERE fltNo = 123 AND fltDate = DATE '2008-12-25'
      AND seatNo = '22A';
```

However, this customer may not be the only one reserving a seat on flight 123 on Dec. 25, 2008 and this exact moment. Another customer may have asked for the seat map at the same time, in which case they also see seat 22A empty. Should they also choose seat 22A, they too believe they have reserved 22A. The timing of these events is as suggested by Fig. 6.16. □




Figure 6.16: Two customers trying to book the same seat simultaneously

As we see from Example 6.40, it is conceivable that two operations could each be performed correctly, and yet the global result not be correct: both customers believe they have been granted seat 22A. The problem is solved in SQL by the notion of a “transaction,” which is informally a group of operations that need to be performed together. Suppose that in Example 6.40, the query

### Assuring Serializable Behavior

In practice it is often impossible to require that operations run serially; there are just too many of them, and some parallelism is required. Thus, DBMS's adopt a mechanism for assuring serializable behavior; even if the execution is not serial, the result looks to users as if operations were executed serially.

One common approach is for the DBMS to *lock* elements of the database so that two functions cannot access them at the same time. We mentioned locking in Section 1.2.4, and there is an extensive technology of how to implement locks in a DBMS. For example, if the transaction of Example 6.40 were written to lock other transactions out of the *Flights* relation, then transactions that did not access *Flights* could run in parallel with the seat-selection transaction, but no other invocation of the seat-selection operation could run in parallel.

and update shown would be grouped into one transaction.<sup>6</sup> SQL then allows the programmer to state that a certain transaction must be *serializable* with respect to other transactions. That is, these transactions must behave as if they were run *serially* — one at a time, with no overlap.

Clearly, if the two invocations of the seat-selection operation are run serially (or serializably), then the error we saw cannot occur. One customer's invocation occurs first. This customer sees seat 22A is empty, and books it. The other customer's invocation then begins and is not given 22A as a choice, because it is already occupied. It may matter to the customers who gets the seat, but to the database all that is important is that a seat is assigned only once.

### 6.6.2 Atomicity

In addition to nonserialized behavior that can occur if two or more database operations are performed about the same time, it is possible for a single operation to put the database in an unacceptable state if there is a hardware or software “crash” while the operation is executing. Here is another example suggesting what might occur. As in Example 6.40, we should remember that real database systems do not allow this sort of error to occur in properly designed application programs.

**Example 6.41:** Let us picture another common sort of database: a bank's account records. We can represent the situation by a relation

<sup>6</sup>However, it would be extremely unwise to group into a single transaction operations that involved a user, or even a computer that was not owned by the airline, such as a travel agent's computer. Another mechanism must be used to deal with event sequences that include operations outside the database.

Accounts(acctNo, balance)

Consider the operation of transferring \$100 from the account numbered 123 to the account 456. We might first check whether there is at least \$100 in account 123, and if so, we execute the following two steps:

1. Add \$100 to account 456 by the SQL update statement:

```
UPDATE Accounts
SET balance = balance + 100
WHERE acctNo = 456;
```

2. Subtract \$100 from account 123 by the SQL update statement:

```
UPDATE Accounts
SET balance = balance - 100
WHERE acctNo = 123;
```

Now, consider what happens if there is a failure after Step (1) but before Step (2). Perhaps the computer fails, or the network connecting the database to the processor that is actually performing the transfer fails. Then the database is left in a state where money has been transferred into the second account, but the money has not been taken out of the first account. The bank has in effect given away the amount of money that was to be transferred.  $\square$

The problem illustrated by Example 6.41 is that certain combinations of database operations, like the two updates of that example, need to be done *atomically*; that is, either they are both done or neither is done. For example, a simple solution is to have all changes to the database done in a local workspace, and only after all work is done do we *commit* the changes to the database, whereupon all changes become part of the database and visible to other operations.

### 6.6.3 Transactions

The solution to the problems of serialization and atomicity posed in Sections 6.6.1 and 6.6.2 is to group database operations into *transactions*. A transaction is a collection of one or more operations on the database that must be executed atomically; that is, either all operations are performed or none are. In addition, SQL requires that, as a default, transactions are executed in a serializable manner. A DBMS may allow the user to specify a less stringent constraint on the interleaving of operations from two or more transactions. We shall discuss these modifications to the serializability condition in later sections.

When using the *generic SQL interface* (the facility wherein one types queries and other SQL statements), each statement is a transaction by itself. However,

### How the Database Changes During Transactions

Different systems may do different things to implement transactions. It is possible that as a transaction executes, it makes changes to the database. If the transaction aborts, then (unless the programmer took precautions) it is possible that these changes were seen by some other transaction. The most common solution is for the database system to lock the changed items until `COMMIT` or `ROLLBACK` is chosen, thus preventing other transactions from seeing the tentative change. Locks or an equivalent would surely be used if the user wants the transactions to run in a serializable fashion.

However, as we shall see starting in Section 6.6.4, SQL offers us several options regarding the treatment of tentative database changes. It is possible that the changed data is not locked and becomes visible even though a subsequent rollback makes the change disappear. It is up to the author of a transaction to decide whether it is safe for that transaction to see tentative changes of other transactions.

SQL allows the programmer to group several statements into a single transaction. The SQL command `START TRANSACTION` is used to mark the beginning of a transaction. There are two ways to end a transaction:

1. The SQL statement `COMMIT` causes the transaction to end successfully. Whatever changes to the database were caused by the SQL statement or statements since the current transaction began are installed permanently in the database (i.e., they are *committed*). Before the `COMMIT` statement is executed, changes are tentative and may or may not be visible to other transactions.
2. The SQL statement `ROLLBACK` causes the transaction to abort, or terminate unsuccessfully. Any changes made in response to the SQL statements of the transaction are undone (i.e., they are *rolled back*), so they never permanently appear in the database.

**Example 6.42:** Suppose we want the transfer operation of Example 6.41 to be a single transaction. We execute `BEGIN TRANSACTION` before accessing the database. If we find that there are insufficient funds to make the transfer, then we would execute the `ROLLBACK` command. However, if there are sufficient funds, then we execute the two update statements and then execute `COMMIT`.  
□

#### 6.6.4 Read-Only Transactions

Examples 6.40 and 6.41 each involved a transaction that read and then (possibly) wrote some data into the database. This sort of transaction is prone to

### Application- Versus System-Generated Rollbacks

In our discussion of transactions, we have presumed that the decision whether a transaction is committed or rolled back is made as part of the application issuing the transaction. That is, as in Examples 6.44 and 6.42, a transaction may perform a number of database operations, then decide whether to make any changes permanent by issuing **COMMIT**, or to return to the original state by issuing **ROLLBACK**. However, the system may also perform transaction rollbacks, to ensure that transactions are executed atomically and conform to their specified isolation level in the presence of other concurrent transactions or system crashes. Typically, if the system aborts a transaction then a special error code or exception is generated. If an application wishes to guarantee that its transactions are executed successfully, it must catch such conditions and reissue the transaction in question.

serialization problems. Thus we saw in Example 6.40 what could happen if two executions of the function tried to book the same seat at the same time, and we saw in Example 6.41 what could happen if there was a crash in the middle of a funds transfer. However, when a transaction only reads data and does not write data, we have more freedom to let the transaction execute in parallel with other transactions.

**Example 6.43 :** Suppose we wrote a program that read data from the **Flights** relation of Example 6.40 to determine whether a certain seat was available. We could execute many invocations of this program at once, without risk of permanent harm to the database. The worst that could happen is that while we were reading the availability of a certain seat, that seat was being booked or was being released by the execution of some other program. Thus, we might get the answer “available” or “occupied,” depending on microscopic differences in the time at which we executed the query, but the answer would make sense at some time. □

If we tell the SQL execution system that our current transaction is *read-only*, that is, it will never change the database, then it is quite possible that the SQL system will be able to take advantage of that knowledge. Generally it will be possible for many read-only transactions accessing the same data to run in parallel, while they would not be allowed to run in parallel with a transaction that wrote the same data.

We tell the SQL system that the next transaction is read-only by:

```
SET TRANSACTION READ ONLY;
```

This statement must be executed before the transaction begins. We can also inform SQL that the coming transaction may write data by the statement

SET TRANSACTION READ WRITE;

However, this option is the default.

### 6.6.5 Dirty Reads

**Dirty data** is a common term for data written by a transaction that has not yet committed. A **dirty read** is a read of dirty data written by another transaction. The risk in reading dirty data is that the transaction that wrote it may eventually abort. If so, then the dirty data will be removed from the database, and the world is supposed to behave **as if that data never existed**. If some other transaction has read the dirty data, then that transaction might commit or take some other action that reflects its knowledge of the dirty data.

**Sometimes the dirty read matters, and sometimes it doesn't.** Other times it matters little enough that it makes sense to risk an occasional dirty read and thus avoid:

1. The time-consuming work by the DBMS that is needed to prevent dirty reads, and
2. The loss of parallelism that results from waiting until there is no possibility of a dirty read.

Here are some examples of what might happen when dirty reads are allowed.

**Example 6.44:** Let us reconsider the account transfer of Example 6.41. However, suppose that transfers are implemented by a program *P* that executes the following **sequence of steps**:

1. Add money to account 2.
2. Test if account 1 has enough money.
  - (a) If there is not enough money, remove the money from account 2 and end.<sup>7</sup>
  - (b) If there is enough money, subtract the money from account 1 and end.

If program *P* is executed serializably, then it doesn't matter that we have put money temporarily into account 2. No one will see that money, and it gets removed if the transfer can't be made.

However, suppose dirty reads are possible. Imagine there are three accounts: *A*<sub>1</sub>, *A*<sub>2</sub>, and *A*<sub>3</sub>, with \$100, \$200, and \$300, respectively. Suppose transaction

---

<sup>7</sup>You should be aware that the program *P* is trying to perform functions that would more typically be done by the DBMS. In particular, when *P* decides, as it has done at this step, that it must not complete the transaction, it would issue a rollback (abort) command to the DBMS and have the DBMS reverse the effects of this execution of *P*.

$T_1$  executes program  $P$  to transfer \$150 from  $A1$  to  $A2$ . At roughly the same time, transaction  $T_2$  runs program  $P$  to transfer \$250 from  $A2$  to  $A3$ . Here is a possible sequence of events:

1.  $T_2$  executes Step (1) and adds \$250 to  $A3$ , which now has \$550.
2.  $T_1$  executes Step (1) and adds \$150 to  $A2$ , which now has \$350.
3.  $T_2$  executes the test of Step (2) and finds that  $A2$  has enough funds (\$350) to allow the transfer of \$250 from  $A2$  to  $A3$ .
4.  $T_1$  executes the test of Step (2) and finds that  $A1$  does not have enough funds (\$100) to allow the transfer of \$150 from  $A1$  to  $A2$ .
5.  $T_2$  executes Step (2b). It subtracts \$250 from  $A2$ , which now has \$100, and ends.
6.  $T_1$  executes Step (2a). It subtracts \$150 from  $A2$ , which now has  $-\$50$ , and ends.

The total amount of money has not changed; there is still \$600 among the three accounts. But because  $T_2$  read dirty data at the third of the six steps above, we have not protected against an account going negative, which supposedly was the purpose of testing the first account to see if it had adequate funds.  $\square$

**Example 6.45:** Let us imagine a variation on the seat-choosing function of Example 6.40. In the new approach:

1. We find an available seat and reserve it by setting `seatStatus` to 'occupied' for that seat. If there is none, end.
2. We ask the customer for approval of the seat. If so, we commit. If not, we release the seat by setting `seatStatus` to 'available' and repeat Step (1) to get another seat.

If two transactions are executing this algorithm at about the same time, one might reserve a seat  $S$ , which later is rejected by the customer. If the second transaction executes Step (1) at a time when seat  $S$  is marked occupied, the customer for that transaction is not given the option to take seat  $S$ .

As in Example 6.44, the problem is that a dirty read has occurred. The second transaction saw a tuple (with  $S$  marked occupied) that was written by the first transaction and later modified by the first transaction.  $\square$

How important is the fact that a read was dirty? In Example 6.44 it was very important; it caused an account to go negative despite apparent safeguards against that happening. In Example 6.45, the problem does not look too serious. Indeed, the second traveler might not get their favorite seat, or might even be told that no seats existed. However, in the latter case, running the transaction



again will almost certainly reveal the availability of seat *S*. It might well make sense to implement this seat-choosing function in a way that allowed dirty reads, in order to speed up the average processing time for booking requests.

SQL allows us to specify that dirty reads are acceptable for a given transaction. We use the `SET TRANSACTION` statement that we discussed in Section 6.6.4. The appropriate form for a transaction like that described in Example 6.45 is:

```
1) SET TRANSACTION READ WRITE
2) ISOLATION LEVEL READ UNCOMMITTED;
```

The statement above does two things:

1. Line (1) declares that the transaction may write data.
2. Line (2) declares that the transaction may run with the “isolation level” *read-uncommitted*. That is, the transaction is allowed to read dirty data. We shall discuss the four isolation levels in Section 6.6.6. So far, we have seen two of them: serializable and read-uncommitted.

Note that if the transaction is not read-only (i.e., it may modify the database), and we specify isolation level `READ UNCOMMITTED`, then we must also specify `READ WRITE`. Recall from Section 6.6.4 that the default assumption is that transactions are read-write. However, SQL makes an exception for the case where dirty reads are allowed. Then, the default assumption is that the transaction is read-only, because read-write transactions with dirty reads entail significant risks, as we saw. If we want a read-write transaction to run with read-uncommitted as the isolation level, then we need to specify `READ WRITE` explicitly, as above.

### 6.6.6 Other Isolation Levels

SQL provides a total of four *isolation levels*. Two of them we have already seen: *serializable* and *read-uncommitted* (dirty reads allowed). The other two are *read-committed* and *repeatable-read*. They can be specified for a given transaction by

```
SET TRANSACTION ISOLATION LEVEL READ COMMITTED;
```

or

```
SET TRANSACTION ISOLATION LEVEL REPEATABLE READ;
```

respectively. For each, the default is that transactions are read-write, so we can add `READ ONLY` to either statement, if appropriate. Incidentally, we also have the option of specifying

```
SET TRANSACTION ISOLATION LEVEL SERIALIZABLE;
```

### Interactions Among Transactions Running at Different Isolation Levels

A subtle point is that the isolation level of a transaction affects only what data *that* transaction may see; it does not affect what any other transaction sees. As a case in point, if a transaction  $T$  is running at level serializable, then the execution of  $T$  must appear as if all other transactions run either entirely before or entirely after  $T$ . However, if some of those transactions are running at another isolation level, then *they* may see the data written by  $T$  as  $T$  writes it. They may even see dirty data from  $T$  if they are running at isolation level read-uncommitted, and  $T$  aborts.

However, that is the SQL default and need not be stated explicitly.

The **read-committed** isolation level, as its name implies, forbids the reading of dirty (uncommitted) data. However, it does allow a transaction running at this isolation level to issue the same query several times and get different answers, as long as the answers reflect data that has been written by transactions that already committed.

**Example 6.46:** Let us reconsider the seat-choosing program of Example 6.45, but suppose we declare it to run with isolation level read-committed. Then when it searches for a seat at Step (1), it will not see seats as booked if some other transaction is reserving them but not committed.<sup>8</sup> However, if the traveler rejects seats, and one execution of the function queries for available seats many times, it may see a different set of available seats each time it queries, as other transactions successfully book seats or cancel seats in parallel with our transaction. □

Now, let us consider isolation level repeatable-read. The term is something of a misnomer, since the same query issued more than once is not quite guaranteed to get the same answer. Under repeatable-read isolation, if a tuple is retrieved the first time, then we can be sure that the identical tuple will be retrieved again if the query is repeated. However, it is also possible that a second or subsequent execution of the same query will retrieve *phantom tuples*. The latter are tuples that result from insertions into the database while our transaction is executing.

**Example 6.47:** Let us continue with the seat-choosing problem of Examples 6.45 and 6.46. If we execute this function under isolation level repeatable-read,

<sup>8</sup>What actually happens may seem mysterious, since we have not addressed the algorithms for enforcing the various isolation levels. Possibly, should two transactions both see a seat as available and try to book it, one will be forced by the system to roll back in order to break the deadlock (see the box on “Application- Versus System-Generated Rollbacks” in Section 6.6.3).

then a seat that is available on the first query at Step (1) will remain available at subsequent queries.

However, suppose some new tuples enter the relation `Flights`. For example, the airline may have switched the flight to a larger plane, creating some new tuples that weren't there before. Then under repeatable-read isolation, a subsequent query for available seats may also retrieve the new seats.  $\square$

Figure 6.17 summarizes the differences between the four SQL isolation levels.

Isolation Level	Dirty Reads	Nonrepeatable Reads	Phantoms
Read Uncommitted	Allowed	Allowed	Allowed
Read Committed	Not Allowed	Allowed	Allowed
Repeatable Read	Not Allowed	Not Allowed	Allowed
Serializable	Not Allowed	Not Allowed	Not Allowed

Figure 6.17: Properties of SQL isolation levels

### 6.6.7 Exercises for Section 6.6

**Exercise 6.6.1:** This and the next exercises involve certain programs that operate on the two relations

```
Product(maker, model, type)
PC(model, speed, ram, hd, price)
```

from our running PC exercise. Sketch the following programs, including SQL statements and work done in a conventional language. Do not forget to issue `BEGIN TRANSACTION`, `COMMIT`, and `ROLLBACK` statements at the proper times and to tell the system your transactions are read-only if they are.

- Given a speed and amount of RAM (as arguments of the function), look up the PC's with that speed and RAM, printing the model number and price of each.
- Given a model number, delete the tuple for that model from both `PC` and `Product`.
- Given a model number, decrease the price of that model PC by \$100.
- Given a maker, model number, processor speed, RAM size, hard-disk size, and price, check that there is no product with that model. If there is such a model, print an error message for the user. If no such model existed in the database, enter the information about that model into the `PC` and `Product` tables.

**! Exercise 6.6.2:** For each of the programs of Exercise 6.6.1, discuss the atomicity problems, if any, that could occur should the system crash in the middle of an execution of the program.

**! Exercise 6.6.3:** Suppose we execute as a transaction  $T$  one of the four programs of Exercise 6.6.1, while other transactions that are executions of the same or a different one of the four programs may also be executing at about the same time. What behaviors of transaction  $T$  may be observed if all the transactions run with isolation level `READ UNCOMMITTED` that would not be possible if they all ran with isolation level `SERIALIZABLE`? Consider separately the case that  $T$  is any of the programs (a) through (d) of Exercise 6.6.1.

**!! Exercise 6.6.4:** Suppose we have a transaction  $T$  that is a function which runs “forever,” and at each hour checks whether there is a PC that has a speed of 3.5 or more and sells for under \$1000. If it finds one, it prints the information and terminates. During this time, other transactions that are executions of one of the four programs described in Exercise 6.6.1 may run. For each of the four isolation levels — serializable, repeatable read, read committed, and read uncommitted — tell what the effect on  $T$  of running at this isolation level is.

## 6.7 Summary of Chapter 6

- ◆ *SQL:* The language SQL is the principal query language for relational database systems. The most recent full standard is called SQL-99 or SQL3. Commercial systems generally vary from this standard.
- ◆ *Select-From-Where Queries:* The most common form of SQL query has the form select-from-where. It allows us to take the product of several relations (the `FROM` clause), apply a condition to the tuples of the result (the `WHERE` clause), and produce desired components (the `SELECT` clause).
- ◆ *Subqueries:* Select-from-where queries can also be used as subqueries within a `WHERE` clause or `FROM` clause of another query. The operators `EXISTS`, `IN`, `ALL`, and `ANY` may be used to express boolean-valued conditions about the relations that are the result of a subquery in a `WHERE` clause.
- ◆ *Set Operations on Relations:* We can take the union, intersection, or difference of relations by connecting the relations, or connecting queries defining the relations, with the keywords `UNION`, `INTERSECT`, and `EXCEPT`, respectively.
- ◆ *Join Expressions:* SQL has operators such as `NATURAL JOIN` that may be applied to relations, either as queries by themselves or to define relations in a `FROM` clause.

- ♦ **Null Values:** SQL provides a special value NULL that appears in components of tuples for which no concrete value is available. The arithmetic and logic of NULL is unusual. Comparison of any value to NULL, even another NULL, gives the truth value UNKNOWN. That truth value, in turn, behaves in boolean-valued expressions as if it were halfway between TRUE and FALSE.
- ♦ **Outerjoins:** SQL provides an OUTER JOIN operator that joins relations but also includes in the result dangling tuples from one or both relations; the dangling tuples are padded with NULL's in the resulting relation.
- ♦ **The Bag Model of Relations:** SQL actually regards relations as bags of tuples, not sets of tuples. We can force elimination of duplicate tuples with the keyword DISTINCT, while keyword ALL allows the result to be a bag in certain circumstances where bags are not the default.
- ♦ **Aggregations:** The values appearing in one column of a relation can be summarized (aggregated) by using one of the keywords SUM, AVG (average value), MIN, MAX, or COUNT. Tuples can be partitioned prior to aggregation with the keywords GROUP BY. Certain groups can be eliminated with a clause introduced by the keyword HAVING.
- ♦ **Modification Statements:** SQL allows us to change the tuples in a relation. We may INSERT (add new tuples), DELETE (remove tuples), or UPDATE (change some of the existing tuples), by writing SQL statements using one of these three keywords.
- ♦ **Transactions:** SQL allows the programmer to group SQL statements into transactions, which may be committed or rolled back (aborted). Transactions may be rolled back by the application in order to undo changes, or by the system in order to guarantee atomicity and isolation.
- ♦ **Isolation Levels:** SQL defines four isolation levels called, from most stringent to least stringent: “serializable” (the transaction must appear to run either completely before or completely after each other transaction), “repeatable-read” (every tuple read in response to a query will reappear if the query is repeated), “read-committed” (only tuples written by transactions that have already committed may be seen by this transaction), and “read-uncommitted” (no constraint on what the transaction may see).

## 6.8 References for Chapter 6

Many books on SQL programming are available. Some popular ones are [3], [5], and [7]. [6] is an early exposition of the SQL-99 standard.

SQL was first defined in [4]. It was implemented as part of System R [1], one of the first generation of relational database prototypes.