

HW 4

Name: **Jiacheng Zhao**

Resources. (All people, books, articles, web pages, etc. that have been consulted when producing your answers to this homework)

Textbook and instructor's slides

On my honor, as an Aggie, I have neither given nor received any unauthorized aid on any portion of the academic work included in this assignment. Furthermore, I have disclosed all resources (people, books, web sites, etc.) that have been used to prepare this homework. This work is my own and is written in my own words.

Signature: JIACHENG ZHAO

Problem 1. Exercise 16.4

Solution.

The balance of Z should be 20 in the end.

Transactions of T and U is not a serially equivalent example. The conflicting operations in T and U are NOT executed in the same order for all the data they both access. If U is executed first then execute T, the update of all U's operations will be lost, since we can not deposit money to an account that does not exist; if T is executed first, then the final deposit should be 30. In that case T and U are not serially equivalent.

Problem 2. Exercise 16.9

Solution.

- (a) serially equivalent but not with two-phase locking
- (b) serially equivalent and with two-phase locking
- (c) serially equivalent and with two-phase locking
- (d) serially equivalent but not with two-phase locking

Problem 3. Exercise 16.10

Solution.

T	U
read (i)	
	write (i, 55)
	write (j, 66)
read (j)	

A read only transaction can have inconsistent retrievals. Take the scenario above as an example. When read(i) release the read-only lock, U calls write-only lock and release it only after changing the number of j. After that T is able to read the value of j. Since the pairs of conflict operation in T and U are different so these transactions have inconsistent retrievals. They are NOT serially equivalent.

Problem 4. Exercise 16.16

Solution.

Scenario i)

T	U
$x := \text{read}(i);$ $\text{write}(j, 44);$	$\text{write}(i, 55);$ $\text{write}(j, 66);$

i) In this scenario, because it's backward validation we only check rule 2. Since U has not committed when T perform read(i), rule 2 is satisfied.

Scenario ii)

T	U
$x := \text{read}(i)$ Abort	$\text{write}(i, 55);$ $\text{write}(j, 66);$

ii) In this scenario, U commits first. And since it's backward validation as well, we only need check rule 2. Rule 2 forbids T from reading object written by U. Obviously, this rule is violated because T commits later and performs read(i), which was written by U before. In this case T should abort after performing read(i). The backward validation fails.



Scenario iii)

T	U
$x := \text{read}(i);$ $\text{write}(j, 44);$	$\text{write}(i, 55);$ $\text{write}(j, 66);$

iii) In this scenario we only need to check rule 1 since it's forward validation. Rule 1 forbids U from reading objects written by T. Since U does NOT perform any reading action, this rule is automatically satisfied.

Scenario iv)

T	U
$x := \text{read}(i)$ $\text{write}(j, 44)$	Abort

iv) In this scenario, this case satisfy Rule 1 which forbids U from reading objects written by T. However, T commits later and performs read(i), which was written by U before. This action violates the Rule 2, so U has to abort. The forward validation fails.

Problem 5. Exercise 16.19

Solution.

(a) Initially:

$a_i = 10$, write timestamp = max read timestamp = t_0

$a_j = 20$, write timestamp = max read timestamp = t_0

First, T: read(i); T timestamp = t_1 ;

According to the read rule, $t_1 > \text{write timestamp on committed version}$, which is t_0 and $D_{selected}$ is committed. In this case, allow T to read $x = 10$ and set $\text{max read timestamp}(a_i)$ as t_1 .

Next, U: $\text{write}(i, 55)$; U timestamp = t_2 ;

According to write rule, $t_2 \geq \text{max read timestamp}$, which is t_1 , and $t_2 > \text{write timestamp committed version}(t_0)$. In this case, allow U to write a_i 's value as 55 and set write timestamp as t_2 .

Next, T: $\text{write}(j, 44)$; T timestamp = t_1 ;

According to write rule, $t_1 \geq \text{max read timestamp}$, which is t_0 , and $t_1 > \text{write timestamp committed version}(t_0)$. In this case, allow T to write a_j 's value as 44 and set write timestamp as t_1 .

Finally, U: $\text{write}(j, 66)$; U timestamp = t_2 ;

According to write rule, $t_2 \geq \text{max read timestamp}$, which is t_0 , and $t_2 > \text{write timestamp committed version}(t_0)$. In this case, allow U to write a_j 's value as 66 and set write timestamp as t_2 .

After U commits:

a_i : committed version: value = 55; write timestamp = t_2 ; max read timestamp = t_1

a_j : committed version: value = 66; write timestamp = t_2 ; max read timestamp = t_0

(b) Initially as (a);

First, T: $\text{read}(i)$; T timestamp = t_1 ;

According to the read rule, $t_1 > \text{write timestamp on committed version}$, which is t_0 and $D_{selected}$ is committed. In this case, allow T to read $x = 10$ and set $\text{max read timestamp}(a_i)$ as t_1 .

Next, T: $\text{write}(j, 44)$; T timestamp = t_1 ;

According to write rule, $t_1 \geq \text{max read timestamp}$, which is t_0 , and $t_1 > \text{write timestamp committed version}(t_0)$. In this case, allow T to write a_j 's value as 44 and set write timestamp as t_1 .

Next, U: $\text{write}(i, 55)$; U timestamp = t_2 ;

According to write rule, $t_2 \geq \text{max read timestamp}$, which is t_1 , and $t_2 > \text{write timestamp committed version}(t_0)$. In this case, allow U to write a_i 's value as 55 and set write timestamp as t_2 .

Finally, U: $\text{write}(j, 66)$; U timestamp = t_2 ;

According to write rule, $t_2 \geq \text{max read timestamp}$, which is t_0 , and $t_2 > \text{write timestamp committed version}(t_0)$. In this case, allow U to write a_j 's value as 66 and set write timestamp as t_2 .

After U commits:

a_i : committed version: value = 55; write timestamp = t_2 ; max read timestamp = t_1

a_j : committed version: value = 66; write timestamp = t_2 ; max read timestamp = t_0

(c) Initially as (a)

First, U: $\text{write}(i, 55)$; U timestamp = t_1 ;

According to write rule, $t_1 \geq \max \text{read timestamp}$, which is t_0 , and $t_1 > \text{write timestamp committed version}(t_0)$. In this case, allow U to write a_i 's value as 55 and set write timestamp as t_1 .

Next, U: write(j, 66); U timestamp = t_1 ;

According to write rule, $t_1 \geq \max \text{read timestamp}$, which is t_0 , and $t_1 > \text{write timestamp committed version}(t_0)$. In this case, allow U to write a_j 's value as 66 and set write timestamp as t_1 .

Next, T: read(i); T timestamp = t_2 ;

According to the read rule, $t_2 > \text{write timestamp on committed version}$, which is t_0 , but $D_{\text{selected}} = t_1$ is NOT committed yet. In this case, WAIT U to commit or abort.

U commits:

a_i : committed version: value = 55; write timestamp = t_1 ; max read timestamp = t_0

a_j : committed version: value = 66; write timestamp = t_1 ; max read timestamp = t_0

Finally, T: write(j, 44); T timestamp = t_2 ;

According to write rule, $t_2 \geq \max \text{read timestamp}$, which is t_0 , and $t_2 > \text{write timestamp committed version}(t_1)$. In this case, allow T to write a_j 's value as 44 and set write timestamp as t_2 .

After T commits:

a_i : committed version: value = 55; write timestamp = t_1 ; max read timestamp = t_2

a_j : committed version: value = 44; write timestamp = t_2 ; max read timestamp = t_0

(d) Initially as (a)

First, U: write(i, 55); U timestamp = t_1 ;

According to write rule, $t_1 \geq \max \text{read timestamp}$, which is t_0 , and $t_1 > \text{write timestamp committed version}(t_0)$. In this case, allow U to write a_i 's value as 55 and set write timestamp as t_1 .

Next, T: read(i); T timestamp = t_2 ;

According to the read rule, $t_2 > \text{write timestamp on committed version}$, which is t_0 , but $D_{\text{selected}} = t_1$ is NOT committed yet. In this case, WAIT U to commit or abort.

Next, U: write(j, 66); U timestamp = t_1 ;

According to write rule, $t_1 \geq \max \text{read timestamp}$, which is t_0 , and $t_1 > \text{write timestamp committed version}(t_0)$. In this case, allow U to write a_j 's value as 66 and set write timestamp as t_1 .

U commits:

a_i : committed version: value = 55; write timestamp = t_1 ; max read timestamp = t_0

a_j : committed version: value = 66; write timestamp = t_1 ; max read timestamp = t_0

Finally, T: write(j, 44); T timestamp = t_2 ;

According to write rule, $t_2 \geq \max \text{read timestamp}$, which is t_0 , and $t_2 \geq \text{write timestamp committed version}(t_1)$. In this case, allow T to write a_j 's value as 44 and set write timestamp as t_2 .

After T commits:

a_i : committed version: value = 55; write timestamp = t_1 ; max read timestamp = t_2

a_j : committed version: value = 44; write timestamp = t_2 ; max read timestamp = t_0

