





# CSE3103 : Database

Nazmus Sakib  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Computer Science and Engineering  
Ahsanullah University of Science and Technology

# Concurrent Executions

- Multiple transactions are allowed to run concurrently in the system.
- Advantages are:
  - **Increased processor and disk utilization**, leading to better transaction *throughput*
  - **Reduced average response time** for transactions: short transactions need not wait behind long ones.
- **Concurrency control schemes** – mechanisms to achieve isolation
  - That is, to control the interaction among the concurrent transactions in order to prevent them from destroying the consistency of the database

# Schedules

- **Schedule** – a sequences of instructions that specify the chronological order in which instructions of concurrent transactions are executed
  - A schedule for a set of transactions must consist of all instructions of those transactions.
  - Must preserve the order in which the instructions appear in each individual transaction.
- A transaction that successfully completes its execution will have a **commit** instructions as the last statement
  - By default transaction assumed to execute commit instruction as its last step
- A transaction that fails to successfully complete its execution will have an **abort** instruction as the last statement

# Schedule 1

- $T_1$  transfer \$50 from  $A$  to  $B$ , and
- $T_2$  transfer 10% of the balance from  $A$  to  $B$ .
- An example of a **serial** schedule in which  $T_1$  is followed by  $T_2$  :

$T_1$	$T_2$
read ( $A$ ) $A := A - 50$ write ( $A$ ) read ( $B$ ) $B := B + 50$ write ( $B$ ) commit	read ( $A$ ) $temp := A * 0.1$ $A := A - temp$ write ( $A$ ) read ( $B$ ) $B := B + temp$ write ( $B$ ) commit

T1	T2
A=100	A=50
A=100-50	TEMP=50*10%=5
A=50	A=50-TEMP =45
B= 200	B= 250
B= 200+50	B= 250+5
B=250	B=255

After Schedule 1	
A = 45	B= 255

# Schedule 2

- $T_1$  transfer \$50 from  $A$  to  $B$ , and
- $T_2$  transfer 10% of the balance from  $A$  to  $B$ .
- An example of a **serial** schedule in which  $T_2$  is followed by  $T_1$  :

$T_1$	$T_2$
read ( $A$ ) $A := A - 50$ write ( $A$ ) read ( $B$ ) $B := B + 50$ write ( $B$ ) commit	read ( $A$ ) $temp := A * 0.1$ $A := A - temp$ write ( $A$ ) read ( $B$ ) $B := B + temp$ write ( $B$ ) commit

After Schedule 1	
$A = 45$	$B = 255$

$T_1$	$T_2$
$A=90$	$A=100$
$A=90-50$	$TEMP=100*10\%=10$
$A=40$	$A=100-TEMP =90$
$B= 210$	$B= 200$
$B= 210+50$	$B= 200+10$
$B=260$	$B=210$

After Schedule 2	
$A = 40$	$B = 260$

# Schedule 3

- Let  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  be the transactions defined previously.
- The following schedule is not a serial schedule,
- but it is **equivalent** to Schedule 1.

$T_1$	$T_2$
read (A) $A := A - 50$ write (A)	
	read (A) $temp := A * 0.1$ $A := A - temp$ write (A)
read (B) $B := B + 50$ write (B) commit	
	read (B) $B := B + temp$ write (B) commit

Note -- In schedules 1, 2 and 3, the sum "A + B" is preserved.

## After Schedule 1

A = 45

B = 255

## After Schedule 2

A = 40

B = 260

T1	T2
A=100	A=50
A=100-50	TEMP=50*10%=5
A=50	A=50-TEMP =45
B= 200	B= 250
B= 200+50	B= 250+5
B=250	B=255

## After Schedule 3

A = 45

B = 255

# Schedule 4

- Let  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  be the transactions defined previously.
- The following schedule is not a serial schedule,

Note -- In schedules 4 the sum "A + B" is not preserved.

$T_1$	$T_2$
read (A) $A := A - 50$	
	read (A) $temp := A * 0.1$ $A := A - temp$ write (A) read (B)
write (A) read (B) $B := B + 50$ write (B) commit	
	$B := B + temp$ write (B) commit

After Schedule 1	
A = 45	B = 255

After Schedule 2	
A = 40	B = 260

After Schedule 3	
A = 45	B = 255

T1	T2
A=100	A=100
A=100-50	TEMP=100*10%=10
A=50	A=100-TEMP =90
B= 200	B= 200
B= 200+50	B= 200+10
B=250	B=210

After Schedule 4	
A = 50	B = 210



