Chapter 18 : Concurrency Control

Database System Concepts, 7th Ed.

Outline

- Lock-Based Protocols
- Timestamp-Based Protocols

Lock-Based Protocols

- In concurrent environment many users can access same data in a DBMS simultaneously each has the feel that it has exclusive access to the database.
- To achieve such system we must have interaction amongst those concurrent transactions which is also called a mutual Exclusion.
- A lock is a mechanism to control concurrent access to a data item
- Data items can be locked in two modes :

1. **exclusive** *(X) mode*. Data item can be both read as well as written. X-lock is requested using **lock-X** instruction.
2. **shared** *(S) mode*. Data item can only be read. S-lock is requested using **lock-S** instruction.

- Lock requests are made to concurrency-control manager. Transaction can proceed only after request is granted.

Lock-Based Protocols (Cont.)

- **Lock-compatibility matrix**

	S	X
S	true	false
X	false	false

- A transaction may be granted a lock on an item if the requested lock is compatible with locks already held on the item by other transactions
- Any number of transactions can hold shared locks on an item,
  - But if any transaction holds an exclusive on the item no other transaction may hold any lock on the item.
- If a lock cannot be granted, the requesting transaction is made to wait till all incompatible locks held by other transactions have been released. The lock is then granted.

Deadlock

- Consider the partial schedule

T_3	T_4
lock-X(B)	
read(B)	
$B := B - 50$	
write(B)	
	lock-S(A)
	read(A)
	lock-S(B)
lock-X(A)	

- Neither T_3 nor T_4 can make progress — executing **lock-S**(B) causes T_4 to wait for T_3 to release its lock on B, while executing **lock-X**(A) causes T_3 to wait for T_4 to release its lock on A.
- Such a situation is called a **deadlock**.
  - To handle a deadlock one of T_3 or T_4 must be rolled back and its locks released.

Deadlock (Cont.)

- The potential for deadlock exists in most locking protocols. Deadlocks are a necessary evil.
- **Starvation** is also possible if concurrency control manager is badly designed. For example:
  - A transaction may be waiting for an X-lock on an item, while a sequence of other transactions request and are granted an S-lock on the same item.
  - The same transaction is repeatedly rolled back due to deadlocks.
- Concurrency control manager can be designed to prevent starvation.

The Two-Phase Locking Protocol

- A protocol which ensures conflict-serializable schedules.
- Phase 1: **Growing Phase**
  - Transaction may obtain locks
  - Transaction may not release locks
- Phase 2: **Shrinking Phase**
  - Transaction may release locks
  - Transaction may not obtain locks
- The protocol assures serializability. It can be proved that the transactions can be serialized in the order of their **lock points** (i.e., the point where a transaction acquired its final lock).



The Two-Phase Locking Protocol

Ti: LOCK X(B)	Tj: LOCK X(B)
READ (B)	READ (B)
B=B-50	B=B-50
WRITE (B)	WRITE (B)
LOCK X-(A)	UNLOCK (B)
READ (A)	LOCK X-(A)
A=A+50	READ (A)
WRITE (A)	A=A+50
UNLOCK (B)	WRITE (A)
UNLOCK (A)	UNLOCK (A)

Timestamp Based Concurrency Control

Timestamp-Based Protocols

- Each transaction T_i is issued a timestamp TS(T_i) when it enters the system.
  - Each transaction has a *unique* timestamp
  - Newer transactions have timestamps strictly greater than earlier ones
  - Timestamp could be based on a logical counter
    - Real time may not be unique
    - Can use (wall-clock time, logical counter) to ensure
- Timestamp-based protocols manage concurrent execution such that
  time-stamp order = serializability order
- Several alternative protocols based on timestamps

Timestamp-Ordering Protocol

The **timestamp ordering (TSO) protocol**

- Maintains for each data *Q* two timestamp values:
  - **W-timestamp**(*Q*) is the largest time-stamp of any transaction that executed **write**(*Q*) successfully.
  - **R-timestamp**(*Q*) is the largest time-stamp of any transaction that executed **read**(*Q*) successfully.
- Imposes rules on read and write operations to ensure that
  - Any conflicting operations are executed in timestamp order
  - Out of order operations cause transaction rollback

Timestamp-Based Protocols (Cont.)

- Suppose a transaction T_i issues a **read**(Q)

  1. If TS(T_i) ≤ **W**-timestamp(Q), then T_i needs to read a value of Q that was already overwritten.
     - Hence, the **read** operation is rejected, and T_i is rolled back.
  2. If TS(T_i) ≥ **W**-timestamp(Q), then the **read** operation is executed, and R-timestamp(Q) is set to

     max(R-timestamp(Q), TS(T_i)).

Timestamp-Based Protocols (Cont.)

- Suppose that transaction T_i issues **write**(Q).
  1. If TS(T_i) < R-timestamp(Q), then the value of Q that T_i is producing was needed previously, and the system assumed that that value would never be produced.
     - Hence, the **write** operation is rejected, and T_i is rolled back.
  2. If TS(T_i) < W-timestamp(Q), then T_i is attempting to write an obsolete value of Q.
     - Hence, this **write** operation is rejected, and T_i is rolled back.
  3. Otherwise, the **write** operation is executed, and W-timestamp(Q) is set to TS(T_i).

Example of Schedule Under TSO

- Is this schedule valid under TSO?

  Assume that initially:
  R-TS(A) = W-TS(A) = 0
  R-TS(B) = W-TS(B) = 0
  Assume TS(T_{25}) = 25 and
  TS(T_{26}) = 26

T_{25}	T_{26}
read(B)	
	read(B)
	$B := B - 50$
	write(B)
read(A)	
	read(A)
display($A + B$)	
	$A := A + 50$
	write(A)
	display($A + B$)

- How about this one, where initially
  R-TS(Q)=W-TS(Q)=0

T_{27}	T_{28}
read(Q)	
	write(Q)
write(Q)	

Another Example Under TSO

A partial schedule for several data items for transactions with timestamps 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, with all R-TS and W-TS = 0 initially

T_1	T_2	T_3	T_4	T_5
				read (X)
	read (Y)			
read (Y)				
		write (Y)		
		write (Z)		
				read (Z)
	read (Z)			
	abort			
read (X)				
			read (W)	
		write (W)		
		abort		
				write (Y)
				write (Z)

Correctness of Timestamp-Ordering Protocol

- The timestamp-ordering protocol guarantees serializability since all the arcs in the precedence graph are of the form:

Thus, there will be no cycles in the precedence graph

- Timestamp protocol ensures freedom from deadlock as no transaction ever waits.
- But the schedule may not be cascade-free, and may not even be recoverable.

Recoverability and Cascade Freedom

- Solution 1:
  - A transaction is structured such that its writes are all performed at the end of its processing
  - All writes of a transaction form an atomic action; no transaction may execute while a transaction is being written
  - A transaction that aborts is restarted with a new timestamp
- Solution 2:
  - Limited form of locking: wait for data to be committed before reading it
- Solution 3:
  - Use commit dependencies to ensure recoverability

Thomas' Write Rule

- Modified version of the timestamp-ordering protocol in which obsolete **write** operations may be ignored under certain circumstances.
- When T_i attempts to write data item Q, if TS(T_i) < W-timestamp(Q), then T_i is attempting to write an obsolete value of {Q}.
  - Rather than rolling back T_i as the timestamp ordering protocol would have done, this {**write**} operation can be ignored.
- Otherwise this protocol is the same as the timestamp ordering protocol.
- Thomas' Write Rule allows greater potential concurrency.
  - Allows some view-serializable schedules that are not conflict-serializable.