Concurrency Control

Outline

- Lock-Based Protocols
- Timestamp-Based Protocols
- Validation-Based Protocols
- Multiversion Schemes

Lock-Based Protocols

- 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.

Schedule With Lock Grants

- Grants omitted in rest of chapter
  - Assume grant happens just before the next instruction following lock request
- This schedule is not serializable (why?)
- A **locking protocol** is a set of rules followed by all transactions while requesting and releasing locks.
- Locking protocols enforce serializability by restricting the set of possible schedules.

T_1	T_2	concurrency-control manager
lock-X(B)		
		grant-X(B, T_1)
read(B)		
$B := B - 50$		
write(B)		
unlock(B)		
	lock-S(A)	
		grant-S(A, T_2)
	read(A)	
	unlock(A)	
	lock-S(B)	
		grant-S(B, T_2)
	read(B)	
	unlock(B)	
	display($A + B$)	
lock-X(A)		
		grant-X(A, T_1)
read(A)		
$A := A + 50$		
write(A)		
unlock(A)		

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 (Cont.)

- Two-phase locking *does not* ensure freedom from deadlocks
- Extensions to basic two-phase locking needed to ensure recoverability of freedom from cascading roll-back
  - **Strict two-phase locking:** a transaction must hold all its exclusive locks till it commits/aborts.
    - Ensures recoverability and avoids cascading roll-backs
  - **Rigorous two-phase locking**: a transaction must hold *all* locks till commit/abort.
    - Transactions can be serialized in the order in which they commit.
- Most databases implement rigorous two-phase locking, *but refer to it as simply two-phase locking*

The Two-Phase Locking Protocol (Cont.)

- Two-phase locking is not a necessary condition for serializability
  - There are conflict serializable schedules that cannot be obtained if the two-phase locking protocol is used.
- In the absence of extra information (e.g., ordering of access to data), two-phase locking is necessary for conflict serializability *in the following sense*:
  - *Given a transaction T_i that does not follow two-phase locking, we can find a transaction T_j that uses two-phase locking, and a schedule for T_i and T_j that is not conflict serializable.*

T_1	T_2
lock-X(B)	
read(B)	
$B := B - 50$	
write(B)	
unlock(B)	
	lock-S(A)
	read(A)
	unlock(A)
	lock-S(B)
	read(B)
	unlock(B)
	display($A + B$)
lock-X(A)	
read(A)	
$A := A + 50$	
write(A)	
unlock(A)	

Locking Protocols

- Given a locking protocol (such as 2PL)
  - A schedule S is **legal** under a locking protocol if it can be generated by a set of transactions that follow the protocol
  - A protocol **ensures** serializability if all legal schedules under that protocol are serializable

Lock Conversions

- Two-phase locking protocol with lock conversions:
  - Growing Phase:
    - can acquire a lock-S on item
    - can acquire a lock-X on item
    - can **convert** a lock-S to a lock-X (**upgrade**)
  - Shrinking Phase:
    - can release a lock-S
    - can release a lock-X
    - can convert a lock-X to a lock-S (**downgrade**)
- This protocol ensures serializability

Implementation of Locking

- A **lock manager** can be implemented as a separate process
- Transactions can send lock and unlock requests as messages
- The lock manager replies to a lock request by sending a lock grant messages (or a message asking the transaction to roll back, in case of a deadlock)
  - The requesting transaction waits until its request is answered
- The lock manager maintains an in-memory data-structure called a **lock table** to record granted locks and pending requests

Lock Table



- Dark rectangles indicate granted locks, light colored ones indicate waiting requests
- Lock table also records the type of lock granted or requested
- New request is added to the end of the queue of requests for the data item, and granted if it is compatible with all earlier locks
- Unlock requests result in the request being deleted, and later requests are checked to see if they can now be granted
- If transaction aborts, all waiting or granted requests of the transaction are deleted
  - lock manager may keep a list of locks held by each transaction, to implement this efficiently

Deadlock Handling

- System is **deadlocked** if there is a set of transactions such that every transaction in the set is waiting for another transaction in the set.

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)	

Deadlock Handling

- ***Deadlock prevention*** protocols ensure that the system will *never* enter into a deadlock state. Some prevention strategies:
  - Require that each transaction locks all its data items before it begins execution (pre-declaration).
  - Impose partial ordering of all data items and require that a transaction can lock data items only in the order specified by the partial order (graph-based protocol).

More Deadlock Prevention Strategies

- **wait-die** scheme — non-preemptive
  - Older transaction may wait for younger one to release data item.
  - Younger transactions never wait for older ones; they are rolled back instead.
  - A transaction may die several times before acquiring a lock
- **wound-wait** scheme — preemptive
  - Older transaction *wounds* (forces rollback) of younger transaction instead of waiting for it.
  - Younger transactions may wait for older ones.
  - Fewer rollbacks than *wait-die* scheme.
- In both schemes, a rolled back transactions is restarted with its original timestamp.
  - Ensures that older transactions have precedence over newer ones, and starvation is thus avoided.

Deadlock prevention (Cont.)

- **Timeout-Based Schemes**:
  - A transaction waits for a lock only for a specified amount of time. After that, the wait times out and the transaction is rolled back.
  - Ensures that deadlocks get resolved by timeout if they occur
  - Simple to implement
  - But may roll back transaction unnecessarily in absence of deadlock
    - Difficult to determine good value of the timeout interval.
  - Starvation is also possible

Deadlock Detection

- **Wait-for graph**
  - *Vertices:* transactions
  - *Edge from* $T_i \rightarrow T_j$. : if T_i is waiting for a lock held in conflicting mode by T_j
- The system is in a deadlock state if and only if the wait-for graph has a cycle.
- Invoke a deadlock-detection algorithm periodically to look for cycles.



Wait-for graph without a cycle



Wait-for graph with a cycle

Deadlock Recovery

- When deadlock is detected :
  - Some transaction will have to rolled back (made a **victim**) to break deadlock cycle.
    - Select that transaction as victim that will incur minimum cost
  - Rollback -- determine how far to roll back transaction
    - **Total rollback**: Abort the transaction and then restart it.
    - **Partial rollback**: Roll back victim transaction only as far as necessary to release locks that another transaction in cycle is waiting for
- Starvation can happen (why?)
  - One solution: oldest transaction in the deadlock set is never chosen as victim

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.

Validation-Based Protocol

- Idea: can we use commit time as serialization order?
- To do so:
  - Postpone writes to end of transaction
  - Keep track of data items read/written by transaction
  - **Validation** performed at commit time, detect any out-of-serialization order reads/writes
- Also called as **optimistic concurrency control** since transaction executes fully in the hope that all will go well during validation

Validation-Based Protocol

- Execution of transaction T_i is done in three phases.
  1. **Read and execution phase**: Transaction T_i writes only to temporary local variables
  2. **Validation phase**: Transaction T_i performs a "validation test" to determine if local variables can be written without violating serializability.
  3. **Write phase**: If T_i is validated, the updates are applied to the database; otherwise, T_i is rolled back.
- The three phases of concurrently executing transactions can be interleaved, but each transaction must go through the three phases in that order.
  - We assume for simplicity that the validation and write phase occur together, atomically and serially
    - I.e., only one transaction executes validation/write at a time.

Validation-Based Protocol (Cont.)

- Each transaction T_i has 3 timestamps
  - **StartTS**(T_i) : the time when T_i started its execution
  - **ValidationTS**(T_i): the time when T_i entered its validation phase
  - **FinishTS**(T_i) : the time when T_i finished its write phase
- Validation tests use above timestamps and read/write sets to ensure that serializability order is determined by validation time
  - Thus, TS(T_i) = ValidationTS(T_i)
- Validation-based protocol has been found to give greater degree of concurrency than locking/TSO if probability of conflicts is low.

Validation Test for Transaction T_j

- If for all T_i with TS (T_i) < TS (T_j) either one of the following condition holds:
  - **finishTS**(T_i) < **startTS**(T_j)
  - **startTS**(T_j) < **finishTS**(T_i) < **validationTS**(T_j) **and** the set of data items written by T_i does not intersect with the set of data items read by T_j.

  then validation succeeds and T_j can be committed.
- Otherwise, validation fails and T_j is aborted.
- Justification:
  - First condition applies when execution is not concurrent
    - The writes of T_j do not affect reads of T_i since they occur after T_i has finished its reads.
  - If the second condition holds, execution is concurrent, T_j does not read any item written by T_i.

Schedule Produced by Validation

- Example of schedule produced using validation

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

Multiversion Concurrency Control

Multiversion Schemes

- Multiversion schemes keep old versions of data item to increase concurrency. Several variants:
  - **Multiversion Timestamp Ordering**
  - **Multiversion Two-Phase Locking**
  - **Snapshot isolation**
- Key ideas:
  - Each successful **write** results in the creation of a new version of the data item written.
  - Use timestamps to label versions.
  - When a **read**(*Q*) operation is issued, select an appropriate version of *Q* based on the timestamp of the transaction issuing the read request, and return the value of the selected version.
- **read**s never have to wait as an appropriate version is returned immediately.

Multiversion Timestamp Ordering

- Each data item Q has a sequence of versions $<Q_1, Q_2, ..., Q_m>$. Each version Q_k contains three data fields:
  - **Content** -- the value of version Q_k.
  - **W-timestamp**(Q_k) -- timestamp of the transaction that created (wrote) version Q_k
  - **R-timestamp**(Q_k) -- largest timestamp of a transaction that successfully read version Q_k

Multiversion Timestamp Ordering (Cont)

- Suppose that transaction T_i issues a **read**(Q) or **write**(Q) operation. Let Q_k denote the version of Q whose write timestamp is the largest write timestamp less than or equal to TS(T_i).
  1. If transaction T_i issues a **read**(Q), then
     - the value returned is the content of version Q_k
     - If R-timestamp(Q_k) < TS(T_i), set R-timestamp(Q_k) = TS(T_i),
  2. If transaction T_i issues a **write**(Q)
     1. if TS(T_i) < R-timestamp(Q_k), then transaction T_i is rolled back.
     2. if TS(T_i) = W-timestamp(Q_k), the contents of Q_k are overwritten
     3. Otherwise, a new version Q_i of Q is created
        - W-timestamp(Q_i) and R-timestamp(Q_i) are initialized to TS(T_i).

Multiversion Timestamp Ordering (Cont)

- Observations
  - Reads always succeed
  - A write by T_i is rejected if some other transaction T_j that (in the serialization order defined by the timestamp values) should read T_i's write, has already read a version created by a transaction older than T_i.
- Protocol guarantees serializability

Multiversion Two-Phase Locking

- Differentiates between read-only transactions and update transactions
- **Update transactions** acquire read and write locks, and hold all locks up to the end of the transaction. That is, update transactions follow rigorous two-phase locking.
  - Read of a data item returns the latest version of the item
  - The first **write** of Q by T_i results in the creation of a new version Q_i of the data item Q written
    - W-timestamp(Q_i) set to ∞ initially
  - When update transaction T_i completes, commit processing occurs:
    - Value **ts-counter** stored in the database is used to assign timestamps
      - **ts-counter** is locked in two-phase manner
    - Set TS(T_i) = **ts-counter** + 1
    - Set W-timestamp(Q_i) = TS(T_i) for all versions Q_i that it creates
    - **ts-counter** = **ts-counter +** 1

Multiversion Two-Phase Locking (Cont.)

- **Read-only transactions**
  - are assigned a timestamp = **ts-counter** when they start execution
  - follow the multiversion timestamp-ordering protocol for performing reads
    - Do not obtain any locks
- Read-only transactions that start after T_i increments **ts-counter** will see the values updated by T_i.
- Read-only transactions that start before T_i increments the **ts-counter** will see the value before the updates by T_i.
- Only serializable schedules are produced.

View Serializability

- Let *S* and *S´* be two schedules with the same set of transactions. *S* and *S´* are **view equivalent** if the following three conditions are met, for each data item *Q,*
  1. If in schedule S, transaction T_i reads the initial value of *Q*, then in schedule *S'* also transaction T_i must read the initial value of *Q.*
  2. If in schedule S transaction T_i executes **read**(*Q*), and that value was produced by transaction T_j (if any), then in schedule *S'* also transaction T_i must read the value of *Q* that was produced by the same **write**(Q) operation of transaction T_j .
  3. The transaction (if any) that performs the final **write**(*Q*) operation in schedule *S* must also perform the final **write**(*Q*) operation in schedule *S'.*
- As can be seen, view equivalence is also based purely on **reads** and **writes** alone.

View Serializability (Cont.)

- A schedule *S* is **view serializable** if it is view equivalent to a serial schedule.
- Every conflict serializable schedule is also view serializable.
- Below is a schedule which is view-serializable but *not* conflict serializable.

T_3	T_4	T_6
read(Q)		
	write(Q)	
write(Q)		
		write(Q)

- What serial schedule is above equivalent to?
- Every view serializable schedule that is not conflict serializable has **blind writes**.

Test for View Serializability

- The precedence graph test for conflict serializability cannot be used directly to test for view serializability.
  - Extension to test for view serializability has cost exponential in the size of the precedence graph.
- The problem of checking if a schedule is view serializable falls in the class of *NP*-complete problems.
  - Thus, existence of an efficient algorithm is *extremely* unlikely.
- However practical algorithms that just check some **sufficient conditions** for view serializability can still be used.