EXPERIMENT: 12

Description:

Given a table StudentEnrollments containing student records, simulate a situation where two concurrent transactions (from different users) try to update overlapping records in different orders, resulting in a deadlock. Demonstrate how such deadlocks are detected and how they can be avoided using proper transaction ordering.

Input Format:

- Table StudentEnrollments with columns:
 - o student_id (INT, Primary Key)
 - o student_name (VARCHAR(100))
 - 0 course_id (VARCHAR(10))
 - 0 enrollment_date (DATE)

Output Format:

Demonstrate that one transaction will be rolled back automatically by the database to resolve the deadlock.

Constraints:

- Use two user sessions to run START TRANSACTION simultaneously.
- Ensure the transactions access rows in reverse order to trigger a deadlock.
- Database must support deadlock detection (e.g., MySQL, PostgreSQL).

Sample Input:

StudentEnrollments

student_id	student_name	course_id	enrollment_date
1	Ashish	CSE101	2024-06-01
2	Smaran	CSE102	2024-06-01
3	Vaibhav	CSE103	2024-06-01

Sample Output:

Transaction 2 is aborted due to a detected deadlock.

Explanation of Output:

Both transactions try to lock each other's rows in reverse order. This causes a deadlock, and the database automatically rolls back one transaction (usually the one that waited longest) to break the cycle.

Query:

DROP TABLE IF EXISTS StudentEnrollments;

```
CREATE TABLE StudentEnrollments (
student_id INT PRIMARY KEY,
student_name VARCHAR(100),
course_id VARCHAR(10),
enrollment_date DATE
) ENGINE=InnoDB;
```

INSERT INTO StudentEnrollments (student_id, student_name, course_id, enrollment_date) VALUES

```
(1, 'Ashish', 'CSE101', '2024-06-01'), (2, 'Smaran', 'CSE102', '2024-06-01');
```

-- Simulate deadlock

```
-- Transaction 1
START TRANSACTION;
UPDATE StudentEnrollments
SET enrollment_date = '2024-07-01'
WHERE student_id = 1;
-- Simulate concurrent access
DO SLEEP(1);
-- Attempt to update student_id = 2
-- This will conflict if another transaction has locked it
UPDATE StudentEnrollments
SET enrollment_date = '2024-07-02'
WHERE student_id = 2;
COMMIT;
-- Transaction 2 (run immediately after Transaction 1 starts)
START TRANSACTION:
UPDATE StudentEnrollments
SET enrollment_date = '2024-08-01'
WHERE student_id = 2;
DO SLEEP(1);
UPDATE StudentEnrollments
SET enrollment_date = '2024-08-02'
WHERE student_id = 1;
COMMIT;
-- Final table state
```

SELECT * FROM StudentEnrollments;

OUTPUT:



Explanation:

- Two transactions try to update the same rows **in reverse order**.
- Each transaction holds a lock the other needs → **deadlock**.
- MySQL detects it and **rolls back one transaction** automatically to resolve it.

Key point: Access rows in the **same order** in all transactions to avoid deadlocks.

Part B: Applying MVCC to Prevent Conflicts During Concurrent Reads/Writes

Description:

Use the MVCC (Multiversion Concurrency Control) approach to allow User A to read a record and User B to update the same record concurrently without blocking or conflict. Demonstrate how MVCC provides a consistent snapshot to the reader while allowing the writer to update.

Input Format:

Table StudentEnrollments with the same structure.

Output Format:

User A sees the old value during the transaction.
User B successfully updates the row without waiting.

Constraints:

- Use databases that support MVCC (e.g., PostgreSQL, MySQL InnoDB).
- Avoid SELECT FOR UPDATE; use normal SELECT in repeatable read or snapshot isolation mode.

Sample Input:

student_id	student_name	course_id	enrollment_date
1	Ashish	CSE101	2024-06-01

Sample Output:

- User A sees: enrollment_date = 2024-06-01
- User B updates to: 2024-07-10
- User A continues to see the old value in the transaction until commit.

Evn	lanation	οf	Outr	
EXU	ldiiduvii	UI	Out	uı.

MVCC ensures User A reads a consistent snapshot taken at the start of the transaction, unaffected by concurrent updates. This enables non-blocking concurrency.

Query:
Part B: MVCC Demonstration in MySQL
DROP TABLE IF EXISTS StudentEnrollments;
CREATE TABLE StudentEnrollments (
student_id INT PRIMARY KEY,
student_name VARCHAR(100),
course_id VARCHAR(10),
enrollment_date DATE
) ENGINE=InnoDB;
INSERT INTO StudentEnrollments (student_id, student_name, course_id, enrollment_date) VALUES (1, 'Ashish', 'CSE101', '2024-06-01');
User A: Reader (REPEATABLE READ)

Start transaction for User A
START TRANSACTION;
User A reads the record
SELECT student_id, student_name, course_id, enrollment_date
FROM StudentEnrollments
WHERE student_id = 1;
Output: enrollment_date = 2024-06-01
====================================
User B: Writer (Concurrent update)
====================================
In another session, User B updates the same row
For simulation in single script, we emulate delay
UPDATE StudentEnrollments
SET enrollment_date = '2024-07-10'
WHERE student_id = 1;
Commit User B's transaction
COMMIT;
====================================

- -- Output: enrollment_date = 2024-06-01 (old snapshot due to MVCC)
- -- Commit User A's transaction

COMMIT;

. -----

-- Final check: outside transactions

SELECT * FROM StudentEnrollments;

-- Output: enrollment_date = 2024-07-10 (reflects User B's update)

OUTPUT:



Explanation:

- **User A** starts a transaction and reads a row.
- **User B** updates the same row and commits.
- **User A** still sees the old value until they commit.

Key point: MVCC allows **non-blocking reads** by giving each transaction a **consistent snapshot** of the data at its start.

Part C: Comparing Behavior With and Without MVCC in High-Concurrency

Description:

Evaluate how MVCC vs. traditional locking behaves when multiple users access the same row for read and write. Use SELECT FOR UPDATE to demonstrate blocking in a non-MVCC system and contrast that with MVCC-based reads and updates.

Input Format:

Same StudentEnrollments table and data.

Output Format:

Two scenarios:

- With Locking: Readers are blocked until the writer commits.
- With MVCC: Readers get consistent data without blocking.

Constraints:

- MVCC-supported database (e.g., PostgreSQL).
- Use different isolation levels or query techniques to simulate both cases.

Sample Input:

student_id	student_name	course_id	enrollment_date
1	Ashish	CSE101	2024-06-01

Sample Output:

- Without MVCC: Reader blocks until writer commits.
- With MVCC: Reader sees 2024-06-01 even while the writer updates to 2024-07-10.

Explanation of Output:

- Traditional locking causes blocking and delays.
- MVCC enables concurrent operations with no blocking, ensuring performance and consistency.

DROP TABLE IF EXISTS StudentEnrollments;

```
CREATE TABLE StudentEnrollments (
student_id INT PRIMARY KEY,
student_name VARCHAR(100),
course_id VARCHAR(10),
enrollment_date DATE
) ENGINE=InnoDB;
```

INSERT INTO StudentEnrollments (student_id, student_name, course_id, enrollment_date)
VALUES
(1, 'Ashish', 'CSE101', '2024-06-01');
====================================
Scenario 1: With Locking (SELECT FOR UPDATE)
====================================
Transaction 1: Writer locks the row
START TRANSACTION;
SELECT * FROM StudentEnrollments WHERE student_id = 1 FOR UPDATE;
Row is now locked
Normally, in a real concurrent session:
Transaction 2: Reader trying SELECT FOR UPDATE would block until Transaction 1 commits
Simulate waiting
DO SLEEP(2);
Commit writer
UPDATE StudentEnrollments
SET enrollment_date = '2024-07-10'
WHERE student_id = 1;
COMMIT;

====================================
Scenario 2: With MVCC (Normal SELECT, REPEATABLE READ)
Transaction 3: Reader (MVCC)
START TRANSACTION;
SET TRANSACTION ISOLATION LEVEL REPEATABLE READ;
SELECT * FROM StudentEnrollments WHERE student_id = 1;
Output: enrollment_date = 2024-07-10 (snapshot at start of transaction)
Transaction 4: Writer updates concurrently
UPDATE StudentEnrollments
SET enrollment_date = '2024-08-15'
WHERE student_id = 1;
COMMIT;
Back to Transaction 3: Reader still sees snapshot
SELECT * FROM StudentEnrollments WHERE student_id = 1;
Output: enrollment_date = 2024-07-10 (old snapshot due to MVCC)
COMMIT;
====================================
Final table check
SELECT * FROM StudentEnrollments;
Output:



Explanation:

- With SELECT FOR UPDATE (locking): Readers block if a writer has locked the row.
- **With normal SELECT in REPEATABLE READ (MVCC):** Readers see a consistent snapshot while writers update concurrently.

Key point: MVCC avoids blocking, improves concurrency, and ensures **read consistency**.