[Kaushik Sathupadi](#)
Programmer. Creator. Co–Founder. Dad.

A plain english introduction to CAP Theorem

You'll often hear about the CAP theorem which specifies some kind of an upper limit when designing distributed systems. As with most of my other introduction tutorials, lets try understanding CAP by comparing it with a real world situation.

Chapter 1: "Remembrance Inc" Your new venture :

Last night when your spouse appreciated you on remembering her birthday and bringing her a gift, a strange Idea strikes you. People are so bad in remembering things. And you're sooo good at it. So why not start a venture that will put your talent to use? The more you think about it, the more you like it. In fact you even come up with a news paper ad which explains your idea

```
Remembrance Inc! - Never forget,  even without remembering!
  Ever felt bad that you forget so much?  Don't worry. Help is just a phone away!
    When you need to remember something, just call 555--55-REMEM and tell us what you need to remember. For eg., call us and let us know of your boss's phone number, and forget to remember
  Charges : only $0.1 per request
```

So, your typical phone conversation will look like this:

- Customer : Hey, Can you store my neighbor's birthday?
- You: Sure.. when is it?
- Customer : 2nd of jan
- You: (write it down against the customer's page in your paper note book)Stored. Call us any time for knowing your neighbor's birthday again!
- Customer : Thank you!
- You: No problem! We charged your credit card with $0.1

Chapter 2 : You scale up:

Your venture gets funded by YCombinator. Your Idea is so simple, needs nothing but a paper notebook and phone, yet so effective that it spreads like wild fire. You start getting hundreds of call every day.

And there starts the problem. You see that more and more of your customers have to wait in the queue to speak to you. Most of them even hang up tired of the waiting tone. Besides when you were sick the other day and could not come to work you lost a whole day of business. Not to mention all those dissatisfied customers who wanted information on that day.
You decide it's time for you to scale up and bring in your wife to help you.

Your start with a simple plan:

1. You and your wife both get an extension phone
2. Customers still dial (555)—55–REMEM and need to remember only one number
3. A pbx will route the a customers call to whoever is free and equally

Chapter 3 : You have your first "Bad Service" :

Two days after you implemented the new system, you get a call from you get a call from your trusted customer Jhon. This is how it goes:

- Jhon: Hey
- You: Glad you called "Remembrance Inc!". What can I do for you?
- Jhon: Can you tell me when is my flight to New Delhi?
- You: Sure.. 1 sec sir
  (You look up your notebook)
  (wow! there is no entry for "flight date" in Jhon's page)!!!!!
- You: Sir, I think there is a mistake. You never told us about your flight to delhi
- Jhon: What! I just called you guys yesterday!(cuts the call!)

How did that happen? Could Jhon be lying? You think about it for a second and the reason hits you! Could Jhon's call yesterday reached your wife? You go to your wife's desk and check her notebook. Sure enough it's there. You tell this to your wife and she realizes the problem too.

What a terrible flaw in your distributed design! **Your distributed system is not consistent! There could always be a chance that a customer updates something which goes to either you or your wife and when the next call from the customer is routed to another person there will not be a consistent reply from Remembrance Inc!**

Chapter 4: You fix the Consistency problem:

Well, your competitors may ignore a bad service, but not you. You think all night in the bed when your wife is sleeping and come up with a beautiful plan in the morning. You wake up your wife and tell her:

" Darling this is what we are going to do from now"

- Whenever any one of us get a call for an update(when the customer wants us to remember something) before completing the call we tell the other person
- This way both of us note down any updates
- When there is call for search(When the customer wants information he has already stored) we don't need to talk with the other person. Since both of us have the latest updated information in both of our note books we can just refer to it..

There is only one problem though, you say, and that is an "update" request has to involve both of us and we cannot work in parallel during that time. For eg. when you get an update request and telling me to update too, i cannot take other calls. But that's okay because most calls we get anyway are "search" (a customer updates once and asks many times) . Besides, we cannot give wrong information at any cost.

"Neat" your wife says, "but there is one more flaw in this system that you haven't thought of. What if one of us doesn't report to work on a particular day? On that day, then, we won't be able to take "any" Update calls, because the other person cannot be updated! We will have **Availability problem , i.e, for eg., if an update request comes to me I will never be able to complete that call because even though I have written the update in my note book, I can never update you. So I can never complete the call!"**

Chapter 5: You come up with the greatest solution Ever:

You being to realize a little bit on why distributed system might not be as easy as you thought at first. Is it that difficult to come up with a solution that could be both **"Consistent and Available"**? Could be difficult for others, but not for you!! Then next morning you come up with a solution that your competitors cannot think of in their dreams! You wake your wife up eagerly again..

" look" , you tell her.. "This is what we can do to be consistent and available" . The plan is mostly similar to what I told you yesterday:

- i) Whenever any one of us get a call for an update(when the customer wants us to remember something) before completing the call, if the other person is available we tell the other person. This way both of us note down any updates
- ii) But if the other person is not available(doesn't report to work) we send the other person an email about the update.
- iii) The next day when the other person comes to work after taking a day off, He first goes through all the emails, updates his note book accordingly.. before taking his first call.

Genius! You wife says! I can't find any flaws in this systems. Let's put it to use.. Remembrance Inc! is now both **Consistent and available!**

Chapter 6: Your wife gets angry :

Everything goes well for a while. Your system is consistent. Your system works well even when one of you doesn't report to work. But what if Both of you report to work and one of you doesn't update the other person? Remember all those days you've been waking your wife up early with your Greatest–idea–ever–bullshit? * What if your wife decides to take calls but is too angry with you and decides not to update you for a day? Your idea totally breaks! Your idea so far is good for consistency and availability but is not Partition Tolerant!*

You can decide to be partition tolerant by deciding not to take any calls until you patch up with your wife.. Then your system will not be "available" during that time…

Chapter 7: Conclusion :

So Let's look at CAP Theorem now. Its states that, when you are designing a distributed system you can get cannot achieve all three of Consistency, Availability and Partition tolerance. You can pick only two of:

- Consistency: You customers, once they have updated information with you, will always get the most updated information when they call subsequently. No matter how quickly they call back
- Availability: Remembrance Inc will always be available for calls until any one of you(you or your wife) report to work.
- Partition Tolerance: Remembrance Inc will work even if there is a communication loss between you and your wife!

Bonus : Eventual Consistency with a run around clerk :

Here is another food for thought. You can have a run around clerk, who will update other's notebook when one of your's or your wife's note books is updated. The greatest benefit of this is that, he can work in background and one of your or your wife's "update" doesn't have to block, waiting for the other one to update. This is how many NoSql systems work, one node updates itself locally and a background process synchronizes all other nodes accordingly… The only problem is that you will lose consistency of some time. For eg., a customer's call reaches your wife first and before the clerk has a chance to update your notebook , the customer' calls back and it reaches you. Then he won't get a consistent reply.. But that said, this is not at all a bad idea if such cases are limited. For eg., assuming a customer won't forget things so quickly that he calls back in 5 minutes.

That's CAP and eventual consistency for you in simple english :)

[Tweet]

Post by Kaushik Sathupadi, Founder Cull.io – A platform to recruit web developers by having them develop a web application

---

130 Comments   **Kaushik Sathupadi**   ● Jacky Wang ▾

♡ Recommend 73   ⬆ Share   Sort by Best ▾

	Join the discussion…

Ricardo · 5 years ago
You Sir are a genius! Thanks.
22 ⌃ | ⌄ · Reply · Share ›

Kamal · 5 years ago
No words!!! A great article with such a good example. Keep it up.
5 ⌃ | ⌄ · Reply · Share ›

Somil · 10 months ago
Nice and simple explanation of CAP.
Would like to highlight
Mysql is CA
Mongo is CP
3 ⌃ | ⌄ · Reply · Share ›

tim · 3 years ago
could have done without all the sexism though
3 ⌃ | ⌄ · Reply · Share ›

> **Asad** ➔ tim · 2 years ago
> What sexism would you be referring to?
> 4 ⌃ | ⌄ · Reply · Share ›

>> **Daniel Marton** ➔ Asad · 2 years ago
>> Female readers don't have wives. And neither do the males if they're gay.
>>
>> Yeah, those goddamn liberals are so annoying!
>> ⌃ | ⌄ · Reply · Share ›

>>> **odigity** ➔ Daniel Marton · a year ago
>>> "Female readers don't have wives."
>>>
>>> /facepalm
>>>
>>> There are just no words for such stupidity...
>>> 2 ⌃ | ⌄ · Reply · Share ›

>>> **Daniel Marton** ➔ odigity · a year ago
>>> Well, then don't use words! Go get yourself a cup of Men's Rights tea & jack off on antisocialdouchebagsgetting...
>>>
>>> Have a nice day ;)
>>> ⌃ | ⌄ · Reply · Share ›

>>> **odigity** ➔ Daniel Marton · a year ago
>>> Are you really so stupid that you can miss the obvious case of a married lesbian reader while decrying "sexism" obnoxiously to everyone around you?
>>>
>>> I know plenty of females with wives, you imbecile.
>>>
>>> How embarrassing for you... a retarded sexist wannabe-SJW. :)
>>> ⌃ | ⌄ · Reply · Share ›

>>> **Daniel Marton** ➔ odigity · a year ago
>>> Yeah, lesbian women have wives. Genius! But the fact that I failed to include the word "straight" does not change the fact that Sexism is poisonously prevalent in the IT community and the reason why so few girls choose this profession which is very bad for all of us. Your chest-banging insults against anyone who is not polite enough with you & your pointless taunts against liberals is not making you an enlightened person. I don't know you and the number of your lesbian friends, but you started bitching and I was just reacting to it. Probably not in the best way, but then it's a free country - now isn't it? Go fuck yourself!
>>> ⌃ | ⌄ · Reply · Share ›

>>> **mkind** ➔ Daniel Marton · 2 years ago
>>> gays should have performed selfies in bathroom instead of learning CAP-theorem
>>> ⌃ | ⌄ · Reply · Share ›

>>> **Daniel Marton** ➔ mkind · 2 years ago
>>> Homophobes should eat feline excrement in toilet instead of learning CAP theorem. Especially the wannabe schoolyard bullies like you!
>>> 1 ⌃ | ⌄ · Reply · Share ›

>>> **mkind** ➔ Daniel Marton · 2 years ago
>>> Learn russian before it's too late, my little gay ;)
>>> ⌃ | ⌄ · Reply · Share ›

>>> **Daniel Marton** ➔ mkind · 2 years ago
>>> Хуй тебе!
>>> ⌃ | ⌄ · Reply · Share ›

mkind → Daniel Marton · 2 years ago

Как приятно поговорить с образованным человеком =)

1 ∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Daniel Marton → mkind · 2 years ago

Yeah, I do my best! Still I think there are better ways of convincing people to learn Russian. But okay, I get what you mean. Stop being a homophobe and I'll stop being a grammar nazi.

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

mkind → Daniel Marton · 2 years ago

The big difference between us, mate, is that I don't use translator =) also Im not actually a homophobe, why should I fear those worms? =) I just hate them, because only gays may comment excellent technical article with remarks about sexism =) I so proud of my country because all other countries have already caved under tolerant assholes.

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Daniel Marton → mkind · 2 years ago

The big difference between us is that I am able to distinguish the former greatness of Russian civilization from the abomination that it currently is... Not because of "tolerant assholes" but because of arrogant idiots like you. There are many countries in the world not "caving in" to Western values and guess what? All of them are even more full of shit than yours. And if the wording of a technical article is sexist, that means it's no longer just technical. Deal with it!

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Nikhilkumar Jadhav → Daniel Marton · 6 months ago

:s/wife/spouse works?

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Manuel Palacio · 4 years ago

You can never pick consistency and availability. http://codahale.com/you-can...

1 ∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Marco Dinacci → Manuel Palacio · 4 years ago

The linked article is fantastic and everybody should read it. The author though is partially wrong and he admits it in the update at the end of the page where he agrees with Dr. Stonebraker statement that a wholly partitioned system (the case of this article) can be CA. However, it is true that it's hard or may be even be practically impossible to guarantee CA in case of a multi-node failure.

See also http://dbmsmusings.blogspot...

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Xiaobo Zhang · 9 days ago

Best explanation I have ever seen. Good job.

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

abhishek srivastava · 14 days ago

great way to deliver the concept....Thanks..

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Hossein Moshfegh · 18 days ago

Fantastic Example. Thank u so much

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

mariostallone · 22 days ago

Wow. Thats a brilliant way to put it :)

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Gaurav Verma · a month ago

Great article, very simple to understand. :)

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

magurmach · a month ago

Kudos (y)

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Sanjay Bharadhwaj · 3 months ago

That was fun to read! Explained beautifully. Thank you!

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Sarang Manjrekar · 4 months ago

Nice explaination.

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

agniswar · 8 months ago

Amazing explanation! Loved it!

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

SShedthikere · 9 months ago

Awesome write-up!! Totally enjoyed reading and understood CAP theorem

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Dziamid · 9 months ago

I love the parallels with non-tech. This one couldn't have been better!

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Gregory White · 10 months ago

awsome, and this is why sql replication both ways / merge replication is so tricky. im sending this to my boss!

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Srinath Krishna · 10 months ago

Great read! :) "You can decide to be partition tolerant by deciding not to take any calls until you patch up with your wife" - I believe it should say - "partition intolerant" as the service stops to function until the partition exists.

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Dziamid → Srinath Krishna · 9 months ago

Don't see problem with that statement. I'd rather say the service becomes unAvailable, while the data remains consistent and partitioned.

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Rajesh Rao · a year ago

Amazing explanation Kaushik. Thank you very much for sharing this.

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Amit · a year ago

Amazing ... thanks for this

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Mahendren · a year ago

Great explanation.Thanks

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Suyash Soni · a year ago

After reading so many articles on CAP theorem, I can say that this one is the best. Everything is explained quite well.

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

rickoshay · a year ago

tl;dr I think I'll stick with a simple statement of the theorem's characteristics rather than wade through this drivel. Honestly, it's not that difficult to grasp.

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Kumar · 2 years ago

Kaushik, you understood the C, A and P very well and this is reflected in this article. Great article and enjoyed reading it. Thanks.

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Jessi Baker · 2 years ago

This is ace. Thanks

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

jayakumaur ravi · 2 years ago

Great article!! The language and the example!! Wow! Thanks to my faculty - Matt for introducing me to this!!

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Anurag · 2 years ago

Awesome explanation!!

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

yajunwf · 2 years ago

Great!
I just think when one of the Two gets angry but all report to work, how about treat the angry one as not available ?

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

> **Colin Plank** → yajunwf · a year ago
>
> To make the analogy closer to a distributed computing environment, the wife would not be angry and refuse to communicate, but rather there would be a wall between them whereby they could not communicate at all. It would be nice if you could just pick one and have them stop taking calls, but since they cannot talk to each other, they don't have a way to determine which one will keep operating and which one will stop.
>
> 1 ∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›
>
>> **yajunwf** → Colin Plank · a year ago
>>
>> I get it, thanks
>>
>> ∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Dipankar · 2 years ago

Brilliant...can't be a better explanation than this....

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Brajesh · 2 years ago

Excellent, never came across such a brilliant article.Thanks

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

budi · 2 years ago

artikel yang menarik sehingga bisa diambil manfaatnya

seputar hidup sehat
tips dan info kesehatan
zona tips kesehatan
blog seputar kesehatan
artikel seputar hidup sehat
saya ingin hidup sehat
seputar makanan sehat
zona kecantikan alami

∧ | ∨ · Reply · Share ›

Load more comments

✉ Subscribe   ⊕ Add Disqus to your siteAdd DisqusAdd   🔒 Privacy

DISQUS