

Transaction Processing

Dr. Anindya Halder
Dept of Computer Application,
North-Eastern Hill University, Tura Campus

Transaction Processing

- Transaction Concept
- Transaction State
- Implementation of Atomicity and Durability
- Concurrent Executions
- Serializability
- Recoverability
- Implementation of Isolation
- Transaction Definition in SQL
- Testing for Serializability.

Transaction Concept

- A **transaction** is a *unit* of program execution that accesses and possibly updates various data items.
- A transaction must see a consistent database.
- During transaction execution the database may be inconsistent.
- When the transaction is committed, the database must be consistent.
- Two main issues to deal with:
 - ★ Failures of various kinds, such as hardware failures and system crashes
 - ★ Concurrent execution of multiple transactions

ACID Properties

To preserve integrity of data, the database system must ensure:

- **Atomicity.** Either all operations of the transaction are properly reflected in the database or none are.
- **Consistency.** Execution of a transaction in isolation preserves the consistency of the database.
- **Isolation.** Although multiple transactions may execute concurrently, each transaction must be unaware of other concurrently executing transactions. Intermediate transaction results must be hidden from other concurrently executed transactions.
 - ★ That is, for every pair of transactions T_i and T_j , it appears to T_i that either T_j finished execution before T_i started, or T_j started execution after T_i finished.
- **Durability.** After a transaction completes successfully, the changes it has made to the database persist, even if there are system failures.

Example of Fund Transfer

- Transaction to transfer \$50 from account A to account B :
 1. `read(A)`
 2. $A := A - 50$
 3. `write(A)`
 4. `read(B)`
 5. $B := B + 50$
 6. `write(B)`
- **Atomicity requirement** — if the transaction fails after step 3 and before step 6, the system should ensure that its updates are not reflected in the database, else an inconsistency will result.
- **Consistency requirement** – the sum of A and B is unchanged by the execution of the transaction.


Example of Fund Transfer (Cont.)

- **Durability requirement** — once the user has been notified that the transaction has completed (i.e., the transfer of the \$50 has taken place), the updates to the database by the transaction must persist despite failures.
- **Isolation requirement** — if between steps 3 and 6, another transaction is allowed to access the partially updated database, it will see an inconsistent database (the sum $A + B$ will be less than it should be).
Can be ensured trivially by running transactions **serially**, that is one after the other. However, executing multiple transactions concurrently has significant benefits, as we will see.

Transaction State

- **Active**, the initial state; the transaction stays in this state while it is executing
- **Partially committed**, after the final statement has been executed.
- **Failed**, after the discovery that normal execution can no longer proceed.
- **Aborted**, after the transaction has been rolled back and the database restored to its state prior to the start of the transaction. Two options after it has been aborted:
 - ★ restart the transaction – only if no internal logical error
 - ★ kill the transaction
- **Committed**, after *successful completion*.

Transaction State (Cont.)




Implementation of Atomicity and Durability

- The recovery-management component of a database system implements the support for atomicity and durability.
- The *shadow-database* scheme:
 - ★ assume that only one transaction is active at a time.
 - ★ a pointer called **db_pointer** always points to the current consistent copy of the database.
 - ★ all updates are made on a *shadow copy* of the database, and **db_pointer** is made to point to the updated shadow copy only after the transaction reaches partial commit and all updated pages have been flushed to disk.
 - ★ in case transaction fails, old consistent copy pointed to by **db_pointer** can be used, and the shadow copy can be deleted.

Implementation of Atomicity and Durability (Cont.)

The shadow-database scheme:



- Assumes disks to not fail
- Useful for text editors, but extremely inefficient for large databases: executing a single transaction requires copying the *entire* database. Will see better schemes in Chapter 17.

Concurrent Executions

- Multiple transactions are allowed to run concurrently in the system. Advantages are:
 - ★ **increased processor and disk utilization**, leading to better transaction *throughput*: one transaction can be using the CPU while another is reading from or writing to the disk
 - ★ **reduced average response time** for transactions: short transactions need not wait behind long ones.
- *Concurrency control schemes* – mechanisms to achieve isolation, i.e., to control the interaction among the concurrent transactions in order to prevent them from destroying the consistency of the database

Schedules

- *Schedules* – sequences that indicate 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.

Example Schedules

- Let T_1 transfer \$50 from A to B , and T_2 transfer 10% of the balance from A to B . The following is a serial schedule (Schedule 1 in the text), in which T_1 is followed by T_2 .

T_1	T_2
$\text{read}(A)$ $A := A - 50$ $\text{write}(A)$ $\text{read}(B)$ $B := B + 50$ $\text{write}(B)$	$\text{read}(A)$ $\text{temp} := A * 0.1$ $A := A - \text{temp}$ $\text{write}(A)$ $\text{read}(B)$ $B := B + \text{temp}$ $\text{write}(B)$

Schedule 1

Example Schedule (Cont.)

- Let T_1 and T_2 be the transactions defined previously. The following schedule (Schedule 3 in the text) is not a serial schedule, but it is *equivalent* to Schedule 1.

T_1	T_2
$\text{read}(A)$ $A := A - 50$ $\text{write}(A)$	$\text{read}(A)$ $\text{temp} := A * 0.1$ $A := A - \text{temp}$ $\text{write}(A)$
$\text{read}(B)$ $B := B + 50$ $\text{write}(B)$	$\text{read}(B)$ $B := B + \text{temp}$ $\text{write}(B)$

Schedule 3

In both Schedule 1 and 3, the sum $A + B$ is preserved.

Example Schedules (Cont.)

- The following concurrent schedule (Schedule 4 in the text) does not preserve the value of the the sum $A + B$.

T_1	T_2
$\text{read}(A)$ $A := A - 50$	$\text{read}(A)$ $\text{temp} := A * 0.1$ $A := A - \text{temp}$ $\text{write}(A)$ $\text{read}(B)$
$\text{write}(A)$ $\text{read}(B)$ $B := B + 50$ $\text{write}(B)$	$B := B + \text{temp}$ $\text{write}(B)$

Schedule 4

Serializability

- Basic Assumption – Each transaction preserves database consistency.
- Thus serial execution of a set of transactions preserves database consistency.
- A (possibly concurrent) schedule is serializable if it is equivalent to a serial schedule. Different forms of schedule equivalence give rise to the notions of:
 1. conflict serializability
 2. view serializability
- We ignore operations other than **read** and **write** instructions, and we assume that transactions may perform arbitrary computations on data in local buffers in between reads and writes. Our simplified schedules consist of only **read** and **write** instructions.

Conflict Serializability

- Instructions I_i and I_j of transactions T_i and T_j respectively, **conflict** if and only if there exists some item Q accessed by both I_i and I_j , and at least one of these instructions wrote Q .
 1. $I_i = \text{read}(Q)$, $I_j = \text{read}(Q)$. I_i and I_j don't conflict.
 2. $I_i = \text{read}(Q)$, $I_j = \text{write}(Q)$. They conflict.
 3. $I_i = \text{write}(Q)$, $I_j = \text{read}(Q)$. They conflict
 4. $I_i = \text{write}(Q)$, $I_j = \text{write}(Q)$. They conflict
- Intuitively, a conflict between I_i and I_j forces a (logical) temporal order between them. If I_i and I_j are consecutive in a schedule and they do not conflict, their results would remain the same even if they had been interchanged in the schedule.

Conflict Serializability (Cont.)

- If a schedule S can be transformed into a schedule S' by a series of swaps of non-conflicting instructions, we say that S and S' are **conflict equivalent**.
- We say that a schedule S is **conflict serializable** if it is conflict equivalent to a serial schedule
- Example of a schedule that is **NOT** conflict serializable:

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

We are unable to swap instructions in the above schedule to obtain either the serial schedule $\langle T_3, T_4 \rangle$, or the serial schedule $\langle T_4, T_3 \rangle$.

Conflict Serializability (Cont.)

- Schedule 3 below can be transformed into Schedule 1, a serial schedule where T_2 follows T_1 , by series of swaps of non-conflicting instructions. Therefore **Schedule 3 is conflict serializable.**

T_1	T_2
read(A)	
write(A)	
	read(A)
	write(A)
read(B)	
write(B)	
	read(B)
	write(B)

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:
 1. For each data item Q , if transaction T_i reads the initial value of Q in schedule S , then transaction T_i must, in schedule S' , also read the initial value of Q .
 2. For each data item Q if transaction T_i executes **read(Q)** in schedule S , and that value was produced by transaction T_j (if any), then transaction T_i in schedule S' must also read the value of Q that was produced by transaction T_j .
 3. For each data item Q , the transaction (if any) that performs the final **write(Q)** operation in schedule S must 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.
- Schedule 9 (from text) — a schedule which is view-serializable but *not* conflict serializable.

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

- Every view serializable schedule that is not conflict serializable has **blind writes**.

Other Notions of Serializability

- Schedule 8 (from text) given below produces same outcome as the serial schedule $\langle T_1, T_5 \rangle$, yet is not conflict equivalent or view equivalent to it.

T_1	T_5
read(A) $A := A - 50$ write(A)	read(B) $B := B - 10$ write(B)
read(B) $B := B + 50$ write(B)	
	read(A) $A := A + 10$ write(A)

- Determining such equivalence requires analysis of operations other than read and write.

Recoverability

Need to address the effect of transaction failures on concurrently running transactions.

- **Recoverable schedule** — if a transaction T_j reads a data item previously written by a transaction T_i , the commit operation of T_i appears before the commit operation of T_j .
- The following schedule is not recoverable if T_9 commits immediately after the read

T_8	T_9
read(A)	
write(A)	
read(B)	read(A)
commits	commits

- If T_8 should abort, T_9 would have read (and possibly shown to the user) an inconsistent database state. Hence database must ensure that schedules are recoverable.

Recoverability (Cont.)

- **Cascading rollback** – a single transaction failure leads to a series of transaction rollbacks. Consider the following schedule where none of the transactions has yet committed (so the schedule is recoverable)

T_{10}	T_{11}	T_{12}
read(A)		
read(B)		
write(A)		
	read(A)	
	write(A)	
		read(A)

If T_{10} fails, T_{11} and T_{12} must also be rolled back.

- Can lead to the undoing of a significant amount of work

Recoverability (Cont.)

- **Cascadeless schedules** — restrict the schedule where cascading rollbacks cannot occur;
 - Formally, for each pair of transactions T_i and T_j such that T_j reads a data item previously written by T_i , the commit operation of T_i appears before the read operation of T_j .
- Every cascadeless schedule is also recoverable
- It is desirable to restrict the schedules to those that are cascadeless

Implementation of Isolation

- Schedules must be conflict or view serializable, and recoverable, for the sake of database consistency, and preferably cascadeless.
- A policy in which only one transaction can execute at a time generates serial schedules, but provides a poor degree of concurrency..
- Concurrency-control schemes tradeoff between the amount of concurrency they allow and the amount of overhead that they incur.
- Some schemes allow only conflict-serializable schedules to be generated, while others allow view-serializable schedules that are not conflict-serializable.

Transaction Definition in SQL

- Data manipulation language must include a construct for specifying the set of actions that comprise a transaction.
- In SQL, a transaction begins implicitly.
- A transaction in SQL ends by:
 - ★ **Commit work** commits current transaction and begins a new one.
 - ★ **Rollback work** causes current transaction to abort.
- Levels of consistency specified by SQL-92:
 - ★ **Serializable** — default
 - ★ **Repeatable read**
 - ★ **Read committed**
 - ★ **Read uncommitted**


Levels of Consistency in SQL-92

- **Serializable** — default
- **Repeatable read** — only committed records to be read, repeated reads of same record must return same value. However, a transaction may not be serializable – it may find some records inserted by a transaction but not find others.
- **Read committed** — only committed records can be read, but successive reads of record may return different (but committed) values.
- **Read uncommitted** — even uncommitted records may be read.

Lower degrees of consistency useful for gathering approximate information about the database, e.g., statistics for query optimizer.

Testing for Serializability

- Consider some schedule of a set of transactions T_1, T_2, \dots, T_n
- **Precedence graph** — a direct graph where the vertices are the transactions (names).
- We draw an arc from T_i to T_j if the two transaction conflict, and T_i accessed the data item on which the conflict arose earlier.
- This graph consists of a pair $G = (V, E)$, where, V is a set of vertices and E is a set of edges.
- The set of vertices consists of all the transactions participating in the schedule.
- We may label the arc by the item that was accessed.
- **Example 1**



Testing for Serializability contd..

□ The set of edges consists of all edges $T_i \rightarrow T_j$ for which one of three conditions holds:

1. T_i executes $\text{write}(Q)$ before T_j executes $\text{read}(Q)$.
2. T_i executes $\text{read}(Q)$ before T_j executes $\text{write}(Q)$.
3. T_i executes $\text{write}(Q)$ before T_j executes $\text{write}(Q)$.


□ If an edge $T_i \rightarrow T_j$ exists in the precedence graph, then, in any serial schedule S' equivalent to S , T_i must appear before T_j

Testing for Serializability contd..

T_1	T_2
$\text{read}(A)$ $A := A - 50$ $\text{write}(A)$ $\text{read}(B)$ $B := B + 50$ $\text{write}(B)$	$\text{read}(A)$ $\text{temp} := A * 0.1$ $A := A - \text{temp}$ $\text{write}(A)$ $\text{read}(B)$ $B := B + \text{temp}$ $\text{write}(B)$

If the graph contains no cycles,
then the schedule S is
conflict serializable

■ Example 1



□ The precedence graph for schedule 4 appears in Figure 14.11. It contains the edge $T_1 \rightarrow T_2$, because T_1 executes $\text{read}(A)$ before T_2 executes $\text{write}(A)$.


□ It also contains the edge $T_2 \rightarrow T_1$, because T_2 executes $\text{read}(B)$ before T_1 executes $\text{write}(B)$.

□ If the precedence graph for S has a cycle, then schedule S is not conflict serializable.

Example Schedule (Schedule A)

T_1	T_2	T_3	T_4	T_5
$\text{read}(Y)$ $\text{read}(Z)$	$\text{read}(X)$			
	$\text{read}(Y)$ $\text{write}(Y)$			$\text{read}(V)$ $\text{read}(W)$ $\text{read}(W)$
$\text{read}(U)$		$\text{write}(Z)$		
			$\text{read}(Y)$ $\text{write}(Y)$ $\text{read}(Z)$ $\text{write}(Z)$	
$\text{read}(U)$ $\text{write}(U)$				

Precedence Graph for Schedule A



Test for Conflict Serializability

- A schedule is conflict serializable if and only if its precedence graph is acyclic.
- Cycle-detection algorithms exist which take order n^2 time, where n is the number of vertices in the graph. (Better algorithms take order $n + e$ where e is the number of edges.)
- If precedence graph is acyclic, the serializability order can be obtained by a *topological sorting* of the graph. This is a linear order consistent with the partial order of the graph. For example, a serializability order for Schedule A would be $T_5 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow T_3 \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow T_4$.

Test for View Serializability

- The precedence graph test for conflict serializability must be modified to apply to a test for view serializability.
- 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 unlikely.
However practical algorithms that just check some *sufficient conditions* for view serializability can still be used.

Concurrency Control vs. Serializability Tests

- Testing a schedule for serializability *after* it has executed is a little too late!
- Goal – to develop concurrency control protocols that will assure serializability. They will generally not examine the precedence graph as it is being created; instead a protocol will impose a discipline that avoids nonserializable schedules.
Will study such protocols in Chapter 16.
- Tests for serializability help understand why a concurrency control protocol is correct.

End of Chapter

Schedule 2 -- A Serial Schedule in Which T_2 is Followed by T_1

T_1	T_2
	$\text{read}(A)$ $\text{temp} := A * 0.1$ $A := A - \text{temp}$ $\text{write}(A)$ $\text{read}(B)$ $B := B + \text{temp}$ $\text{write}(B)$
$\text{read}(A)$ $A := A - 50$ $\text{write}(A)$ $\text{read}(B)$ $B := B + 50$ $\text{write}(B)$	

**Schedule 5 -- Schedule 3 After Swapping A
Pair of Instructions**

T_1	T_2
read(A)	
write(A)	
	read(A)
read(B)	
	write(A)
write(B)	
	read(B)
	write(B)

**Schedule 6 -- A Serial Schedule That is
Equivalent to Schedule 3**

T_1	T_2
read(A)	
write(A)	
read(B)	
write(B)	
	read(A)
	write(A)
	read(B)
	write(B)


Schedule 7

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

**Precedence Graph for
(a) Schedule 1 and (b) Schedule 2**



Illustration of Topological Sorting



Precedence Graph




fig. 15.21

T_3	T_4	T_7
read(Q)	write(Q)	read(Q)
write(Q)		write(Q)