When the replication SQL thread executes an event read from the source, it modifies its own time to the event timestamp. (This is why `TIMESTAMP` is well replicated.) In the `Time` column in the output of `SHOW PROCESSLIST`, the number of seconds displayed for the replication SQL thread is the number of seconds between the timestamp of the last replicated event and the real time of the replica machine. You can use this to determine the date of the last replicated event. Note that if your replica has been disconnected from the source for one hour, and then reconnects, you may immediately see large `Time` values such as 3600 for the replication SQL thread in `SHOW PROCESSLIST`. This is because the replica is executing statements that are one hour old. See Section 17.2.3, “Replication Threads”.

A.14.4. How do I force the source to block updates until the replica catches up?

Use the following procedure:

1. On the source, execute these statements:

   ```
   mysql> FLUSH TABLES WITH READ LOCK;
   mysql> SHOW MASTER STATUS;
   ```

   Record the replication coordinates (the current binary log file name and position) from the output of the `SHOW` statement.

2. On the replica, issue the following statement, where the arguments to the `MASTER_POS_WAIT()` function are the replication coordinate values obtained in the previous step:

   ```
   mysql> SELECT MASTER_POS_WAIT('log_name', log_pos);
   ```

   The `SELECT` statement blocks until the replica reaches the specified log file and position. At that point, the replica is in synchrony with the source and the statement returns.

3. On the source, issue the following statement to enable the source to begin processing updates again:

   ```
   mysql> UNLOCK TABLES;
   ```

A.14.5. What issues should I be aware of when setting up two-way replication?

MySQL replication currently does not support any locking protocol between source and replica to guarantee the atomicity of a distributed (cross-server) update. In other words, it is possible for client A to make an update to co-source 1, and in the meantime, before it propagates to co-source 2, client B could make an update to co-source 2 that makes the update of client A work differently than it did on co-source 1. Thus, when the update of client A makes it to co-source 2, it produces tables that are different from what you have on co-source 1, even after all the updates from co-source 2 have also propagated. This means that you should not chain two servers together in a two-way replication relationship unless you are sure that your updates can safely happen in any order, or unless you take care of mis-ordered updates somehow in the client code.

You should also realize that two-way replication actually does not improve performance very much (if at all) as far as updates are concerned. Each server must do the same number of updates, just as you would have a single server do. The only difference is that there is a little less lock contention because the updates originating on another server are serialized in one replication thread. Even this benefit might be offset by network delays.

A.14.6. How can I use replication to improve performance of my system?