This document is for private circulation only, For Third Year BTech. Computer 2020-21 CCOEW students.

Subject: Database Management Systems (DMS)

Faculty: Prof. Jyoti Bangare

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

- This presentation contains pictures, contents taken from multiple sources, authors and sites.
- We would like to appreciate and thank the authors, artists and do not claim any of following work to be ours, but it has been compiled here to use for academic purpose only.

Concurrency Control

Concurrency Control

- A database must provide a mechanism that will ensure that all possible schedules are both:
  - Conflict serializable.
  - Recoverable 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
- Testing a schedule for serializability *after* it has executed is a little too late!
  - Tests for serializability help us understand why a concurrency control protocol is correct
- **Goal** – to develop concurrency control protocols that will assure serializability.

Concurrency Control

- Lock-Based Protocols
- 2 phase locking protocol
- Deadlocks
- Timestamp-Based Protocols

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.
- If a lock cannot be granted, the requesting transaction is made to wait till all incompatible locks held by other transactions have been released. The lock is then granted.

Lock-Based Protocols (Cont.)

- Example of a transaction performing locking:

  T_2: **lock-S**(*A*);
  read (*A*);
  unlock(*A*);
  lock-S(*B*);
  read (*B*);
  unlock(*B*);
  display(*A*+*B*)

- Locking as above is not sufficient to guarantee serializability — if *A* and *B* get updated in-between the read of *A* and *B*, the displayed sum would be wrong.
- A **locking protocol** is a set of rules followed by all transactions while requesting and releasing locks. Locking protocols restrict the set of possible schedules.

Pitfalls of Lock-Based Protocols

- 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.

Pitfalls of Lock-Based Protocols (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.
- Starvation : indefinite postponement of a process because it requires some resource before it can run, but the resource, though available for allocation, is never allocated to this process.
- 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

This locking protocol divides the execution phase of a transaction into three parts.

- In the first part, when the transaction starts executing, it seeks permission for the locks it requires.
- The second part is where the transaction acquires all the locks. As soon as the transaction releases its first lock, the third part starts.
- In this part, the transaction cannot demand any new locks; it only releases the acquired locks.



The Two-Phase Locking Protocol

- This is 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
- Cascading roll-back is possible under two-phase locking. To avoid this, follow a modified protocol called **strict two-phase locking**. Here a transaction must hold all its exclusive locks till it commits/aborts.
- **Rigorous two-phase locking** is even stricter: here *all* locks are held till commit/abort. In this protocol transactions can be serialized in the order in which they commit.
- Strict-2PL does not have cascading abort as 2PL does.



Lock Conversions

- Two-phase locking with lock conversions:
  - First 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)
  - Second Phase:
    - can release a lock-S
    - can release a lock-X
    - can convert a lock-X to a lock-S (downgrade)
- This protocol assures serializability. But still relies on the programmer to insert the various locking instructions.

Automatic Acquisition of Locks

- A transaction T_i issues the standard read/write instruction, without explicit locking calls.
- The operation **read**(*D*) is processed as:

```
if T_i has a lock on D
  then
      read(D)
  else begin
      if necessary wait until no other
          transaction has a lock-X on D
      grant T_i a  lock-S on D;
      read(D)
  end
```

Automatic Acquisition of Locks (Cont.)

- **write**(*D*) is processed as:

```
if T_i has a lock-X on D
   then
     write(D)
  else begin
       if necessary wait until no other trans. has any lock on D,
       if T_i has a lock-S on D
            then
                upgrade lock on D to lock-X
            else
                grant T_i a lock-X on D
            write(D)
   end;
```

- All locks are released after commit or abort

Implementation of Locking

- A **lock manager** can be implemented as a separate process to which transactions send lock and unlock requests
- 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 a data-structure called a **lock table** to record granted locks and pending requests
- The lock table is usually implemented as an in-memory hash table indexed on the name of the data item being locked

Lock Table



- 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

- Consider the following two transactions:

  T_1: write(X) T_2: write(Y)
  write(Y) write(X)

- Schedule with deadlock

T_1	T_2
lock-X on X write(X)	
	lock-X on Y write (Y) wait for **lock-X** on X
wait for **lock-X** on Y	

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.
- ***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 (predeclaration).
  - 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).
  - Deadlock prevention by ordering usually ensured by careful programming of transactions

More Deadlock Prevention Strategies

- Following schemes use transaction timestamps for the sake of deadlock prevention alone.
- **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 needed data item
- **wound-wait** scheme – preemptive
  - older transaction *wounds* (= forces rollback) of younger transaction instead of waiting for it. Younger transactions may wait for older ones.
  - may be fewer rollbacks than *wait-die* scheme
- Both in *wait-die* and in *wound-wait* schemes:
  - a rolled back transaction is restarted with its original timestamp. Older transactions thus have precedence over newer ones, and starvation is hence avoided.
- 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
    - thus deadlocks are not possible
  - simple to implement; but starvation is possible. Also difficult to determine good value of the timeout interval.

Deadlock Detection

- Deadlocks can be described as a *wait-for graph*, which consists of a pair $G = (V,E)$,
  - V is a set of vertices (all the transactions in the system)
  - E is a set of edges; each element is an ordered pair $T_i \rightarrow T_j$.
- If $T_i \rightarrow T_j$ is in E, then there is a directed edge from T_i to T_j, implying that T_i is waiting for T_j to release a data item.
- When T_i requests a data item currently being held by T_j, then the edge T_i T_j is inserted in the wait-for graph. This edge is removed only when T_j is no longer holding a data item needed by T_i.
- The system is in a deadlock state if and only if the wait-for graph has a cycle. Must invoke a deadlock-detection algorithm periodically to look for cycles.
- For further detail see lessons on deadlocks in the OS part of the course

Deadlock Detection

- ***Deadlock detection*** algorithms used to detect deadlocks



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. 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.
    - More effective to roll back transaction only as far as necessary to break deadlock.
  - Starvation happens if same transaction is always chosen as victim. Include the number of rollbacks in the cost factor to avoid starvation

Timestamp-Based Protocols

- Each transaction is issued a timestamp when it enters the system. If an old transaction T_i has time-stamp TS(T_i), a new transaction T_j is assigned time-stamp TS(T_j) such that TS(T_i) <TS(T_j).
- The protocol manages concurrent execution such that the time-stamps determine the serializability order.
- In order to assure such behavior, the 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.

Timestamp-Based Protocols (Cont.)

- The timestamp ordering protocol ensures that any conflicting **read** and **write** operations are executed in timestamp order.
- 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).

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.