

Scheduler

42

- The scheduler is the module that schedules the transaction's actions, ensuring serializability.
- How ?
 - ▣ Locks
 - ▣ Time stamps

42

Lock Based Concurrency Control

43

- DBMS aims to allow only recoverable and serializable schedules
- Ensure committed transactions are not un-done while aborting transactions
- Use a *locking protocol*: a set of rules to be followed by each transaction to ensure serializable schedules
- *Lock*: a mechanism to control concurrent access to a data object

43

Locking Scheduler

44

Simple idea:

- Each element has a unique lock
- Each transaction must first acquire the lock before reading/writing that element
- If the lock is taken by another transaction, then wait
- The transaction must release the lock(s)

Adapted from M. Balazinska

44

Notation

45

- $Li(A)$ = transaction T_i acquires lock for element A
- $Ui(A)$ = transaction T_i releases lock for element A

45

Example 1

46

T1	T2
L1(A)	
R1(A), W1(A)	
U1(A), L1(B)	
	L2(A)
	R2(A), W2(A)
	U2(A)
	L2(B), DENIED...
R1(B), W1(B)	
U1(B)	
	GRANTED;
	R2(B), W2(B)
	U2(B)

Scheduler has enforced a
conflict serializable schedule

46

Example 2

47

T1	T2
L1(A)	
R1(A), W1(A)	
U1(A)	
	L2(A)
	R2(A), W2(A)
	U2(A)
	L2(B)
	R2(B), W2(B)
	U2(B)
L1(B)	
R1(B), W1(B)	
U1(B)	

47

Types of Locks

48

- Shared lock (for reading)
- Exclusive lock (for writing, and of course, also for reading)
- Notation
 - $S_T(A)$: transaction T requests shared lock on object A
 - $X_T(A)$: transaction T requests exclusive lock on object A

48

Lock Modes

49

- S = Shared lock (for read)
- X = Exclusive lock (for write)

Lock compatibility matrix

	None	S	X
None	OK	OK	OK
S	OK	OK	Conflict
X	OK	Conflict	Conflict

49

Strict Two Phase Locking (Strict 2PL)

50

- Most widely used locking protocol
- Two rules:
 1. Each Xact must obtain a **S (shared) lock** on object before reading, and an **X (exclusive) lock** on object before writing.
 2. All locks held by a transaction are released when the transaction completes
- If an Xact holds an X lock on an object, no other Xact can get a lock (S or X) on that object.
- Strict 2PL allows only schedules whose precedence graph is acyclic (i.e., serializable)
- Recoverable and ACA

50

Strict 2PL Example

51

T1	T2
L(A);	
R(A), W(A)	
	L(A); DENIED...
L(B);	
R(B), W(B)	
U(A), U(B)	
Commit;	
	...GRANTED
	R(A), W(A)
	L(B);
	R(B), W(B)
	U(A), U(B)
	Commit;

All locks held by T1 are released when T1 completes.

51

Implications

52

- The locking protocol only allows safe interleavings of transactions
- If T1 and T2 access different data objects, then no conflict and each may proceed
- Otherwise, if same object, actions are ordered serially.
 - ▣ The Xact who gets the lock first must complete before the other can proceed

52

Two Phase Locking Protocol (2PL)

53

- Variant of Strict 2PL
- Relaxes the 2nd rule of Strict 2PL to allow Xacts to release locks before the end (commit/abort)
- Two rules:
 - ▣ Each Xact must obtain a S (shared) lock on object before reading, and an X (exclusive) lock on object before writing.
 - ▣ A transaction cannot request additional locks once it releases any lock.
 - ▣ If an Xact holds an X lock on an object, no other Xact can get a lock (S or X) on that object.

53

2PL Example

54

T1	T2
X(A), X(B)	
R(A), W(A)	
U(A)	
	X(A)
	R(A), W(A)
	X(B), DENIED...
R(B), W(B)	
U(B)	
	..GRANTED
	R(B), W(B)
	U(A), U(B)

All locks are first acquired, and then released.

54

2PL Implications

55

- In every transaction, all lock requests must precede all unlock requests.
- This ensures conflict serializability
 - ▣ Why? (Think of order Xacts enter their shrinking phase)
 - ▣ This induces a sort ordering of the transactions that can be serialized

55

Strict 2PL makes 2PL “strict”

56

- Recall: a strict schedule is one where a value written by T is not read/overwritten until T commits/aborts
 - Strict 2PL makes T hold locks until commit/abort
 - No other transaction can see or modify the data object until T is complete

56

Remarks

57

- What if a transaction releases its locks and then aborts?
- Recall: conflict serializable definition only considers *committed* transactions

57

Phantom Problem

58

- So far we have assumed the database to be a *static* collection of elements (=tuples)
- If tuples are inserted/deleted then the *phantom problem* appears

58

Phantom Problem

59

T1	T2
SELECT *	
FROM Product	
WHERE color='blue'	
	INSERT INTO Product(name, color)
	VALUES ('gizmo','blue')
SELECT *	
FROM Product	
WHERE color='blue'	

Is this schedule serializable ?

59

Phantom Problem

60

T1	T2
SELECT *	
FROM Product	
WHERE color='blue'	
	INSERT INTO Product(name, color)
	VALUES ('gizmo','blue')
SELECT *	
FROM Product	
WHERE color='blue'	

Suppose there are two blue products, X1, X2:

R1(X1),R1(X2),W2(X3),R1(X1),R1(X2),R1(X3)

This is conflict serializable ! What's wrong ??

60

Phantom Problem

61

T1	T2
SELECT *	
FROM Product	
WHERE color='blue'	
	INSERT INTO Product(name, color)
	VALUES ('gizmo','blue')
SELECT *	
FROM Product	
WHERE color='blue'	

Suppose there are two blue products, X1, X2:

R1(X1),R1(X2),W2(X3),R1(X1),R1(X2),R1(X3)

61

Phantom Problem

62

- A “phantom” is a tuple that is invisible during part of a transaction execution but not all of it.
- In our example:
 - ▣ T1: reads list of products
 - ▣ T2: inserts a new product
 - ▣ T1: re-reads: a new product appears !

62

Phantom Problem

63

- In a static database:
 - ▣ Conflict serializability implies serializability
- In a dynamic database, this may fail due to phantoms

63

Dealing With Phantoms

64

- Lock the entire table, or
- Lock the index entry for ‘blue’
 - ▣ If index is available

Dealing with phantoms is expensive !

64