Chapter 14: Transactions

Dr. CHEN Jian
Professor
ellachen@scut.edu.cn

SCUT

华南理工大学 软件学院

Chapter 14: Transactions

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

14.1 Transaction Concept

- A **transaction** is a *unit* of program execution that accesses and possibly updates various data items.
- E.g. 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)*
- Two main issues to deal with:
  - Failures of various kinds, such as hardware failures and system crashes
  - Concurrent execution of multiple transactions

14.2 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, money will be "lost" leading to an inconsistent database state
    - Failure could be due to software or hardware
  - the system should ensure that updates of a partially executed transaction are not reflected in the database
- **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 even if there are software or hardware failures.

14.2 Example of Fund Transfer (Cont.)

- 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*)
- **Consistency requirement** in above example:
  - the sum of A and B is unchanged by the execution of the transaction
- In general, consistency requirements include
    - Explicitly specified integrity constraints such as primary keys and foreign keys
    - Implicit integrity constraints
      - e.g. sum of balances of all accounts, minus sum of loan amounts must equal value of cash-in-hand
  - A transaction must see a consistent database.
  - During transaction execution the database may be temporarily inconsistent.
  - When the transaction completes successfully the database must be consistent
    - Erroneous transaction logic can lead to inconsistency

14.2 Example of Fund Transfer (Cont.)

- **Isolation requirement** — if between steps 3 and 6, another transaction T2 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).

T1	**T2**
1. **read**(*A*)	
2. *A* := *A* – 50	
3. **write**(*A*)	
	read(A), **read**(B), print(A+B)
4. **read**(*B*)	
5. *B* := *B* + 50	
6. **write**(*B*	

- Isolation 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 later.

ACID Properties

A **transaction** is a unit of program execution that accesses and possibly updates various data items.To preserve the 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.

14.4 Transaction Atomicity and Durability

- 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
      - can be done only if no internal logical error
    - kill the transaction
      - It usually does so because of some internal logical error
  - **Committed** – after successful completion.

Transaction State (Cont.)



14.5 Transaction Isolation

- Multiple transactions are allowed to run concurrently in the system. Advantages are:
  - **increased processor and disk utilization**, leading to better transaction *throughput*
    - E.g. 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
  - that is, to control the interaction among the concurrent transactions in order to prevent them from destroying the consistency of the database
    - Will study in Chapter 16, after studying notion of correctness of concurrent executions.

Concurrent Executions

- Multiple transactions are allowed to run concurrently in the system. Advantages are:
  - **increased processor and disk utilization**, leading to better transaction *throughput*
    - E.g. 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
  - that is, to control the interaction among the concurrent transactions in order to prevent them from destroying the consistency of the database

Schedules

- **Schedule** – a sequences of instructions that specify 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.
- A transaction that successfully completes its execution will have a commit instructions as the last statement
  - by default transaction assumed to execute commit instruction as its last step
- A transaction that fails to successfully complete its execution will have an abort instruction as the last statement

Schedule 1

- Let T_1 transfer \$50 from *A* to *B*, and T_2 transfer 10% of the balance from *A* to *B*. Suppose the current values of accounts A and B are \$1000 and \$2000, respectively.
- A serial schedule in which T_1 is followed by T_2 :

T_1	T_2
read (A)	
$A := A - 50$	
write (A)	
read (B)	
$B := B + 50$	
write (B)	
commit	
	read (A)
	$temp := A * 0.1$
	$A := A - temp$
	write (A)
	read (B)
	$B := B + temp$
	write (B)
	commit

A = 855
B = 2145
A+B = 3000

SCUT

Schedule 2

- A serial schedule where T_2 is followed by T_1

T_1	T_2
	read (A)
	$temp := A * 0.1$
	$A := A - temp$
	write (A)
	read (B)
	$B := B + temp$
	write (B)
	commit
read (A)	
$A := A - 50$	
write (A)	
read (B)	
$B := B + 50$	
write (B)	
commit	

$A = 850$

$B = 2150$

$A+B = 3000$

Schedule 3

- Let T1 and T2 be the transactions defined previously. The following schedule is not a serial schedule, but it is equivalent to Schedule 1.

T_1	T_2
read (A)	
$A := A - 50$	
write (A)	
	read (A)
	$temp := A * 0.1$
	$A := A - temp$
	write (A)
read (B)	
$B := B + 50$	
write (B)	
commit	
	read (B)
	$B := B + temp$
	write (B)
	commit

A = 855
B = 2145
A+B = 3000

The sum A + B is preserved.

Schedule 4

- The following concurrent schedule does not preserve the value of (*A* + *B*).



T_1	T_2
read (A)	
$A := A - 50$	
	read (A)
	$temp := A * 0.1$
	$A := A - temp$
	write (A)
	read (B)
write (A)	
read (B)	
$B := B + 50$	
write (B)	
commit	
	$B := B + temp$
	write (B)
	commit

$A = 950$
$B = 2100$
$A+B = 3050$

Serializable Schedules

- We can ensure consistency of the database under concurrent execution by making sure that any schedule that is executed has the same effect as a schedule that could have occurred without any concurrent execution.
- That is, the schedule should, in some sense, be equivalent to a serial schedule. Such schedules are called **serializable schedules**.

14.6 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**

Simplified view of transactions

- We ignore operations other than **read** and **write** instructions
- 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.

Conflicting Instructions

- Instructions l_i and l_j of transactions T_i and T_j respectively, **conflict** if and only if there exists some item Q accessed by both l_i and l_j, and at least one of these instructions wrote Q.
  1. l_i = **read**(Q), l_j = **read**(Q). l_i and l_j don't conflict.
  2. l_i = **read**(Q), l_j = **write**(Q). They conflict.
  3. l_i = **write**(Q), l_j = **read**(Q). They conflict
  4. l_i = **write**(Q), l_j = **write**(Q). They conflict
- Intuitively, a conflict between l_i and l_j forces a (logical) temporal order between them.
  - If l_i and l_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

- 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

Conflict Serializability (Cont.)

- Schedule 3 can be transformed into Schedule 6, 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)

Schedule 3

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

Schedule 6

Conflict Serializability (Cont.)

- 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 < T_3, T_4 >, or the serial schedule < T_4, T_3 >.

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

T_{27}	T_{28}	T_{29}
read (Q)		
	write (Q)	
write (Q)		
		write (Q)

- What serial schedule is above equivalent to?
- Every view serializable schedule that is not conflict serializable has **blind writes**.

Other Notions of Serializability

- The schedule below produces same outcome as the serial schedule < T_1, T_5 >, 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.

Testing for Serializability

- Consider some schedule of a set of transactions T_1, T_2, ..., 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.
- We may label the arc by the item that was accessed.
- **Example 1**



Example Schedule (Schedule A) + Precedence Graph

T_1	T_2	T_3	T_4	T_5
	read(X)			
read(Y)				
read(Z)				
				read(V)
				read(W)
				read(W)
	read(Y)			
	write(Y)			
		write(Z)		
read(U)				
			read(Y)	
			write(Y)	
			read(Z)	
			write(Z)	
read(U)				
write(U)				

$$\begin{tikzcd}
T_1 \arrow[rr, bend left] \arrow[d, bend right] \arrow[drr] & & T_2 \arrow[d, bend left] \\
T_3 \arrow[rr, bend right] & & T_4 \\
& T_5 &
\end{tikzcd}$$

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.)



(a)



(b)



(c)

Test for Conflict Serializability

- 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 $T_5 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow T_3 \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow T_4$
    - Are there others?


$$\begin{tikzcd} T_1 \arrow[r, bend left] \arrow[d, bend right] \arrow[dr] & T_2 \arrow[d, bend left] \\ T_3 \arrow[r, bend right] & T_4 \\ & T_5 \end{tikzcd}$$

Test for View Serializability

- The precedence graph test for conflict serializability cannot be used directly to test for view serializability.
  - Extension to test for view serializability has cost exponential in the size of the precedence graph.
- 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 *extremely* unlikely.
- However practical algorithms that just check some **sufficient conditions** for view serializability can still be used.

14.7 Transaction Isolation and Atomicity

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

- The following schedule (Schedule 11) is not recoverable if T_9 commits immediately after the read

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

- 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.
- **Recoverable schedule** — if a transaction T_j reads a data item previously written by a transaction T_i , then the commit operation of T_i appears before the commit operation of T_j.

Cascading Rollbacks

- Even if a schedule is recoverable, to recover correctly from the failure of a transaction T_i , we may have to roll back several transactions
- **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)

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

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

Cascadeless Schedules

- Cascading rollback is undesirable, since it leads to the undoing of a significant amount of work.
- **Cascadeless schedules** — cascading rollbacks cannot occur; 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

Concurrency Control

- A database must provide a mechanism that will ensure that all possible schedules are
  - either conflict or view serializable, and
  - are 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
  - Are serial schedules recoverable/cascadeless?
- Testing a schedule for serializability *after* it has executed is a little too late!
- **Goal** – to develop concurrency control protocols that will assure serializability.

Concurrency Control vs. Serializability Tests

- Concurrency-control protocols allow concurrent schedules, but ensure that the schedules are conflict/view serializable, and are recoverable and cascadeless .
- Concurrency control protocols generally do not examine the precedence graph as it is being created
  - Instead a protocol imposes a discipline that avoids nonseralizable schedules.
  - We study such protocols in Chapter 16.
- Different concurrency control protocols provide different tradeoffs between the amount of concurrency they allow and the amount of overhead that they incur.
- Tests for serializability help us understand why a concurrency control protocol is correct.

14.8 Transaction Isolation Levels

- 可串行化调度是保证熟即可一致性的理想方案，但保证绝对的可串行化有可能只能满足极小的并发度。现实中为了提高系统响应时间，SQL标准允许事务可以以一种与其他事务不可串行化的方式来执行。
- **Serializable** — 保证可串行化调度
- **Repeatable read** — 只允许读取已提交数据，一个事务两读取同一数据项的时候，其他事务不得更新该数据，但不要求该事务与其他事务可串行化
- **Read committed** — 只允许读取已提交数据，但不要求可重复读
- **Read uncommitted** — 允许读取未提交数据。这是SQL允许的最低一致性级别。

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.
- In almost all database systems, by default, every SQL statement also commits implicitly if it executes successfully
  - Implicit commit can be turned off by a database directive
    - E.g. in JDBC,   connection.setAutoCommit(false);

Assignment

- 14.12
- 14.15

End of Chapter