Introduction to Database Systems
CSE 414

Lecture 27:
Implementation of Transactions

Announcements

- Final exam
  - Will test concepts from entire class but emphasis on post-midterm
  - Previous finals are for reference only, better to study lecture and section materials

conflicts between a series of transactions

Testing for Conflict-Serializability

Precedence graph: which transactions have to go before others for process to be consistent

- A node for each transaction T_i,
- An edge from T_i to T_j whenever an action in T_i conflicts with, and comes before an action in T_j

- The schedule is conflict-serializable iff the precedence graph is acyclic

if cyclic there is no possible order; i.e. A needs to be run before B, B needs to be run before A = cycle = not possible

Example 1

$r_2(A); r_1(B); w_2(A); r_3(A); w_1(B); w_3(A); r_2(B); w_2(B)$

1 2 3

Example 1

$r_2(A); r_1(B); w_2(A); r_3(A); w_1(B); w_3(A); r_2(B); w_2(B)$

read to A, the



This schedule is conflict-serializable

Example 2

$r_2(A); r_1(B); w_2(A); r_2(B); r_3(A); w_1(B); w_3(A); w_2(B)$

1 2 3

start with far left element r2(A) in this case:
There exists a conflict if we have a read write, write read, or write write conflict on SAME dataset
for each element:
Compare this element with all elements to right of it; if we have current element & element to the right of it
ri(A) & wj(A)
OR
wi(A) & rj(A)
OR
wi(A) & wj(A)

with i =/= j then we have a conflict between i and j; draw graph and check for cycles

Example 2

$r_2(A); r_1(B); w_2(A); r_2(B); r_3(A); w_1(B); w_3(A); w_2(B)$



This schedule is NOT conflict-serializable

Implementing Transactions

preventing the formation of non-seralizable conflicts (i.e. we can always find a proper order to run our transactions)

Scheduler

- Scheduler = the module that schedules the transaction's actions, ensuring serializability
- Also called Concurrency Control Manager
- We discuss next how a scheduler may be implemented

Implementing a Scheduler

Major differences between database vendors

- Locking Scheduler starts from assumption that all transactions are interfering with each other.
  - Aka "pessimistic concurrency control"
  - SQLite, SQL Server, DB2
- Multiversion Concurrency Control (MVCC)
  - Aka "optimistic concurrency control"

We discuss only locking schedulers in this class

Locking Scheduler

once a transaction acquires a lock, NO other transaction can access that element

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)

By using locks scheduler ensures conflict-serializability

prevents conflicts from occuring in the first place?

What Data Elements are Locked?

Major differences between vendors:

- Lock on the entire database
  - SQLite only one transaction can run on entire database at a time.
- Lock on individual records
  - SQL Server, DB2, etc

More Notations

$L_i(A)$ = transaction T_i acquires lock for element A

$U_i(A)$ = transaction T_i releases lock for element A

A Non-Serializable Schedule

T1	T2
READ(A)	
A := A+100	
WRITE(A)	
	READ(A)
	A := A*2
	WRITE(A)
	READ(B)
	B := B*2
	WRITE(B)
READ(B)	
B := B+100	
WRITE(B)	

add locks before doing anything with a given element!
Need a lock on a given element to perform an action on that element

Example

T1	T2
$L_1(A)$; READ(A)	
A := A+100	
WRITE(A); $U_1(A)$; $L_1(B)$	
	$L_2(A)$; READ(A)
	A := A*2
	WRITE(A); $U_2(A)$;
	$L_2(B)$; BLOCKED…
READ(B)	
B := B+100	
WRITE(B); $U_1(B)$;	
	…GRANTED; READ(B)
	B := B*2
	WRITE(B); $U_2(B)$;

Scheduler has ensured a conflict-serializable schedule

But what if…

T1	T2
$L_1(A)$; READ(A)	
A := A+100	
WRITE(A); $U_1(A)$;	
	$L_2(A)$; READ(A)
	A := A*2
	WRITE(A); $U_2(A)$;
	$L_2(B)$; READ(B)
	B := B*2
	WRITE(B); $U_2(B)$;
$L_1(B)$; READ(B)	
B := B+100	
WRITE(B); $U_1(B)$;	

Locks did not enforce conflict-serializability !!! What's wrong ?

Two Phase Locking (2PL)

The 2PL rule:

In every transaction, all lock requests must precede all unlock requests

Example: 2PL transactions

T1	T2
$L_1(A)$; $L_1(B)$; READ(A)	
A := A+100	
WRITE(A); $U_1(A)$	
	$L_2(A)$; READ(A)
	A := A*2
	WRITE(A);
	$L_2(B)$; BLOCKED…
READ(B)	
B := B+100	
WRITE(B); $U_1(B)$;	
	…GRANTED; READ(B)
	B := B*2
	WRITE(B); $U_2(A)$; $U_2(B)$;

Now it is conflict-serializable

Two Phase Locking (2PL)

Theorem: 2PL ensures conflict serializability

19

Two Phase Locking (2PL)

Theorem: 2PL ensures conflict serializability

Proof. Suppose not: then there exists a cycle in the precedence graph.



Two Phase Locking (2PL)

Theorem: 2PL ensures conflict serializability

Proof. Suppose not: then there exists a cycle in the precedence graph.



Then there is the following **temporal** cycle in the schedule:

21

Two Phase Locking (2PL)

Theorem: 2PL ensures conflict serializability

Proof. Suppose not: then there exists a cycle in the precedence graph.



Then there is the following **temporal** cycle in the schedule:

$U_1(A) \rightarrow L_2(A)$ why?

transaction one has to unlock its element before any other ones can start on A

$U_1(A)$ happened strictly ***before*** $L_2(A)$

22

Two Phase Locking (2PL)

Theorem: 2PL ensures conflict serializability

Proof. Suppose not: then there exists a cycle in the precedence graph.



Then there is the following **temporal** cycle in the schedule:

$U_1(A) \rightarrow L_2(A)$

$L_2(A) \rightarrow U_2(B)$ why?

by 2PL all locks occur BEFORE all unlocks

$L_2(A)$ happened strictly ***before*** $U_1(A)$

23

Two Phase Locking (2PL)

Theorem: 2PL ensures conflict serializability

Proof. Suppose not: then there exists a cycle in the precedence graph.



Then there is the following **temporal** cycle in the schedule:

$U_1(A) \rightarrow L_2(A)$

$L_2(A) \rightarrow U_2(B)$ why?

24

Two Phase Locking (2PL)

Theorem: 2PL ensures conflict serializability

Proof. Suppose not: then there exists a cycle in the precedence graph.



Then there is the following **temporal** cycle in the schedule:

$U_1(A) \rightarrow L_2(A)$
$L_2(A) \rightarrow U_2(B)$
$U_2(B) \rightarrow L_3(B)$ why?

Two Phase Locking (2PL)

Theorem: 2PL ensures conflict serializability

Proof. Suppose not: then there exists a cycle in the precedence graph.



Then there is the following **temporal** cycle in the schedule:

$U_1(A) \rightarrow L_2(A)$
$L_2(A) \rightarrow U_2(B)$
$U_2(B) \rightarrow L_3(B)$

......etc.....

transaction aborts; when this happens ALL elements have to be reset to exactly what they were before the transaction began… But this will overwrite the work/writes of other transactions.

Two Phase Locking (2PL)

Theorem: 2PL ensures conflict serializability

Proof. Suppose not: then there exists a cycle in the precedence graph.



Then there is the following **temporal** cycle in the schedule:

$U_1(A) \rightarrow L_2(A)$
$L_2(A) \rightarrow U_2(B)$
$U_2(B) \rightarrow L_3(B)$
$L_3(B) \rightarrow U_3(C)$
$U_3(C) \rightarrow L_1(C)$
$L_1(C) \rightarrow U_1(A)$

Cycle in time: Contradiction

Text

A New Problem: Non-recoverable Schedule

T1	T2
$L_1(A)$; $L_1(B)$; READ(A)	
A :=A+100	
WRITE(A); $U_1(A)$	
	$L_2(A)$; READ(A)
	A := A*2
	WRITE(A);
	$L_2(B)$; BLOCKED…
READ(B)	
B :=B+100	
WRITE(B); $U_1(B)$;	
	…GRANTED; READ(B)
	B := B*2
	WRITE(B); $U_2(A)$; $U_2(B)$;
	Commit
Rollback	

A New Problem: Non-recoverable Schedule

T1	T2
$L_1(A)$; $L_1(B)$; READ(A)	
A :=A+100	
WRITE(A); $U_1(A)$	
	$L_2(A)$; READ(A)
	A := A*2
	WRITE(A);
	$L_2(B)$; BLOCKED…
READ(B)	
B :=B+100	
WRITE(B); $U_1(B)$;	
	…GRANTED; READ(B)
	B := B*2
	WRITE(B); $U_2(A)$; $U_2(B)$;
	Commit
Rollback	

Elements A, B written by T1 are restored to their original value.

A New Problem: Non-recoverable Schedule

T1	T2
$L_1(A)$; $L_1(B)$; READ(A)	
A :=A+100	
WRITE(A); $U_1(A)$	
	$L_2(A)$; READ(A)
	A := A*2
	WRITE(A);
	$L_2(B)$; BLOCKED…
READ(B)	
B :=B+100	
WRITE(B); $U_1(B)$;	
	…GRANTED; READ(B)
	B := B*2
	WRITE(B); $U_2(A)$; $U_2(B)$;
	Commit
Rollback	

Dirty reads of A, B lead to incorrect writes.

Elements A, B written by T1 are restored to their original value.

A New Problem: Non-recoverable Schedule

T1	T2
$L_1(A)$; $L_1(B)$; READ(A)	
A :=A+100	
WRITE(A); $U_1(A)$	
	$L_2(A)$; READ(A)
	A := A*2
	WRITE(A);
	$L_2(B)$; BLOCKED…
READ(B)	
B :=B+100	
WRITE(B); $U_1(B)$;	
	…GRANTED; READ(B)
	B := B*2
	WRITE(B); $U_2(A)$; $U_2(B)$;
	Commit
Rollback	

Dirty reads of A, B lead to incorrect writes.

Elements A, B written by T1 are restored to their original value.

Can no longer undo!

Strict 2PL

The Strict 2PL rule:

All locks are held until commit/abort:
All unlocks are done together with commit/abort.

locks can occur anywhere throughout transaction, but unlocks MUST occur at end of transaction

With strict 2PL, we will get schedules that are both conflict-serializable and recoverable

Strict 2PL

T1	T2
$L_1(A)$; READ(A)	
A :=A+100	
WRITE(A);	
	$L_2(A)$; BLOCKED…
$L_1(B)$; READ(B)	
B :=B+100	
WRITE(B);	
Rollback & $U_1(A)$;$U_1(B)$;	
	…GRANTED; READ(A)
	A := A*2
	WRITE(A);
	$L_2(B)$; READ(B)
	B := B*2
	WRITE(B);
	Commit & $U_2(A)$; $U_2(B)$;

Strict 2PL

- Lock-based systems always use strict 2PL
- Easy to implement:
  - Before a transaction reads or writes an element A, insert an L(A) DONT just lock all elements at start of transaction
  - When the transaction commits/aborts, then release all locks
- Ensures both conflict serializability and recoverability

Another problem: Deadlocks

- T_1: R(A), W(B)
- T_2: R(B), W(A)

- T_1 holds the lock on A, waits for B
- T_2 holds the lock on B, waits for A

one solution: monitor how long transactions last; abort slow running transactions

This is a deadlock!

Another problem: Deadlocks

To detect a deadlocks, search for a cycle in the *waits-for graph*:

- T_1 waits for a lock held by T_2;
- T_2 waits for a lock held by T_3;
- . . .
- T_n waits for a lock held by T_1



Relatively expensive: check periodically, if deadlock is found, then abort one transaction.
need to continuously re-check for deadlocks

A “Solution”: Lock Modes

two different types of locks

- S = shared lock (for READ)
- X = exclusive lock (for WRITE)

Lock compatibility matrix:

	None	S	X
None			
S			
X			

A “Solution”: Lock Modes

- S = shared lock (for READ)
- X = exclusive lock (for WRITE)

Lock compatibility matrix:

	None	S	X
None			
S			
X			

Lock Granularity

what do you lock? How big/small? DB or single tuples?

lock individual tuples/attributes; more likely to create deadlocks

- Fine granularity locking (e.g., tuples)
  - High concurrency
  - High overhead in managing locks
  - E.g., SQL Server

  lock entire tables or entire database; prevents deadlocks
  but slow, as you lock a lot of data you really didnt need to
- Coarse grain locking (e.g., tables, entire database)
  - Many false conflicts
  - Less overhead in managing locks
  - E.g., SQL Lite
- Solution: lock escalation changes granularity as needed

Lock Performance



Phantom Problem

- 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

Suppose there are two blue products, A1, A2:

Phantom Problem

T1	T2
SELECT * FROM Product WHERE color=‘blue’	
	INSERT INTO Product(name, color) VALUES (‘A3’,’blue’)
SELECT * FROM Product WHERE color=‘blue’	

Is this schedule serializable ?

Suppose there are two blue products, A1, A2:

Phantom Problem

T1	T2
SELECT * FROM Product WHERE color='blue'	
	INSERT INTO Product(name, color) VALUES ('A3','blue')
SELECT * FROM Product WHERE color='blue'	

$R_1(A1);R_1(A2);W_2(A3);R_1(A1);R_1(A2);R_1(A3)$

Suppose there are two blue products, A1, A2:

Phantom Problem

T1	T2
SELECT * FROM Product WHERE color='blue'	
	INSERT INTO Product(name, color) VALUES ('A3','blue')
SELECT * FROM Product WHERE color='blue'	

$R_1(A1);R_1(A2);W_2(A3);R_1(A1);R_1(A2);R_1(A3)$

$W_2(A3);R_1(A1);R_1(A2);R_1(A1);R_1(A2);R_1(A3)$

Phantom Problem

- A "phantom" is a tuple that is invisible during part of a transaction execution but not invisible during the entire execution
- In our example:
  - T1: reads list of products
  - T2: inserts a new product
  - T1: re-reads: a new product appears !



Dealing With Phantoms

- Lock the entire table
- Lock the index entry for 'blue'
  - If index is available
- Or use predicate locks
  - A lock on an arbitrary predicate

Dealing with phantoms is expensive !

Summary of Serializability

- Serializable schedule = equivalent to a serial schedule
- (strict) 2PL guarantees *conflict serializability*
  - What is the difference?
- **Static database**:
  - *Conflict serializability* implies serializability
- **Dynamic database**:
  - This no longer holds

Isolation Levels in SQL

1. "Dirty reads"
   SET TRANSACTION ISOLATION LEVEL READ UNCOMMITTED
2. "Committed reads"
   SET TRANSACTION ISOLATION LEVEL READ COMMITTED
3. "Repeatable reads"
   SET TRANSACTION ISOLATION LEVEL REPEATABLE READ
4. Serializable transactions
   SET TRANSACTION ISOLATION LEVEL SERIALIZABLE

ACID

1. Isolation Level: Dirty Reads

- "Long duration" WRITE locks
  - Strict 2PL
- No READ locks
  - Read-only transactions are never delayed

Possible problems: dirty and inconsistent reads

2. Isolation Level: Read Committed

- "Long duration" WRITE locks
  - Strict 2PL
- "Short duration" READ locks
  - Only acquire lock while reading (not 2PL)

Unrepeatable reads:
When reading same element twice,
may get two different values

3. Isolation Level: Repeatable Read

- "Long duration" WRITE locks
  - Strict 2PL
- "Long duration" READ locks
  - Strict 2PL

Why ?

This is not serializable yet !!!

4. Isolation Level Serializable

- "Long duration" WRITE locks
  - Strict 2PL
- "Long duration" READ locks
  - Strict 2PL
- Predicate locking
  - To deal with phantoms

Beware!

In commercial DBMSs:

- Default level is often NOT serializable
- Default level differs between DBMSs
- Some engines support subset of levels!
- Serializable may not be exactly ACID
  - Locking ensures isolation, not atomicity
- Also, some DBMSs do NOT use locking and different isolation levels can lead to different pbs
- Bottom line: RTFM for your DBMS!