

Q1 Construct an example of some transactions and a non-serializable interleaved execution H of those transactions, such that the precedes graph of H has no cycle of length 2.

Q2 Either prove or disprove the following claim: if H is an execution such that no pair of concurrently active transactions have a ww-conflict on the same item, then H is serializable.

Q3 Consider a DBMS which uses multigranularity locking (section 16.4 of Silberschatz-Korth-Sudarshan 5th ed) with rigorous two-phase locking. If H is an execution of the system, and the precedes graph of H has an edge from T_i to T_j , prove that $\text{commit}(T_i)$ occurs before $\text{commit}(T_j)$ in H .

Q4 Fred Foolish is building a DBMS which uses multi-granularity locking (the granules are files and records). Fred makes a mistake in his coding, so that S locks and IX locks on a granule are not conflicting in his system (all other pairs of locks are correctly checked as given in Fig 16.17 of Silberschatz-Korth-Sudarshan 5th ed). Is Fred's system satisfactory? If so, show this; if not, give an example of an execution that Fred's system allows, which is not serialisable.

Q5 Show that if each transaction running alone preserves every integrity condition on the database, then each integrity condition is valid after an arbitrary concurrent execution in which each read-only transaction runs with cursor stability, and each update transaction (doing reads and writes) runs with two-phase locking.

Q6 Construct an example of an integrity condition, two transactions T_1 and T_2 , and a concurrent execution H , such that each transaction running alone preserves the integrity condition, T_1 is a read-only transaction running with cursor stability, T_2 runs with two-phase locking, and the data read by T_1 during H does not satisfy the integrity constraint. (Of course, H must be non-serializable, since in any serial execution, T_1 sees data that satisfies all integrity constraints.)

Q7 Construct the multiversion conflict graph for the execution H_3 from the paper "A Read-Only Transaction Anomaly Under Snapshot Isolation" by Fekete, O'Neil and O'Neil, ACM SIGMOD Record 33(3):12-14, 2004. Also, let H_4 denote the subset of H_3 consisting of the operations of T_1 and T_2 ; draw the conflict graph for H_4 , and show that H_4 is serializable.

Q8 Suppose T_1 , T_2 , T_3 and T_4 are transactions that are each running using SI. Consider an interleaved execution in which the following operations occur in the order shown. Fill in the version information for each accessed

item (for example, the first read operation is $r_1[x_0]$, because the read of x by T_1 accesses the initial version of x .)

start T_1
T1 reads x
T1 writes x
start T_3
commit T_1
start T_2
start T_4
T2 reads x
T2 reads y
T4 reads x
T3 reads x
T2 writes y
T4 reads y
commit T_2
T3 reads y
T4 writes x
commit T_4
commit T_3