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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-compatible matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>true</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lock-X(B)</td>
<td>lock-S(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read(B)</td>
<td>read(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B := B - 50</td>
<td>lock-S(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write(B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Neither T3 nor T4 can make progress — executing lock-S(B) causes T4 to wait for T3 to release its lock on B, while executing lock-X(A) causes T3 to wait for T4 to release its lock on A.

- Such a situation is called a **deadlock**.
  - To handle a deadlock one of T3 or T4 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. 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 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).
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.
The Two-Phase Locking Protocol (Cont.)

- There can be conflict serializable schedules that cannot be obtained if two-phase locking is used.

- However, in the absence of extra information (e.g., ordering of access to data), two-phase locking is needed for conflict serializability in the following sense:

  Given a transaction $T_i$ that does not follow two-phase locking, we can find a transaction $T_j$ that uses two-phase locking, and a schedule for $T_i$ and $T_j$ that is not conflict serializable.
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 $\text{read}(D)$ 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

- Black rectangles indicate granted locks, white ones indicate waiting requests.
- 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.
Graph-based protocols are an alternative to two-phase locking.

Impose a partial ordering → on the set $D = \{d_1, d_2, ..., d_h\}$ of all data items.

- If $d_i \rightarrow d_j$ then any transaction accessing both $d_i$ and $d_j$ must access $d_i$ before accessing $d_j$.

- Implies that the set $D$ may now be viewed as a directed acyclic graph, called a *database graph*.

The *tree-protocol* is a simple kind of graph protocol.
1. Only exclusive locks are allowed.

2. The first lock by $T_i$ may be on any data item. Subsequently, a data $Q$ can be locked by $T_i$ only if the parent of $Q$ is currently locked by $T_i$.

3. Data items may be unlocked at any time.

4. A data item that has been locked and unlocked by $T_i$ cannot subsequently be relocked by $T_i$. 
Graph-Based Protocols (Cont.)

- The tree protocol ensures conflict serializability as well as freedom from deadlock.
- Unlocking may occur earlier in the tree-locking protocol than in the two-phase locking protocol.
  - shorter waiting times, and increase in concurrency
  - protocol is deadlock-free, no rollbacks are required

- Drawbacks
  - Protocol does not guarantee recoverability or cascade freedom
    - Need to introduce commit dependencies to ensure recoverability
  - Transactions may have to lock data items that they do not access.
    - increased locking overhead, and additional waiting time
    - potential decrease in concurrency

- Schedules not possible under two-phase locking are possible under tree protocol, and vice versa.
Multiple Granularity

- Allow data items to be of various sizes and define a hierarchy of data granularities, where the small granularities are nested within larger ones.
- Can be represented graphically as a tree (but don't confuse with tree-locking protocol).
- When a transaction locks a node in the tree explicitly, it implicitly locks all the node's descendents in the same mode.
- **Granularity of locking** (level in tree where locking is done):
  - *fine granularity* (lower in tree): high concurrency, high locking overhead
  - *coarse granularity* (higher in tree): low locking overhead, low concurrency
The levels, starting from the coarsest (top) level are

- database
- area
- file
- record
Intention Lock Modes

- In addition to S and X lock modes, there are three additional lock modes with multiple granularity:
  - **intention-shared** (IS): indicates explicit locking at a lower level of the tree but only with shared locks.
  - **intention-exclusive** (IX): indicates explicit locking at a lower level with exclusive or shared locks.
  - **shared and intention-exclusive** (SIX): the subtree rooted by that node is locked explicitly in shared mode and explicit locking is being done at a lower level with exclusive-mode locks.
- Intention locks allow a higher level node to be locked in S or X mode without having to check all descendent nodes.
The compatibility matrix for all lock modes is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S IX</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S IX</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple Granularity Locking Scheme

Transaction $T_i$ can lock a node $Q$, using the following rules:

1. The lock compatibility matrix must be observed.
2. The root of the tree must be locked first, and may be locked in any mode.
3. A node $Q$ can be locked by $T_i$ in S or IS mode only if the parent of $Q$ is currently locked by $T_i$ in either IX or IS mode.
4. A node $Q$ can be locked by $T_i$ in X, SIX, or IX mode only if the parent of $Q$ is currently locked by $T_i$ in either IX or SIX mode.
5. $T_i$ can lock a node only if it has not previously unlocked any node (that is, $T_i$ is two-phase).
6. $T_i$ can unlock a node $Q$ only if none of the children of $Q$ are currently locked by $T_i$.

Observe that locks are acquired in root-to-leaf order, whereas they are released in leaf-to-root order.
Deadlock Handling

Consider the following two transactions:

\[ T_1: \text{write} (X) \quad T_2: \text{write} (Y) \]
\[ \text{write} (Y) \quad \text{write} (X) \]

Schedule with deadlock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( T_1 )</th>
<th>( T_2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{lock-X on } X</td>
<td>\textbf{lock-X on } Y</td>
<td>\textbf{lock-X on } X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write (X)</td>
<td>write (X)</td>
<td>write (X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wait for \textbf{lock-X on } Y</td>
<td>wait for \textbf{lock-X on } X</td>
<td>wait for \textbf{lock-X on } X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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).
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.
Deadlock prevention (Cont.)

Both in *wait-die* and in *wound-wait* schemes, a rolled back transactions 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 $T_i \rightarrow T_j$ 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.
Deadlock Detection (Cont.)

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.
Other Approaches to Concurrency Control
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 $\text{write}(Q)$ successfully.
- **R-timestamp**($Q$) is the largest time-stamp of any transaction that executed $\text{read}(Q)$ 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 $\text{TS}(T_i) \leq \text{W-timestamp}(Q)$, 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 $\text{TS}(T_i) \geq \text{W-timestamp}(Q)$, then the read operation is executed, and $\text{R-timestamp}(Q)$ is set to $\max(\text{R-timestamp}(Q), \text{TS}(T_i))$. 
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 $TS(T_i)$. 
Example Use of the Protocol

A partial schedule for several data items for transactions with timestamps 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$T_1$</th>
<th>$T_2$</th>
<th>$T_3$</th>
<th>$T_4$</th>
<th>$T_5$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>read($Y$)</td>
<td>read($Y$)</td>
<td>write($Y$)</td>
<td>write($Y$)</td>
<td>read($X$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>read($X$)</td>
<td>abort</td>
<td>write($Z$)</td>
<td>abort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>abort</td>
<td></td>
<td>write($Z$)</td>
<td></td>
<td>read($Z$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>abort</td>
<td></td>
<td>write($Y$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>write($Z$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correctness of Timestamp-Ordering Protocol

- The timestamp-ordering protocol guarantees serializability since all the arcs in the precedence graph are of the form:

```
transaction with smaller timestamp  ->  transaction with larger timestamp
```

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.
Recoverability and Cascade Freedom

- Problem with timestamp-ordering protocol:
  - Suppose $T_i$ aborts, but $T_j$ has read a data item written by $T_i$
  - Then $T_j$ must abort; if $T_j$ had been allowed to commit earlier, the schedule is not recoverable.
  - Further, any transaction that has read a data item written by $T_j$ must abort
  - This can lead to cascading rollback --- that is, a chain of rollbacks

- Solution 1:
  - A transaction is structured such that its writes are all performed at the end of its processing
  - All writes of a transaction form an atomic action; no transaction may execute while a transaction is being written
  - A transaction that aborts is restarted with a new timestamp

- Solution 2: Limited form of locking: wait for data to be committed before reading it

- Solution 3: Use commit dependencies to ensure recoverability
Thomas’ Write Rule

- Modified version of the timestamp-ordering protocol in which obsolete write operations may be ignored under certain circumstances.

- When $T_i$ attempts to write data item $Q$, if $TS(T_i) < W$-timestamp($Q$), then $T_i$ is attempting to write an obsolete value of $\{Q\}$.
  - Rather than rolling back $T_i$ as the timestamp ordering protocol would have done, this \{write\} operation can be ignored.

- Otherwise this protocol is the same as the timestamp ordering protocol.

- Thomas’ Write Rule allows greater potential concurrency.
  - Allows some view-serializable schedules that are not conflict-serializable.
Validation-Based Protocol

- Execution of transaction $T_i$ is done in three phases.

1. Read and execution phase: Transaction $T_i$ writes only to temporary local variables.

2. Validation phase: Transaction $T_i$ performs a "validation test" to determine if local variables can be written without violating serializability.

3. Write phase: If $T_i$ is validated, the updates are applied to the database; otherwise, $T_i$ is rolled back.

- The three phases of concurrently executing transactions can be interleaved, but each transaction must go through the three phases in that order.
  - Assume for simplicity that the validation and write phase occur together, atomically and serially.
    - I.e., only one transaction executes validation/write at a time.

- Also called as optimistic concurrency control since transaction executes fully in the hope that all will go well during validation.
Each transaction $T_i$ has 3 timestamps
- $\text{Start}(T_i)$: the time when $T_i$ started its execution
- $\text{Validation}(T_i)$: the time when $T_i$ entered its validation phase
- $\text{Finish}(T_i)$: the time when $T_i$ finished its write phase

Serializability order is determined by timestamp given at validation time, to increase concurrency.
- Thus $\text{TS}(T_i)$ is given the value of $\text{Validation}(T_i)$.

This protocol is useful and gives greater degree of concurrency if probability of conflicts is low.
- because the serializability order is not pre-decided, and
- relatively few transactions will have to be rolled back.
Validation Test for Transaction $T_j$

- If for all $T_i$ with $TS(T_i) < TS(T_j)$ either one of the following condition holds:
  - $\text{finish}(T_i) < \text{start}(T_j)$
  - $\text{start}(T_j) < \text{finish}(T_i) < \text{validation}(T_j)$ and the set of data items written by $T_i$ does not intersect with the set of data items read by $T_j$.

then validation succeeds and $T_j$ can be committed. Otherwise, validation fails and $T_j$ is aborted.

**Justification:** Either the first condition is satisfied, and there is no overlapped execution, or the second condition is satisfied and

- the writes of $T_j$ do not affect reads of $T_i$ since they occur after $T_i$ has finished its reads.
- the writes of $T_i$ do not affect reads of $T_j$ since $T_j$ does not read any item written by $T_i$. 


Example of schedule produced using validation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T_{14}$</th>
<th>$T_{15}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>read</strong>($B$)</td>
<td><strong>read</strong>($B$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B := B - 50$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>read</strong>($A$)</td>
<td><strong>read</strong>($A$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(validate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(validate)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>display</strong> ($A+B$)</td>
<td><strong>write</strong> ($B$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>write</strong> ($A$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiversion Schemes

- Multiversion schemes keep old versions of data item to increase concurrency.
  - Multiversion Timestamp Ordering
  - Multiversion Two-Phase Locking
- Each successful write results in the creation of a new version of the data item written.
- Use timestamps to label versions.
- When a read(Q) operation is issued, select an appropriate version of Q based on the timestamp of the transaction, and return the value of the selected version.
- reads never have to wait as an appropriate version is returned immediately.
Multiversion Timestamp Ordering

■ Each data item $Q$ has a sequence of versions $<Q_1, Q_2, \ldots, Q_m>$. Each version $Q_k$ contains three data fields:

● **Content** -- the value of version $Q_k$.

● **$W$-timestamp($Q_k$)** -- timestamp of the transaction that created (wrote) version $Q_k$.

● **$R$-timestamp($Q_k$)** -- largest timestamp of a transaction that successfully read version $Q_k$.

■ when a transaction $T_i$ creates a new version $Q_k$ of $Q$, $Q_k$'s $W$-timestamp and $R$-timestamp are initialized to $TS(T_i)$.

■ $R$-timestamp of $Q_k$ is updated whenever a transaction $T_j$ reads $Q_k$, and $TS(T_j) > R$-timestamp($Q_k$).
Suppose that transaction $T_i$ issues a read($Q$) or write($Q$) operation. Let $Q_k$ denote the version of $Q$ whose write timestamp is the largest write timestamp less than or equal to TS($T_i$).

1. If transaction $T_i$ issues a read($Q$), then the value returned is the content of version $Q_k$.
2. If transaction $T_i$ issues a write($Q$)
   1. if TS($T_i$) < R-timestamp($Q_k$), then transaction $T_i$ is rolled back.
   2. if TS($T_i$) = W-timestamp($Q_k$), the contents of $Q_k$ are overwritten
   3. else a new version of $Q$ is created.

Observe that

- Reads always succeed
- A write by $T_i$ is rejected if some other transaction $T_j$ that (in the serialization order defined by the timestamp values) should read $T_i$'s write, has already read a version created by a transaction older than $T_i$.

Protocol guarantees serializability.
Multiversion Two-Phase Locking

- Differentiates between read-only transactions and update transactions
- *Update transactions* acquire read and write locks, and hold all locks up to the end of the transaction. That is, update transactions follow rigorous two-phase locking.
  - Each successful *write* results in the creation of a new version of the data item written.
  - Each version of a data item has a single timestamp whose value is obtained from a counter *ts-counter* that is incremented during commit processing.
- *Read-only transactions* are assigned a timestamp by reading the current value of *ts-counter* before they start execution; they follow the multiversion timestamp-ordering protocol for performing reads.
Multiversion Two-Phase Locking (Cont.)

- When an update transaction wants to read a data item:
  - it obtains a shared lock on it, and reads the latest version.
- When it wants to write an item
  - it obtains X lock on; it then creates a new version of the item and sets this version's timestamp to $\infty$.
- When update transaction $T_i$ completes, commit processing occurs:
  - $T_i$ sets timestamp on the versions it has created to $\text{ts-counter} + 1$
  - $T_i$ increments $\text{ts-counter}$ by 1
- Read-only transactions that start after $T_i$ increments $\text{ts-counter}$ will see the values updated by $T_i$.
- Read-only transactions that start before $T_i$ increments the $\text{ts-counter}$ will see the value before the updates by $T_i$.
- Only serializable schedules are produced.
**MVCC: Implementation Issues**

- Creation of multiple versions increases storage overhead
  - Extra tuples
  - Extra space in each tuple for storing version information
- Versions can, however, be garbage collected
  - E.g. if Q has two versions Q5 and Q9, and the oldest active transaction has timestamp > 9, than Q5 will never be required again
Insert and Delete Operations

- If two-phase locking is used:
  - A delete operation may be performed only if the transaction deleting the tuple has an exclusive lock on the tuple to be deleted.
  - A transaction that inserts a new tuple into the database is given an X-mode lock on the tuple.

- Insertions and deletions can lead to the **phantom phenomenon**.
  - A transaction that scans a relation
    - (e.g., find sum of balances of all accounts in Perryridge)
    and a transaction that inserts a tuple in the relation
    - (e.g., insert a new account at Perryridge)
    (conceptually) conflict in spite of not accessing any tuple in common.
  - If only tuple locks are used, non-serializable schedules can result
    - E.g. the scan transaction does not see the new account, but reads some other tuple written by the update transaction.
Insert and Delete Operations (Cont.)

- The transaction scanning the relation is reading information that indicates what tuples the relation contains, while a transaction inserting a tuple updates the same information.
  - The information should be locked.

- One solution:
  - Associate a data item with the relation, to represent the information about what tuples the relation contains.
  - Transactions scanning the relation acquire a shared lock in the data item,
  - Transactions inserting or deleting a tuple acquire an exclusive lock on the data item. (Note: locks on the data item do not conflict with locks on individual tuples.)

- Above protocol provides very low concurrency for insertions/deletions.

- Index locking protocols provide higher concurrency while preventing the phantom phenomenon, by requiring locks on certain index buckets.
Index Locking Protocol

- Index locking protocol:
  - Every relation must have at least one index.
  - A transaction can access tuples only after finding them through one or more indices on the relation.
  - A transaction $T_i$ that performs a lookup must lock all the index leaf nodes that it accesses, in S-mode.
    - Even if the leaf node does not contain any tuple satisfying the index lookup (e.g., for a range query, no tuple in a leaf is in the range).
  - A transaction $T_i$ that inserts, updates or deletes a tuple $t_i$ in a relation $r$:
    - must update all indices to $r$
    - must obtain exclusive locks on all index leaf nodes affected by the insert/update/delete.
  - The rules of the two-phase locking protocol must be observed.
- Guarantees that phantom phenomenon won’t occur.
Weak Levels of Consistency

■ **Degree-two consistency:** differs from two-phase locking in that S-locks may be released at any time, and locks may be acquired at any time
  ● X-locks must be held till end of transaction
  ● Serializability is not guaranteed, programmer must ensure that no erroneous database state will occur]

■ **Cursor stability:**
  ● For reads, each tuple is locked, read, and lock is immediately released
  ● X-locks are held till end of transaction
  ● Special case of degree-two consistency
Weak Levels of Consistency in SQL

- SQL allows non-serializable executions
  - **Serializable**: is the default
  - **Repeatable read**: allows only committed records to be read, and repeating a read should return the same value (so read locks should be retained)
    - However, the phantom phenomenon need not be prevented
      - T1 may see some records inserted by T2, but may not see others inserted by T2
  - **Read committed**: same as degree two consistency, but most systems implement it as cursor-stability
  - **Read uncommitted**: allows even uncommitted data to be read

- In many database systems, read committed is the default consistency level
  - has to be explicitly changed to serializable when required
    - set isolation level serializable
Concurrent in Index Structures

- Indices are unlike other database items in that their only job is to help in accessing data.
- Index-structures are typically accessed very often, much more than other database items.
  - Treating index-structures like other database items, e.g. by 2-phase locking of index nodes can lead to low concurrency.
- There are several index concurrency protocols where locks on internal nodes are released early, and not in a two-phase fashion.
  - It is acceptable to have nonserializable concurrent access to an index as long as the accuracy of the index is maintained.
    - In particular, the exact values read in an internal node of a B+-tree are irrelevant so long as we land up in the correct leaf node.
Example of index concurrency protocol:

- Use **crabbing** instead of two-phase locking on the nodes of the B⁺-tree, as follows. During search/insertion/deletion:
  - First lock the root node in shared mode.
  - After locking all required children of a node in shared mode, release the lock on the node.
  - During insertion/deletion, upgrade leaf node locks to exclusive mode.
  - When splitting or coalescing requires changes to a parent, lock the parent in exclusive mode.

Above protocol can cause excessive deadlocks

- Searches coming down the tree deadlock with updates going up the tree
- Can abort and restart search, without affecting transaction

Better protocols are available; see Section 16.9 for one such protocol, the B-link tree protocol

- Intuition: release lock on parent before acquiring lock on child
  - And deal with changes that may have happened between lock release and acquire
Next-Key Locking

- Index-locking protocol to prevent phantoms required locking entire leaf
  - Can result in poor concurrency if there are many inserts

- Alternative: for an index lookup
  - Lock all values that satisfy index lookup (match lookup value, or fall in lookup range)
  - Also lock next key value in index
  - Lock mode: S for lookups, X for insert/delete/update

- Ensures that range queries will conflict with inserts/deletes/updates
  - Regardless of which happens first, as long as both are concurrent
Extra Slides
Snapshot Isolation

- Motivation: Decision support queries that read large amounts of data have concurrency conflicts with OLTP transactions that update a few rows
  - Poor performance results
- Solution 1: Give logical “snapshot” of database state to read only transactions, read-write transactions use normal locking
  - Multiversion 2-phase locking
  - Works well, but how does system know a transaction is read only?
- Solution 2: Give snapshot of database state to every transaction, updates alone use 2-phase locking to guard against concurrent updates
  - Problem: variety of anomalies such as lost update can result
  - Partial solution: snapshot isolation level (next slide)
    - Proposed by Berenson et al, SIGMOD 1995
    - Variants implemented in many database systems
      - E.g. Oracle, PostgreSQL, SQL Server 2005
Snapshot Isolation

- A transaction T1 executing with Snapshot Isolation
  - takes snapshot of committed data at start
  - always reads/modifies data in its own snapshot
  - updates of concurrent transactions are not visible to T1
  - writes of T1 complete when it commits

- **First-committer-wins rule:**
  - Commits only if no other concurrent transaction has already written data that T1 intends to write.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W(Y := 1) Commit</td>
<td></td>
<td>W(X:=2) Commit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(X) → 0 R(Y) → 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>W(Z:=3) Commit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W(Z) → 0 R(Y) → 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W(X:=3) Commit-Req</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concurrent updates not visible
Own updates are visible
Not first-committer of X
Serialization error, T2 is rolled back
Benefits of SI

- Reading is *never* blocked,
  - and also doesn’t block other txns activities
- Performance similar to Read Committed
- Avoids the usual anomalies
  - No dirty read
  - No lost update
  - No non-repeatable read
  - Predicate based selects are repeatable (no phantoms)

Problems with SI

- SI does not always give serializable executions
  - Serializable: among two concurrent txns, one sees the effects of the other
  - In SI: neither sees the effects of the other
- Result: Integrity constraints can be violated
Snapshot Isolation

- E.g. of problem with SI
  - T1: x:=y
  - T2: y:=x
  - Initially x = 3 and y = 17
    - Serial execution: x = ??, y = ??
    - if both transactions start at the same time, with snapshot isolation: x = ??, y = ??

- Called skew write

- Skew also occurs with inserts
  - E.g:
    - Find max order number among all orders
    - Create a new order with order number = previous max + 1
Snapshot Isolation Anomalies

- SI breaks serializability when txns modify different items, each based on a previous state of the item the other modified
  - Not very common in practice
    - Eg. the TPC-C benchmark runs correctly under SI
      - when txns conflict due to modifying different data, there is usually also a shared item they both modify too (like a total quantity) so SI will abort one of them
  - But does occur
    - Application developers should be careful about write skew

- SI can also cause a read-only transaction anomaly, where read-only transaction may see an inconsistent state even if updaters are serializable
  - We omit details
SI in Oracle and PostgreSQL

- **Warning**: SI used when isolation level is set to serializable, by Oracle and PostgreSQL
  - PostgreSQL’s implementation of SI described in Section 26.4.1.3
  - Oracle implements “first updater wins” rule (variant of “first committer wins”)
    - concurrent writer check is done at time of write, not at commit time
    - Allows transactions to be rolled back earlier
  - Neither supports true serializable execution

- Can sidestep for specific queries by using `select .. for update` in Oracle and PostgreSQL
  - Locks the data which is read, preventing concurrent updates
  - E.g.
    1. `select max(orderno) from orders for update`
    2. read value into local variable `maxorder`
    3. insert into orders (maxorder+1, …)
End of Chapter

Thanks to Alan Fekete and Sudhir Jorwekar for Snapshot Isolation examples
**Snapshot Read**

- Concurrent updates invisible to snapshot read

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$T_1$ deposits 50 in $Y$</th>
<th>$T_2$ withdraws 50 from $X$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r_1(X_0, 100)$</td>
<td>$r_2(Y_0, 0)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_1(Y_0, 0)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_1(Y_1, 50)$</td>
<td>$r_2(X_0, 100)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_1(X_0, 100)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_1(Y_1, 50)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X_0 = 100$, $Y_0 = 0$

$X_2 = 50$, $Y_1 = 50$

*(update by $T_2$ not seen)*

*(can see its own updates)*

*(update by $T_1$ not seen)*
Snapshot Write: First Committer Wins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T_1$ deposits 50 in $X$</th>
<th>$T_2$ withdraws 50 from $X$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r_1(X_0, 100)$</td>
<td>$r_2(X_0, 100)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_1(X_1, 150)$</td>
<td>$w_2(X_2, 50)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$commit_1$</td>
<td>$commit_2$ (Serialization Error $T_2$ is rolled back)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X_0 = 100$

$X_1 = 150$

- Variant: “First-updater-wins”
  - Check for concurrent updates when write occurs
  - (Oracle uses this plus some extra features)
  - Differs only in when abort occurs, otherwise equivalent
### SI Non-Serializability even for Read-Only Transactions

#### Business Logic
- $X =$ checking account balance and $Y =$ savings account balance.
- Withdrawal is covered (without penalty) as long as $X + Y > 0$.
- Penalty charge = 1, if $X + Y < 0$.
- A and B are joint account holders for X and Y.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$T_1$</th>
<th>$T_2$</th>
<th>$T_3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A starts withdrawal txn. Balance is low. A asks B to deposit money</td>
<td>$A$ starts withdrawaltxn. Balance is low. A asks B to deposit money</td>
<td>$r_2(X_0, 0)$</td>
<td>$r_2(Y_0, 0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B deposits money</td>
<td>$r_1(Y_0, 0)$</td>
<td>$W_1(Y_1, 20)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A queries the balance and finds the deposit is in</td>
<td>$A$ queries the balance and finds the deposit is in</td>
<td></td>
<td>$r_3(X_0, 0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>still fined!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$w_2(X_2, -11)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Balance query prints out $X = 0$ and $Y = 20$, while final values are $Y = 20$ and $X = -11$. This can not happen in any serializable execution.
**Partial Schedule Under Two-Phase Locking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T_5$</th>
<th>$T_6$</th>
<th>$T_7$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lock-$X(A)$</td>
<td>lock-$X(A)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read($A$)</td>
<td>read($A$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lock-$S(B)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read($B$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write($A$)</td>
<td>write($A$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlock($A$)</td>
<td>unlock($A$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lock-$S(A)$</td>
<td>lock-$S(A)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>read($A$)</td>
<td>read($A$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Incomplete Schedule With a Lock Conversion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T_8$</th>
<th>$T_9$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lock-$S(a_1)$</td>
<td>lock-$S(a_1)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lock-$S(a_2)$</td>
<td>lock-$S(a_2)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lock-$S(a_3)$</td>
<td>unlock($a_1$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lock-$S(a_4)$</td>
<td>unlock($a_2$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lock-$S(a_n)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upgrade($a_1$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tree-Structured Database Graph
## Serializable Schedule Under the Tree Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T_{10}$</th>
<th>$T_{11}$</th>
<th>$T_{12}$</th>
<th>$T_{13}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lock-$X(B)$</td>
<td>lock-$X(D)$</td>
<td>lock-$X(B)$</td>
<td>lock-$X(D)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lock-$X(E)$</td>
<td>lock-$X(H)$</td>
<td>lock-$X(H)$</td>
<td>lock-$X(H)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lock-$X(D)$</td>
<td>unlock($D$)</td>
<td>unlock($E$)</td>
<td>unlock($E$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlock($B$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlock($E$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lock-$X(G)$</td>
<td>unlock($H$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlock($D$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlock($G$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{14}$</td>
<td>$T_{15}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read($B$)</td>
<td>read($B$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B := B - 50$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read($A$)</td>
<td>write($B$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>display($A + B$)</td>
<td>read($A$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$A := A + 50$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>write($A$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>display($A + B$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Schedule 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T_{16}$</th>
<th>$T_{17}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>read($Q$)</td>
<td>write($Q$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write($Q$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schedule 5, A Schedule Produced by Using Validation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( T_{14} )</th>
<th>( T_{15} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>read(( B ))</td>
<td>read(( B ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( B := B - 50 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read(( A ))</td>
<td>read(( A ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \langle \text{validate} \rangle )</td>
<td>( \langle \text{validate} \rangle )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>display(( A + B ))</td>
<td>write(( B ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>write(( A ))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Compatibility Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>SIX</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>true</td>
<td>true</td>
<td>true</td>
<td>true</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>true</td>
<td>true</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>true</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>true</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIX</td>
<td>true</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nonserializable Schedule with Degree-Two Consistency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T_3$</th>
<th>$T_4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lock-$S(Q)$</td>
<td>lock-$X(Q)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read($Q$)</td>
<td>read($Q$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlock($Q$)</td>
<td>write($Q$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unlock($Q$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lock-$S(Q)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read($Q$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlock($Q$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B+-Tree For account File with $n = 3$. 

![B+-Tree Diagram]

- Perryridge
- Downtown
- Mianus
- Redwood
- Brighton
- Clearview
- Downtown
- Mianus
- Perryridge
- Redwood
- Round Hill
Insertion of “Clearview” Into the B⁺-Tree of Figure 16.21
## Lock-Compatibility Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>true</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>