Chapter 16 : Concurrency Control

Database System Concepts 5th Ed.



Chapter 16: Concurrency Control

- Lock-Based Protocols
- Timestamp-Based Protocols
- Validation-Based Protocols
- Multiple Granularity
- Multiversion Schemes
- Insert and Delete Operations
- Concurrency in Index Structures

Lock-Based Protocols

- 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-compatibility matrix

	S	X
S	true	false
X	false	false

- 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

T_3	T_4
lock-X(B)	
read(B)	
$B := B - 50$	
write(B)	
	lock-S(A)
	read(A)
	lock-S(B)
lock-X(A)	

- Neither T_3 nor T_4 can make progress — executing **lock-S**(*B*) causes T_4 to wait for T_3 to release its lock on *B*, while executing **lock-X**(*A*) causes T_3 to wait for T_4 to release its lock on *A*.
- Such a situation is called a **deadlock**.
  - To handle a deadlock one of T_3 or T_4 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).

The Two-Phase Locking Protocol (Cont.)

- 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 **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

- Graph-based protocols are an alternative to two-phase locking
- Impose a partial ordering $\rightarrow$ on the set **D** = $\{d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_h\}$ 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.

Tree 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

Example of Granularity Hierarchy



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.

Compatibility Matrix with Intention Lock Modes

- The compatibility matrix for all lock modes is:

	IS	IX	S	S IX	X
IS	✓	✓	✓	✓	×
IX	✓	✓	×	×	×
S	✓	×	✓	×	×
S IX	✓	×	×	×	×
X	×	×	×	×	×

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: write (X) $\quad$ T_2: write(Y)

  write(Y) $\quad$ write(X)

- Schedule with deadlock

T_1	T_2
lock-X on *X* write (*X*)	
	lock-X on *Y* write (*X*) wait for **lock-X** on *X*
wait for **lock-X** on *Y*	

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 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

Timestamp-Based Protocols

- 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 **write**(Q) successfully.
  - **R-timestamp**(Q) is the largest time-stamp of any transaction that executed **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 TS(T_i) ≤ **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 TS(T_i)≥ **W**-timestamp(Q), then the **read** operation is executed, and R-timestamp(Q) is set to **max**(R-timestamp(Q), TS(T_i)).



Timestamp-Based Protocols (Cont.)

- 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

T_1	T_2	T_3	T_4	T_5
				read(X)
	read(Y)			
read(Y)				
		write(Y)		
		write(Z)		
				read(Z)
	read(X)			
	abort			
read(X)				
		write(Z)		
		abort		
				write(Y)
				write(Z)

Correctness of Timestamp-Ordering Protocol

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

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

Validation-Based Protocol (Cont.)

- Each transaction T_i has 3 timestamps
  - Start(T_i) : the time when T_i started its execution
  - Validation(T_i): the time when T_i entered its validation phase
  - 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 TS(T_i) is given the value of 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:
  - **finish**(T_i) < **start**(T_j)
  - **start**(T_j) < **finish**(T_i) < **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.

Schedule Produced by Validation

- Example of schedule produced using validation

T_{14}	T_{15}
read(*B*)	
	read(*B*)
	B:= *B-50*
	read(*A*)
	A:= *A+50*
read(*A*)	
(*validate*)	
display (*A*+*B*)	
	(*validate*)
	write (*B*)
	write (*A*)

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.
- **read**s never have to wait as an appropriate version is returned immediately.

Multiversion Timestamp Ordering

- Each data item Q has a sequence of versions $<Q_1, Q_2,...., Q_m>$. 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).

Multiversion Timestamp Ordering (Cont)

- 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 ∞.
- When update transaction T_i completes, commit processing occurs:
  - T_i sets timestamp on the versions it has created to **ts-counter** + 1
  - T_i increments **ts-counter** by 1
- Read-only transactions that start after T_i increments **ts-counter** will see the values updated by T_i.
- Read-only transactions that start before T_i increments the **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**

Concurrency 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.

Concurrency in Index Structures (Cont.)

- 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.

T1	T2	T3
W(Y := 1) Commit		
	Start R(X) → 0 R(Y)→ 1	
		W(X:=2) W(Z:=3) Commit
	R(Z) → 0 R(Y) → 1 W(X:=3) Commit-Req Abort	

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 commin 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 **<u>for update</u>**
    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

$X_0 = 100,\ Y_0 = 0$

T_1 deposits 50 in Y	T_2 withdraws 50 from X
$r_1(X_0, 100)$	
$r_1(Y_0, 0)$	
	$r_2(Y_0, 0)$
	$r_2(X_0, 100)$
	$w_2(X_2, 50)$
$w_1(Y_1, 50)$	
$r_1(X_0, 100)$ (update by T_2 not seen)	
$r_1(Y_1, 50)$ (can see its own updates)	
	$r_2(Y_0, 0)$ (update by T_1 not seen)

$X_2 = 50,\ Y_1 = 50$

Snapshot Write: First Committer Wins

$X_0 = 100$

T_1 deposits 50 in X	T_2 withdraws 50 from X
$r_1(X_0, 100)$	
	$r_2(X_0, 100)$
	$w_2(X_2, 50)$
$w_1(X_1, 150)$	
$commit_1$	
	$commit_2$ (Serialization Error T_2 is rolled back)

$X_1 = 150$

- 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.

	T_1	T_2	T_3
A starts withdrawal txn. Balance is low. *A* asks *B* to deposit money		$r_2(X_0, 0)$ $r_2(Y_0, 0)$	
B deposits money	$r_1(Y_0, 0)$ $W_1(Y_1, 20)$		
A queries the balance and finds the deposit is in			$r_3(X_0, 0)$ $r_2(Y_1, 20)$
still fined!		$w_2(X_2, -11)$	

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

T_5	T_6	T_7
lock-X(A)		
read(A)		
lock-S(B)		
read(B)		
write(A)		
unlock(A)		
	lock-X(A)	
	read(A)	
	write(A)	
	unlock(A)	
		lock-S(A)
		read(A)

Incomplete Schedule With a Lock Conversion

T_8	T_9
lock-S (a_1)	
	lock-S (a_1)
lock-S (a_2)	
	lock-S (a_2)
lock-S (a_3)	
lock-S (a_4)	
	unlock(a_1)
	unlock(a_2)
lock-S (a_n)	
upgrade (a_1)	

Tree-Structured Database Graph



T_{10}	T_{11}	T_{12}	T_{13}
lock-X(B)			
	lock-X(D)		
	lock-X(H)		
	unlock(D)		
lock-X(E)			
lock-X(D)			
unlock(B)			
unlock(E)			
		lock-X(B)	
		lock-X(E)	
	unlock(H)		
lock-X(G)			
unlock(D)			
			lock-X(D)
			lock-X(H)
			unlock(D)
			unlock(H)
		unlock(E)	
		unlock(B)	
unlock (G)			

Schedule 3

T_{14}	T_{15}
read(B)	
	read(B)
	$B := B - 50$
	write(B)
read(A)	
	read(A)
display$(A + B)$	
	$A := A + 50$
	write(A)
	display$(A + B)$

Schedule 4

T_{16}	T_{17}
read(Q)	
	write(Q)
write(Q)	

Schedule 5, A Schedule Produced by Using Validation

T_{14}	T_{15}
read(B)	
	read(B)
	$B := B - 50$
	read(A)
	$A := A + 50$
read(A)	
⟨*validate*⟩	
display($A + B$)	
	⟨*validate*⟩
	write(B)
	write(A)

Compatibility Matrix

	IS	IX	S	SIX	X
IS	true	true	true	true	false
IX	true	true	false	false	false
S	true	false	true	false	false
SIX	true	false	false	false	false
X	false	false	false	false	false

Nonserializable Schedule with Degree-Two Consistency

T_3	T_4
lock-S(Q)	
read(Q)	
unlock(Q)	
	lock-X(Q)
	read(Q)
	write(Q)
	unlock(Q)
lock-S(Q)	
read(Q)	
unlock(Q)	

B+-Tree For *account* File with *n* = 3.



Insertion of "Clearview" Into the B+-Tree of Figure 16.21



Lock-Compatibility Matrix

	S	X	I
S	true	false	false
X	false	false	false
I	false	false	true