Overview of Transaction Management

Midterm Results:
  Ave:  77
  Median:  78
  Q1:  85
  Q3:  72

Problem Set #4 is posted.
Database Transactions

- **A transaction** is the DBMS’s abstract view of a user program: a sequence of database commands; disk reads and writes.

- **Concurrent execution** of user programs is essential for good DBMS performance.
  - Because disk accesses are frequent, and relatively slow, it is important to keep the CPU busy by working on several user programs concurrently.

- A user’s program may carry out many consecutive operations on the data retrieved from the database, but the DBMS is only concerned about what data is read/written from/to the database.
ACID Properties of Transactions

- **Atomic**: the end effect of a transaction should be *all or nothing*. Either it is executed to completion, or it is as if it never happened. (DBMS provides this)
- **Consistency**: Every transaction must preserve all constraints of the database. (User and DBMS)
- **Isolation**: The result of a transaction should give predictable results regardless of any concurrent transactions. (DBMS)
- **Durability**: Transactions must tolerate crashes and being aborted before completion allowing the database to be recoverable to a consistent state. (DBMS)
Concurrency in a DBMS

❖ Users submit a transaction, and can think of it as executing *by itself* on the database.
  - Concurrency is provided by the DBMS, which interleaves the actions (reads/writes) of many transactions.
  - Each transaction must leave the database in a consistent state if the DB was consistent when the transaction began.
  - DBMSs only enforce Integrity Constraints
  - Beyond this, the DBMS does not understand the data. (e.g., it does not understand how interest on a bank account is computed).

❖ **Issues:** Effect of *interleaving transactions* and *crashes*. 
Interleaving’s Impact

❖ Interleaving improves database performance
  ▪ While one transaction waits for pages to be read from disk, the CPU processes other transactions. I/Os proceed in parallel with CPU activity (greater system utilization)
  ▪ Increased system *throughput* (transactions/sec)
  ▪ More “fair” than true sequential access; allows all pending transactions to make progress (heavy transactions, don’t starve out light ones)
  ▪ Predictable *latency* (delay from request to completion)

❖ However, interleaving can lead to anomalies
  ▪ Sequential inconsistency
Example

- Consider two transactions (\textit{Xacts}):

  \begin{tabular}{l}
  T1: BEGIN C=C+100, S=S-100 END \\
  T2: BEGIN C=1.02\times C, S=1.04\times S END \\
  \end{tabular}

- Intuitively, the first transaction is transferring $100 from a savings to a checking account. The second is crediting both accounts interest payments.

- There is no guarantee that T1 will execute before T2 or vice-versa, if both are submitted together. However, the net effect must be equivalent to some execution of these two transactions run sequentially.
All Schedules are not Equal

- Consider a possible interleaving *(schedule)*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1:</td>
<td>C=C+100,</td>
<td>S=S-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2:</td>
<td>C=1.02*C,</td>
<td>S=1.04*S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- This is OK. But what about:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1:</td>
<td>C=C+100,</td>
<td>S=S-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2:</td>
<td>C=1.02*C,</td>
<td>S=1.04*S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The DBMS’s view of the second schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1: R₁(C), W₁(C),</td>
<td>R₁(S), W₁(S)</td>
<td>R₂(C), W₂(C), R₂(S), W₂(S)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scheduling Transactions

❖ **Serial schedule:** Schedule that does not interleave the actions of different transactions. *Too rigid, creates bottlenecks, reduces performance*

❖ **Equivalent schedules:** For any database state, the effect (on the set of objects in the database) of executing the first schedule is identical to the effect of executing the second schedule.

❖ **Serializable schedule:** A schedule that is equivalent to some serial execution of the transactions.

(Note: If each transaction preserves consistency, every serializable schedule also preserves consistency.)
Atomicity of Transactions

❖ An important property guaranteed by the DBMS is that transactions are \textit{atomic}. That is, a user can think of a Xact as either always executing all its actions in one step, or not executing any actions at all.

❖ A transaction might \textit{commit} after completing all its actions, or it could \textit{abort} (or be aborted by the DBMS) after executing some actions.

❖ DBMS \textit{logs} all actions so that it can \textit{undo} aborted transactions.
The 3 Classes of Anomalies

❖ Reading Uncommitted Data--
Write-Read (WR) Conflict, “dirty reads”:

| T1:   | R(A), W(A), R(B), W(B), Abort |
| T2:   | R(A), W(A), R(B), W(B), C, |

❖ Unrepeatable Reads--
Read-Write (RW) Conflict:

| T1:   | R(A), W(A), R(B), W(B), C |
| T2:   | R(A), W(A), R(B), W(B), C, |

T2’s write of A is lost
Anomalies (Continued)

❖ Overwriting Uncommitted Data

Write-Write (WW) Conflict, “blind write”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1:</th>
<th>W(A), W(B), C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2:</td>
<td>W(A), W(B), C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T1's write of A is lost

❖ All 3 anomalies involve at least one write
❖ How do we avoid these?
Lock-Based Concurrency Control

Strict Two-phase Locking (Strict 2PL) Protocol:

- Each Xact must obtain a *shared (S)* lock on an object before reading, and an *exclusive (X)* lock on an object before writing. (of course, you can both read and write an object with an X lock)
- All locks held by a transaction are released when the transaction completes (at Commit or Abort)
- If an Xact holds an X lock on an object, no other Xact can get either an S or X lock on that object.

Strict 2PL allows only serializable schedules.

- Additionally, it simplifies aborts (more soon)
Examples

❖ **Common case**: Xacts affect different parts of db. T1: $B = f(B, A)$, T2: $C = g(C, A)$

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{T1: } & S(A), R(A), \quad \text{X}(B), R(B), W(B), C \\
\text{T2: } & S(A), R(A), \text{X}(C), R(C), W(C), C
\end{align*}
\]

❖ **Hot spots**: Xacts reference a common record. T1: $A = f(A)$, T2: $B = f(B, A)$

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{T1: } & \text{X}(A), R(A), \quad \text{W}(A), C \\
\text{T2: } & \text{S}(A), \ldots \quad \text{R}(A), \text{X}(B), R(B), W(B), C
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{T1: } & \text{X}(A), \ldots \quad \text{R}(A), W(A), C \\
\text{T2: } & \text{S}(A), \text{R}(A), \text{X}(B), \quad \text{R}(B), W(B), C
\end{align*}
\]
Deadlocks

- Transactions request exclusive access to a common locked record. T1: B = f(B, A), T2: A = g(A, B)

| T1: S(A), R(A), X(B), R(B), W(B), C | T2: S(B), ... R(B), X(A), R(A), W(A), C |

- A rare unfortunate ordering, where both transactions wait, and make no progress

| T1: S(A), R(A), X(B), ... Abort, | T2: S(B), R(B), X(A), ... R(A), W(A), C |

- Soln: DBMS monitors how long a transaction has been waiting and aborts it, thus freeing its locks
Aborting a Transaction

- If a transaction $T_i$ is aborted, all its actions have to be undone. Not only that, if $T_j$ reads an object last written by $T_i$, $T_j$ must be aborted as well!

- Releasing transaction locks only on commit/abort avoids cascading aborts (abort handling is simplified)
  - If $T_i$ writes an object, $T_j$ can read it only after $T_i$ frees lock.

- In order to undo the actions of an aborted transaction, the DBMS maintains a log in which every write is recorded. This mechanism is also used to recover from system crashes: all active Xacts at the time of the crash are aborted when the system comes back up.
Transactions in SQL

- Transactions begin on any statement that references a table (CREATE, UPDATE, SELECT, INSERT, etc.)
- Transactions end when either a “COMMIT” or “ROLLBACK” (Abort) command is reached
- SQL provides a “SAVEPOINT name” to break up transactions into intermediate pieces, which can be gotten back to using “ROLLBACK TO SAVEPOINT name”
- Operations between 2 savepoints are handled as separate Xactions, in terms of concurrency control
The Log

❖ The following actions are recorded in the log:
  ▪ *Ti writes an object*: the *old value* and the *new value*.
  ▪ *Ti commits/aborts*: a log record indicating this action.

❖ Log records are chained together by Xact id, so it’s easy to undo a specific Xact.

❖ All log related activities (and in fact, all concurrency-control related activities such as lock/unlock, dealing with deadlocks etc.) are handled transparently by the DBMS.

❖ Complication: committed writes might be held in the buffer pool
Recovering From a Crash

There are 3 phases in the *Aries* recovery algorithm:

- **Analysis:** Scan the log forward (from the most recent checkpoint) to identify all Xacts that were in progress, and all dirty pages in the buffer pool at crash time.

- **Redo:** Redoes all updates to dirty pages in the buffer pool, as needed, to ensure that all logged updates are in fact carried out and written to disk.

- **Undo:** The writes of all Xacts that were in progress at crash time are undone (by restoring the *old value* of the data, which is in the log record for the update), working backwards in the log. (Some care must be taken to handle the case of a crash occurring during the recovery process!)
Summary

❖ Concurrency control and recovery are among the most important functions provided by a DBMS.
❖ Users need not worry about concurrency.
  ▪ System automatically inserts lock/unlock requests and schedules actions of different Xacts in such a way as to ensure that the resulting execution is equivalent to executing the Xacts one after the other in some order.
❖ Write-ahead logging (WAL) is used to undo the actions of aborted transactions and to restore the system to a consistent state after a crash.
  ▪ **Consistent state**: Only the effects of committed Xacts seen.