Concurrency Control

Chapter 17
Conflict Serializable Schedules

- Recall conflicts (WR, RW, WW) were the cause of sequential inconsistency
- Two schedules are conflict equivalent if:
  - Involve the same actions over the same transactions
  - Every pair of conflicting actions is ordered the same way
- A schedule is conflict serializable if it is conflict equivalent to some serializable schedule
Example 1

- A non-serializable schedule that is also not conflict serializable:

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

The cycle in the graph reveals the problem. The output of T1 depends on T2, and vice-versa.
Example 2

- A serializable schedule that is not conflict serializable:

  | T1: R(A), W(A), C |
  | T2: W(A), C       |
  | T3: W(A), C       |

- Serializable because it is equiv to T1, T2, T3, or T2, T1, T3

- Not conflict serializable, because the ordering:
  \[ R_1(A), W_2(A), W_1(A), W_3(A) \]
  is not consistent with any ordering

- Importance of this distinction is that it can be proven that **Strict 2PL** permits only conflict serializable schedules
Review: Strict 2PL

- **Strict Two-phase Locking (Strict 2PL) Protocol:**
  - Each Xact must obtain a *S (shared)* lock on object before reading, and an *X (exclusive)* lock on object before writing.
  - *All locks held by a transaction are released when the transaction completes*
  - If an Xact holds an X lock on an object, no other Xact can get a lock (S or X) on that object.

- **Strict 2PL allows only schedules whose precedence graph is acyclic (a DAG)**
Two-Phase Locking (2PL)

- Two-Phase Locking Protocol
  - Each Xact must obtain a S (shared) lock on object before reading, and an X (exclusive) lock on object before writing.
  - A transaction can release its locks once it has performed its desired operation (R or W). A transaction cannot request additional locks once it releases any locks.
  - If an Xact holds an X lock on an object, no other Xact can get a lock (S or X) on that object.
- Note: locks can be released before Xact completes (commit/abort), thus relaxing Strict 2PL. 2PL starts with a “growing” phase, where locks are requested followed by a “shrinking” phase, where locks are released.
View Serializability

- Schedules S1 and S2 are view equivalent if:
  - If Ti reads initial value of A in S1, then Ti also reads initial value of A in S2
  - If Ti reads value of A written by Tj in S1, then Ti also reads value of A written by Tj in S2
  - If Ti writes final value of A in S1, then Ti also writes final value of A in S2

| T1: R(A) | W(A)     | T1: R(A),W(A)     |
| T2:     | W(A)     | T2: W(A)          |
| T3:     | W(A)     | T3: W(A)          |

- Enforcing view serializability is expensive, thus mainly of theoretical interest
Lock Management

- Lock and unlock requests are handled by the lock manager.
- Lock table entry (per table, record, or index):
  - Number of transactions currently holding a lock
  - Type of lock held (shared or exclusive)
  - Pointer to queue of lock requests
- Locking and unlocking must be atomic.
- Lock upgrades: transaction that holds a shared lock can be upgraded to hold an exclusive lock.
Deadlocks

- Deadlock: Cycle of transactions waiting for locks to be released by each other.
- Relatively rare schedules lead to deadlock
- Two ways of dealing with deadlocks:
  - Deadlock detection
  - Deadlock prevention
Deadlock Detection

- Create a **waits-for graph**:
  - Nodes are transactions
  - Edge from Ti to Tj indicates Ti is waiting for Tj to release a lock

- DBMS periodically checks for cycles in the waits-for graph

- ex: T1: A = f(B), T2: B = g(C), T3: C = h(A), arriving T1,T3,T2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1: S(B), R(B),</th>
<th>X(A),…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2:</td>
<td>S(C), R(C), X(B),…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3: S(A), R(A),</td>
<td>X(C),…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram:
- T1
- T2
- T3

T1 waits for T2, T2 waits for T3, T3 waits for T1, forming a cycle.
Deadlock Detection (Continued)

Example:

T1: S(A), R(A), S(B)...
T2: X(B), W(B) X(C)...
T3: S(C), R(C) X(A) X(B)...
T4:
Deadlock Prevention

- When there is high contention for locks, detection and aborting can hurt performance
- Assign priorities (e.g., based on timestamps). Assume Ti wants a lock that Tj holds. Two policies are possible:
  - *Wait-Die*: If Ti has higher priority, Ti waits for Tj; otherwise abort Ti
  - *Wound-wait*: If Ti has higher priority, abort Tj; otherwise Ti waits
- When Ti re-starts, it retains its original timestamp, thus moving up the priority list
Multi-Granularity Locks

- Hard to decide what granularity to lock (tuples vs. pages vs. tables).
- Shouldn’t have to decide!
- Data “containers” are nested:
Solution: New Lock Modes, Protocol

- Allow Xacts to lock at each level, but with a special protocol using new “intention” locks:
  - Before locking an item, Xact must set “intention locks” on all its ancestors.
  - For unlock, go from specific to general (i.e., bottom-up).
  - SIX mode: Like holding the S & IX locks at the same time.

Grant request rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>--</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<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>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple Granularity Lock Protocol

- Each Xact starts from the root of the hierarchy.
- To get S or IS lock on a node, must first hold an IS or IX lock on the node’s.
- To get X or IX or SIX on a node, must hold IX or SIX on parent node.
- Must release locks in bottom-up order.

Protocol is correct in that it is equivalent to directly setting locks at the leaf levels of the hierarchy.
Examples

- T1 scans R, and updates a few tuples:
  - T1 gets an SIX lock on R, then repeatedly gets an S lock on tuples of R, and occasionally upgrades to X on the tuples.

- T2 uses an index to read only part of R:
  - T2 gets an IS lock on R, and repeatedly gets an S lock on tuples of R.

- T3 reads all of R:
  - T3 gets an S lock on R.
  - OR, T3 could behave like T2; can use lock escalation to decide which.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>--</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<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>X</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
Dynamic Databases

- If we relax the assumption that the DB is a fixed collection of objects, even Strict 2PL will not assure serializability:
  - T1 locks all pages containing sailor records with rating = 1, and finds oldest sailor (say, age = 71).
  - Next, T2 inserts a new sailor; rating = 1, age = 96.
  - T2 also deletes oldest sailor with rating = 2 (and, say, age = 80), and commits.
  - T1 now locks all pages containing sailor records with rating = 2, and finds oldest (say, age = 63).
- No consistent DB state where T1 is “correct”!
The Problem

- T1 implicitly assumes that it has locked the set of all sailor records with *rating* = 1.
  - Assumption only holds if no sailor records are added while T1 is executing!
  - Need some mechanism to enforce this assumption. *(Index locking and predicate locking.)*

- Example shows that conflict serializability guarantees serializability only if the set of objects is fixed!
Index Locking

- If there is a dense index on the rating field using Alternative (2), T1 should lock the index page containing the data entries with rating = 1.
  - If there are no records with rating = 1, T1 must lock the index page where such a data entry would be, if it existed!

- If there is no suitable index, T1 must lock all pages, and lock the file/table to prevent new pages from being added, to ensure that no new records with rating = 1 are added.
Predicate Locking

- Grant lock on all records that satisfy some logical predicate, e.g. \( \text{age} > 2 \times \text{salary} \).

- Index locking is a special case of predicate locking for which an index supports efficient implementation of the predicate lock.
  - What is the predicate in the sailor example?

- In general, predicate locking has a lot of locking overhead.
Locking in B+ Trees

- How can we efficiently lock a particular leaf node?
- One solution: Ignore the tree structure, just lock pages while traversing the tree, following 2PL.
- This has terrible performance!
  - Root node (and many higher level nodes) become bottlenecks because every tree access begins at the root.
Two Useful Observations

- Higher levels of the tree only direct searches for leaf pages.
- For inserts, a node on a path from root to modified leaf must be locked (in X mode), only if a split can propagate up to it from the modified leaf. (Similar point holds w.r.t. deletes.)
- We can exploit these observations to design efficient locking protocols that guarantee serializability even though they violate 2PL.
A Simple Tree Locking Algorithm

- **Search**: Start at root and go down; repeatedly, S lock child then unlock parent.

- **Insert/Delete**: Start at root and go down, obtaining X locks as needed. Once child is locked, check if it is **safe**:
  - If child is safe, release all locks on ancestors.

- **Safe node**: Node such that changes will not propagate up beyond this node.
  - Inserts: Node is not full.
  - Deletes: Node is not half-empty.
Example

Do:
1) Search 38*
2) Delete 38*
3) Insert 45*
4) Insert 25*
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“Optimistic” 2PL

- Basic premise: Most Xacts do not contend for the same object
- Idea: Make a local modified copy, and get locks when ready to commit
- Modified Algorithm:
  - Obtain S locks as usual.
  - Make changes to private copies of objects.
  - Obtain all X locks at end of Xact, make local writes global, then release all locks.
Timestamp CC

- **Idea:** Give each object 2 timestamps and each transaction a timestamp:
  - read-timestamp (RTS), when it was last read
  - write-timestamp (WTS), when it was last written
  - give each Xact a timestamp (TS) when it begins:

- If action $a_i$ of Xact $T_i$ conflicts with action $a_j$ of Xact $T_j$, and $TS(T_i) < TS(T_j)$, then $a_i$ must occur before $a_j$. Otherwise, abort violating Xact.
When Xact T wants to read Object O

- If $TS(T) < WTS(O)$, this violates timestamp order of T w.r.t. writer of O.
  - So, abort T and restart it with a new, larger TS. (If restarted with same TS, T will fail again! Contrast use of timestamps in 2PL for ddlk prevention.)

- If $TS(T) > WTS(O)$:
  - Allow T to read O.
  - Reset RTS(O) to $\max(RTS(O), TS(T))$

- Change to RTS(O) on reads must be written to disk! This and restarts represent overheads.
When Xact T wants to Write Object O

- If $TS(T) < RTS(O)$, this violates timestamp order of T w.r.t. writer of O; abort and restart T.
- If $TS(T) < WTS(O)$, violates timestamp order of T w.r.t. writer of O.
  - **Thomas Write Rule**: We can safely ignore such outdated writes; need not restart T! (T’s write is effectively followed by another write, with no intervening reads.) Allows some serializable but non conflict serializable schedules:
  - Else, allow T to write O.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R(A)</td>
<td>W(A) Commit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W(A)</td>
<td>Commit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Same result as T1; T2
Timestamp CC and Recoverability

- Unfortunately, unrecoverable schedules are allowed:
- Timestamp CC can be modified to allow only recoverable schedules:
  - **Buffer all writes** until writer commits (but update WTS(O) when the write is allowed.)
  - **Block readers** T (where TS(T) > WTS(O)) until writer of O commits.
- Similar to writers holding X locks until commit, but still not quite 2PL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W(A)</td>
<td>R(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiversion Timestamp CC

- **Idea:** Let writer make a “new” copy while readers use an appropriate “old” copies:

  - MAIN SEGMENT (Current versions of DB objects)
  - VERSION POOL (Older versions that may be useful for some active readers.)

- Readers are always allowed to proceed.
  - But may be blocked until writer commits.
Multiversion CC (Contd.)

- Each version of an object has its writer’s TS as its WTS, and the TS of the Xact that most recently read this version as its RTS.

- Versions are chained backward; we can discard versions that are “too old to be of interest”.

- Each Xact is classified as Reader or Writer.
  - Writer may write some object; Reader never will.
  - Xact declares whether it is a Reader when it begins.
Summary

- There are several lock-based concurrency control schemes (Strict 2PL, 2PL). Conflicts between transactions can be detected in the dependency graph.
- The lock manager keeps track of the locks issued. Deadlocks can either be prevented or detected.
- Naïve locking strategies may have the phantom problem.
Index locking is common, and affects performance significantly.
- Needed when accessing records via index.
- Needed for locking logical sets of records (index locking/predicate locking).

Tree-structured indexes:
- Straightforward use of 2PL very inefficient.

In practice, better techniques now known; do record-level, rather than page-level locking.
Multiple granularity locking reduces the overhead involved in setting locks for nested collections of objects (e.g., a file of pages); should not be confused with tree index locking!

Optimistic CC aims to minimize CC overheads in an "optimistic" environment where reads are common and writes are rare.

Optimistic CC has its own overheads however; most real systems use locking.
Summary (Contd.)

- Timestamp CC is another alternative to 2PL; allows some serializable schedules that 2PL does not (although converse is also true).

- Ensuring recoverability with Timestamp CC requires ability to block Xacts, which is similar to locking.

- Multiversion Timestamp CC is a variant which ensures that read-only Xacts are never restarted; they can always read a suitable older version. Additional overhead of version maintenance.