Introduction to Data Management CSE 344

Lecture 23: Transactions

Announcements

- Webquiz due today
- Homework 7 due next Wednesday

Where We Are?

- Last time: all about SQLite (review today)

- Today SQL Server (and other)

Lock-Based Scheduler

Simple idea:

- Each element has a unique lock
- Each transaction must first acquire the lock before reading/writing that element
- If lock is held by another transaction, then wait
- The transaction must release the lock(s)

Notation

$L_i(A)$ = transaction T_i acquires lock for element A

$U_i(A)$ = transaction T_i releases lock for element A

A Non-Serializable Schedule

T1	T2
READ(A)	
A := A+100	
WRITE(A)	
	READ(A)
	A := A*2
	WRITE(A)
	READ(B)
	B := B*2
	WRITE(B)
READ(B)	
B := B+100	
WRITE(B)	

Example

T1	T2
$L_1(A)$; READ(A)	
A := A+100	
WRITE(A); $U_1(A)$; $L_1(B)$	
	$L_2(A)$; READ(A)
	A := A*2
	WRITE(A); $U_2(A)$;
	$L_2(B)$; DENIED…
READ(B)	
B := B+100	
WRITE(B); $U_1(B)$;	
	…GRANTED; READ(B)
	B := B*2
	WRITE(B); $U_2(B)$;

Scheduler has ensured a conflict-serializable schedule

But…

T1	T2
$L_1(A)$; READ(A)	
A := A+100	
WRITE(A); $U_1(A)$;	
	$L_2(A)$; READ(A)
	A := A*2
	WRITE(A); $U_2(A)$;
	$L_2(B)$; READ(B)
	B := B*2
	WRITE(B); $U_2(B)$;
$L_1(B)$; READ(B)	
B := B+100	
WRITE(B); $U_1(B)$;	

Locks did not enforce conflict-serializability !!! What's wrong ?

Two Phase Locking (2PL)

The 2PL rule:

In every transaction, all lock requests must precede all unlock requests

Example: 2PL transactions

T1	T2
$L_1(A)$; $L_1(B)$; READ(A)	
A := A+100	
WRITE(A); $U_1(A)$	
	$L_2(A)$; READ(A)
	A := A*2
	WRITE(A);
	$L_2(B)$; DENIED…
READ(B)	
B := B+100	
WRITE(B); $U_1(B)$;	
	…GRANTED; READ(B)
	B := B*2
	WRITE(B); $U_2(A)$; $U_2(B)$;

Now it is conflict-serializable

A New Problem: Non-recoverable Schedule

T1	T2
L_1(A); L_1(B); READ(A)	
A :=A+100	
WRITE(A); U_1(A)	
	L_2(A); READ(A)
	A := A*2
	WRITE(A);
	L_2(B); DENIED…
READ(B)	
B :=B+100	
WRITE(B); U_1(B);	
	…GRANTED; READ(B)
	B := B*2
	WRITE(B); U_2(A); U_2(B);
	Commit
Rollback	

Strict 2PL

The Strict 2PL rule:

All locks are held until the transaction commits or aborts.

With strict 2PL, we will get schedules that are both conflict-serializable and recoverable

Strict 2PL

T1	T2
L_1(A); READ(A)	
A :=A+100	
WRITE(A);	
	L_2(A); DENIED…
L_1(B); READ(B)	
B :=B+100	
WRITE(B);	
U_1(A),U_1(B);	
Rollback	…GRANTED; READ(A)
	A := A*2
	WRITE(A);
	L_2(B); READ(B)
	B := B*2
	WRITE(B); U_2(A); U_2(B);
	Commit

Deadlocks

- T_1 waits for a lock held by T_2;
- T_2 waits for a lock held by T_3;
- T_3 waits for . . . .
- . . .
- T_n waits for a lock held by T_1

SQL Lite: there is only one exclusive lock; thus, never deadlocks

SQL Server: checks periodically for deadlocks and aborts one TXN

Lock Modes

- S = shared lock (for READ)
- X = exclusive lock (for WRITE)

Lock compatibility matrix:

	None	S	X
None	OK	OK	OK
S	OK	OK	Conflict
X	OK	Conflict	Conflict

Demo

Try this on sqlite, then on SQL Server

```
create table R(A int primary key, B int);

insert into r values (1,10);

insert into r values (2,20);

insert into r values (3,30);
```

A	B
1	10
2	20
3	30

Demo

T1	T2
set transaction isolation level serializable;	
begin transaction;	
update R set B=11 where A=1;	
	set transaction isolation level serializable;
	begin transaction;
	update r set B=21 where A=2;
select * from R where A=1 or A=3;	
	select * from r where A=2 or A=3;
select * from R;	
	select * from R;
commit	
	commit

A	B
1	10
2	20
3	30

Lock Granularity

- Fine granularity locking (e.g., tuples)
  - High concurrency
  - High overhead in managing locks
  - E.g. SQL Server
- Coarse grain locking (e.g., tables, entire database)
  - Many false conflicts
  - Less overhead in managing locks
  - E.g. SQL Lite

Lock Performance



Why ?

TPS =
Transactions
per second

Phantom Problem

- So far we have assumed the database to be a *static* collection of elements (=tuples)

- If tuples are inserted/deleted then the *phantom problem* appears

Phantom Problem

T1	T2
SELECT * FROM Product WHERE color='blue'	
	INSERT INTO Product(name, color) VALUES ('gizmo','blue')
SELECT * FROM Product WHERE color='blue'	

Suppose there are two blue products, A1, A2:

Is this schedule serializable ?

Phantom Problem

T1	T2
SELECT * FROM Product WHERE color=‘blue’	
	INSERT INTO Product(name, color) VALUES (‘gizmo’,’blue’)
SELECT * FROM Product WHERE color=‘blue’	

Suppose there are two blue products, A1, A2:

Is this schedule serializable ?

NO: T1: sees 2 products the first time, then sees 3 products the second time

Phantom Problem

T1	T2
SELECT * FROM Product WHERE color='blue'	
	INSERT INTO Product(name, color) VALUES ('gizmo','blue')
SELECT * FROM Product WHERE color='blue'	

Suppose there are two blue products, A1, A2:

R1(A1),R1(A2),W2(A3),R1(A1),R1(A2),R1(A3)

Phantom Problem

T1	T2
SELECT * FROM Product WHERE color='blue'	
	INSERT INTO Product(name, color) VALUES ('gizmo','blue')
SELECT * FROM Product WHERE color='blue'	

When seen as a sequence of R/W, the schedule appears serializable. Locks ***cannot*** prevent this schedule.

Suppose there are two blue products, A1, A2:

R1(A1),R1(A2),W2(A3),R1(A1),R1(A2),R1(A3)

W2(A3),R1(A1),R1(A2),R1(A1),R1(A2),R1(A3)

Phantom Problem

- A “phantom” is a tuple that is invisible during part of a transaction execution but not invisible during the entire execution

- In our example:
  - T1: reads list of products
  - T2: inserts a new product
  - T1: re-reads: a new product appears !

Dealing With Phantoms

- Lock the entire table, or
- Lock the index entry for ‘blue’
  – If index is available
- Or use predicate locks
  – A lock on an arbitrary predicate

Dealing with phantoms is expensive !

Isolation Levels in SQL

1. "Dirty reads"
   SET TRANSACTION ISOLATION LEVEL READ UNCOMMITTED

2. "Committed reads"
   SET TRANSACTION ISOLATION LEVEL READ COMMITTED

3. "Repeatable reads"
   SET TRANSACTION ISOLATION LEVEL REPEATABLE READ

4. Serializable transactions
   SET TRANSACTION ISOLATION LEVEL SERIALIZABLE

ACID

1. Isolation Level: Dirty Reads

- “Long duration” WRITE locks
  – Strict 2PL
- No READ locks
  – Read-only transactions are never delayed

Possible pbs: dirty and inconsistent reads

2. Isolation Level: Read Committed

- "Long duration" WRITE locks
  - Strict 2PL
- "Short duration" READ locks
  - Only acquire lock while reading (not 2PL)

> Unrepeatable reads
> When reading same element twice, may get two different values

3. Isolation Level: Repeatable Read

- "Long duration" WRITE locks
  - Strict 2PL
- "Long duration" READ locks
  - Strict 2PL

Why ?

This is not serializable yet !!!

4. Isolation Level Serializable

- "Long duration" WRITE locks
  - Strict 2PL
- "Long duration" READ locks
  - Strict 2PL
- Predicate locking
  - To deal with phantoms

Beware!

In commercial DBMSs:

- Default level is often NOT serializable
- Default level differs between DBMSs
- Some engines support subset of levels!
- Serializable may not be exactly ACID
- Also, some DBMSs do NOT use locking and different isolation levels can lead to different pbs
- Bottom line: Read the doc for your DBMS!