

CSE 444 – Homework 4  
Transactions Concurrency Control

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Question	Points	Score
1	30	
2	20	
Total:	50	

# 1 Concurrency Control with Locking

1. (30 points)

- (a) Consider a database with objects X, Y, and Z and assume that there are two transactions T1 and T2. Transaction T1 reads objects X and Y, writes X, and commits. Transaction T2 reads objects X and Y, writes object Y. It then reads objects X and Y again, writes X. Finally, it reads object Z, writes it, and commits:

$$T_1 : R_1(X), R_1(Y), W_1(X), CO_1$$

$$T_2 : R_2(X), R_2(Y), W_2(Y), R_2(X), R_2(Y), W_2(X), R_2(Z), W_2(Z), CO_2$$

Give three examples of schedules for the transactions T1 and T2 to illustrate each of the points below:

- i. (5 points) Your schedule should contain a write-read conflict that causes one of the transactions to perform a dirty read.
- ii. (5 points) Your schedule should contain a read-write conflict that causes one of the transactions to encounter an unrepeatable read.
- iii. (5 points) Your schedule should contain a write-write conflict that causes a lost update.

In each case, your schedule may contain additional conflicts, but should contain at least one conflict of the type indicated. (In particular you may give a single schedule, which illustrates all three conflicts!) In each case, indicate the conflict of the type you are illustrating.

- (b) (5 points) Consider the following three transactions and schedule (time goes from top to bottom). Is this schedule conflict-serializable? Explain why or why not.

Transaction $T_0$	Transaction $T_1$	Transaction $T_2$
$r_0[A]$		
$w_0[A]$		
		$r_2[A]$
		$w_2[A]$
	$r_1[A]$	
$r_0[B]$		
		$r_2[B]$
$w_0[B]$		
		$w_2[B]$
	$r_1[B]$	
	$c_1$	
$c_0$		
		$c_2$

- (c) (5 points) Show how 2PL can ensure a conflict-serializable schedule for the same transactions above. Use the notation  $L_i[A]$  to indicate that transaction  $i$  acquires the lock on element  $A$  and  $U_i[A]$  to indicate that transaction  $i$  releases its lock on  $A$ .

(d) (5 points) If 2PL ensures conflict-serializability, why do we need *strict* 2PL?

## 2 Optimistic Concurrency Control

2. (20 points)

- (a) (10 points) Consider the following schedule. Explain what happens when transactions *try* to execute as per this schedule and the DBMS uses timestamp-based concurrency control. We use  $ST$  to denote the start of a transaction,  $C$  for commit, and  $A$  for abort.

$ST_1, ST_2, ST_3, ST_4, R_2(X), R_1(X), W_2(X), W_4(X), W_1(X), C_1,$   
 $W_3(X), A_4, R_2(Y), W_2(Y), R_3(Y), C_2, W_3(Y), C_3$

**Answer** (Fill in the table below showing what happens as the transactions execute):

$T_1$	$T_2$	$T_3$	$T_4$	$X$	$Y$
1	2	3	4	RT=0	RT=0
				WT=0	WT=0
				C=true	C=true
			$R_2(X)$		

- (b) (10 points) Consider the following schedule. Explain what happens when transactions try to execute as per this schedule and the DBMS uses **multiversion** concurrency control:

$ST_1, ST_2, ST_3, ST_4, R_1(X), R_3(X), W_3(X), R_2(X), R_4(X), W_2(X), W_4(X)$

**Answer**

(Fill in the table below showing what happens as the transactions execute):

$T_1$	$T_2$	$T_3$	$T_4$	$X_0 \dots$
1	2	3	4	
$R_1(X)$				RT=1
...				