# CSE 444: Database Internals 

Section 5:<br>Transactions

## Today

- Serializability and Conflict Serializability
- Precedence graph
-Two-Phase Locking
- Strict two phase locking
- Lab 3 - Transactions


## Problem 1: Serializability and

 Lockina what is- Is this schedule conflict serial: : Senoflitiabilt seralazabality

| $T_{0}$ | $T_{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $R_{0}(A)$ |  |
| $W_{0}(A)$ | $R_{1}(A)$ |
|  | $R_{1}(B)$ |
| $R_{0}(B)$ | $C_{1}$ |
| $W_{0}(B)$ |  |
| $C_{0}$ |  |

## Review: (Conflict) Serializable Schedule

- A schedule is serializable if it is equivalent to a serial schedule
- A schedule is conflict serializable if it can be transformed into a serial schedule by a series of swappings of adjacent non-conflicting actions


## Review: (Conflict) Serializable Schedule

- A schedule is serializable if it is equivalent to a serial schedule
- A schedule is conflict serializable if it can be transformed into a serial schedule by a series of swappings of adjacent non-conflicting actions


## Example:

$r_{1}(A) ; w_{1}(A) ; r_{2}(A) ; w_{2}(A) ; r_{1}(B) ; w_{1}(B) ; r_{2}(B) ; w_{2}(B)$

$$
r_{1}(A) ; w_{1}(A) ; r_{1}(B) ; w_{1}(B) ; r_{2}(A) ; w_{2}(A) ; r_{2}(B) ; w_{2}(B)
$$

## Problem 1: Serializability and Locking

- Is this schedule conflict serializable?

| $T_{0}$ | $T_{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $R_{0}(A)$ |  |
| $W_{0}(A)$ | $R_{1}(A)$ |
|  | $R_{1}(B)$ |
|  | $C_{1}(B)$ |
| $W_{0}(B)$ |  |
|  |  |

- No.
-The precedence graph contains a cycle

$$
W_{0}(A), R_{1}(A)
$$



$$
R_{1}(B), W_{0}(B)
$$

- So, use 2PL ...
- Original schedule below

| $T_{0}$ | $T_{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $R_{0}(A)$ |  |
| $W_{0}(A)$ | $R_{1}(A)$ |
|  | $R_{1}(B)$ |
| $R_{0}(B)$ | $C_{1}$ |
| $W_{0}(B)$ |  |
| $C_{0}$ |  |

- So, use 2PL ...

O Original schedule belom what is

- Two Phase Locking
- Strict Two Phase Locking?

| $T_{0}$ | $T_{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $R_{0}(A)$ |  |
| $W_{0}(A)$ | $R_{1}(A)$ |
|  | $R_{1}(B)$ |
| $R_{0}(B)$ | $C_{1}$ |
| $W_{0}(B)$ |  |
| $C_{0}$ |  |

## Review:

## (Strict) Two Phase Locking (2PL)

The 2PL rule:
In every transaction, all lock requests must precede all unlock requests
Strict 2PL:
All locks held by a transaction are released when the transaction is completed - Ensures that schedules are recoverable
-Transactions commit only after all transactions whose changes they read also commit

- Avoids cascading rollbacks
- How can 2PL can ensure a conflict-serializable schedule? - Original schedule below

| $T_{0}$ | $T_{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $R_{0}(A)$ |  |
| $W_{0}(A)$ | $R_{1}(A)$ |
|  | $R_{1}(B)$ |
| $R_{0}(B)$ | $C_{1}$ |
| $W_{0}(B)$ |  |
| $C_{0}$ |  |



| $\mathrm{T}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{~T}_{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{~L}_{0}(\mathbf{A})$ |  |
| $\mathrm{R}_{0}(\mathrm{~A})$ |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{0}(\mathrm{~A})$ |  |
|  | $\mathrm{L}_{1}(\mathbf{A})$ : Block |


| $\mathrm{T}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{~T}_{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{~L}_{0}(\mathbf{A})$ |  |
| $\mathrm{R}_{0}(\mathrm{~A})$ |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{0}(\mathbf{A})$ |  |
|  |  |
| $\mathrm{L}_{0}(\mathbf{B})$ |  |
| $\mathrm{L}_{0}(\mathbf{B})$ |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{0}($ B $)$ | Block |
| $\mathbf{U}_{0}(\mathbf{A})$ |  |
| $\mathbf{U}_{0}(\mathbf{B})$ |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ |  |




Lab 3 - Transactions

- NO STEAL / FORCE buffer management policy
- you shouldn't evict dirty(updated) pages from the buffer pool if they are locked by an uncommitted transaction. (this is NO STEAL)
- on transaction commit, you should force dirty pages to disk (e.g. write the pages out) (this is FORCE)
- Recommend - locking at page level
- you can acquire and release locks in BufferPool.getPageO, instead of adding calls to each of your operators
- Might have to change previous implementations to access pages using BufferPool.getPageO

Lab 3 - Transactions (contd.)

- You need to implement shared and exclusive locks
- Before read, it must have a shared lock
- Before write, it must have an exclusive lock
- Multiple transactions can have a shared lock
- Only one transaction may have an exclusive lock on an object
- If transaction tis the only transaction holding a shared lock on an object $0,+$ may upgrade its lock on o to an exclusive lock
- You need to implement strict two-phase locking
- transactions should acquire the appropriate type of lock on any object before accessing that object
- transaction shouldn't release any locks until after the transaction commits.


## Lab 3 - Transactions (contd.)

- You will need to implement a LockManager class that will hold data structures to keep track of which locks each transaction holds and that check to see if a lock should be granted to a transaction when it is requested.
- Read about Synchronization in Java, and use the synchronized keyword in appropriate places in LockManager
- You will have to also throw appropriate exceptions like TransactionAbortedException


## Lab 3 - Transactions (contd.)

- Handling deadlocks
- implement a simple timeout policy that aborts a transaction if it has not completed after a given period of time
- implement a cycle-detection in a dependency graph data structure, if cycle exists when granting a new lock abort something.
- Design Choices:
- Locking Granularity: page-level vs tuple-level cour tests assume page-level)
- Deadlock Detection: timeout vs dependency graphs
- Deadlock Resolution: aborting yourself vs aborting others
- Read the spec carefully for more details about various methods and edge cases.

