Transactions Management and Concurrency

- By

Jyoti Tryambake

Transaction Concept

- A **transaction** is a *unit* of program execution that accesses and possibly updates various data items.
- E.g. transaction to transfer $50 from account A to account B:
  1. **read**(*A*)
  2. *A* := *A* – 50
  3. **write**(*A*)
  4. **read**(*B*)
  5. *B* := *B* + 50
  6. **write**(*B)*
- Two main issues to deal with:
  - Failures of various kinds, such as hardware failures and system crashes
  - Concurrent execution of multiple transactions

Example of Fund Transfer

- Transaction to transfer $50 from account A to account B:
  1. **read**(*A*)
  2. *A* := *A* – 50
  3. **write**(*A*)
  4. **read**(*B*)
  5. *B* := *B* + 50
  6. **write**(*B)*
- **Atomicity requirement**
  - if the transaction fails after step 3 and before step 6, money will be "lost" leading to an inconsistent database state
    - Failure could be due to software or hardware
  - the system should ensure that updates of a partially executed transaction are not reflected in the database
  - **Responsible Component = Transaction Management**

Example of Fund Transfer

- Transaction to transfer \$50 from account A to account B:
  1. **read**(*A*)
  2. *A* := *A* – 50
  3. **write**(*A*)
  4. **read**(*B*)
  5. *B* := *B* + 50
  6. **write**(*B)*
- **Durability requirement** — once the user has been notified that the transaction has completed (i.e., the transfer of the \$50 has taken place), the updates to the database by the transaction must persist even if there are software or hardware failures.
- **Responsible Component = Recovery Manager**

Example of Fund Transfer (Cont.)

- Transaction to transfer $50 from account A to account B:
  1. **read**(*A*)
  2. *A* := *A* – 50
  3. **write**(*A*)
  4. **read**(*B*)
  5. *B* := *B* + 50
  6. **write**(*B)*
- **Consistency requirement** in above example:
  - The sum of A and B is unchanged by the execution of the transaction
  - During transaction execution the database may be temporarily inconsistent.
  - When the transaction completes successfully the database must be consistent
    - Erroneous transaction logic can lead to inconsistency

Responsible Component = Application Programmer

Example of Fund Transfer (Cont.)

- **Isolation requirement** — if between steps 3 and 6, another transaction T2 is allowed to access the partially updated database, it will see an inconsistent database (the sum *A* + *B* will be less than it should be).

T1	**T2**
1. **read**(*A*)	
2. *A* := *A* – 50	
3. **write**(*A*)	
	read(A), read(B), print(A+B)
4. **read**(*B*)	
5. *B* := *B* + 50	
6. **write**(*B*)	

- Isolation can be ensured trivially by running transactions **serially**
  - that is, one after the other.

Example of Fund Transfer (Cont.)

- **Isolation requirement** — if between steps 3 and 6, another transaction T2 is allowed to access the partially updated database, it will see an inconsistent database (the sum *A* + *B* will be less than it should be).

T1	**T2**
1. **read**(*A*)	
2. *A* := *A* – 50	
3. **write**(*A*)	
	read(A), read(B), print(A+B)
4. **read**(*B*)	
5. *B* := *B* + 50	
6. **write**(*B*)	

- The isolation property of a transaction ensures that the concurrent execution of transactions results in a system state that is equivalent to a state that could have been obtained had these transactions executed one at a time in some order

Example of Fund Transfer (Cont.)

- **Isolation requirement** — if between steps 3 and 6, another transaction T2 is allowed to access the partially updated database, it will see an inconsistent database (the sum *A* + *B* will be less than it should be).

T1	T2
1. **read**(*A*)	
2. *A* := *A* – 50	
3. **write**(*A*)	
	read(A), read(B), print(A+B)
4. **read**(*B*)	
5. *B* := *B* + 50	
6. **write**(*B*)	

- **Responsible Component = Concurrency Control Management**

ACID Properties

A **transaction** is a unit of program execution that accesses and possibly updates various data items.To preserve the integrity of data the database system must ensure:

- **Atomicity**. Either all operations of the transaction are properly reflected in the database or none are.
- **Consistency**. Execution of a transaction in isolation preserves the consistency of the database.
- **Isolation**. Although multiple transactions may execute concurrently, each transaction must be unaware of other concurrently executing transactions. Intermediate transaction results must be hidden from other concurrently executed transactions.
  - That is, for every pair of transactions T_i and T_j, it appears to T_i that either T_j, finished execution before T_i started, or T_j started execution after T_i finished.
- **Durability**. After a transaction completes successfully, the changes it has made to the database persist, even if there are system failures.

Transaction State

- **Active** – the initial state; the transaction stays in this state while it is executing
- **Partially committed** – after the final statement has been executed.
- **Failed** -- after the discovery that normal execution can no longer proceed.
- **Aborted** – after the transaction has been rolled back and the database restored to its state prior to the start of the transaction. Two options after it has been aborted:
  - restart the transaction
    - can be done only if no internal logical error
  - kill the transaction
- **Committed** – after successful completion.

Transaction State (Cont.)



Implementation of Atomicity and Durability

- The **recovery-management** component of a database system implements the support for atomicity and durability.
- E.g. the ***shadow-database*** scheme:
  - all updates are made on a *shadow copy* of the database
    - **db_pointer** is made to point to the updated shadow copy after
      - the transaction reaches partial commit and
      - all updated pages have been flushed to disk.



Implementation of Atomicity and Durability (Cont.)

- db_pointer always points to the current consistent copy of the database.
  - In case transaction fails, old consistent copy pointed to by **db_pointer** can be used, and the shadow copy can be deleted.
- The shadow-database scheme:
  - Assumes that only one transaction is active at a time.
  - Assumes disks do not fail
  - Useful for text editors, but
    - extremely inefficient for large databases (why?)
      - Variant called shadow paging reduces copying of data, but is still not practical for large databases
  - Does not handle concurrent transactions
- Will study better schemes in Chapter 17.

Concurrent Executions

- Multiple transactions are allowed to run concurrently in the system. Advantages are:
  - **Increased processor and disk utilization**, leading to better transaction *throughput*
    - E.g. one transaction can be using the CPU while another is reading from or writing to the disk
  - **Reduced average response time** for transactions: short transactions need not wait behind long ones.

Concurrent Executions

- Advantages are (cont.):
  - **Waiting time –** less if multiple transactions executed concurrently.
  - **Response time –** less for concurrent executions. (It is the time at which process comes for execution and the time at which it gets response from CPU)
  - **Resource utilization –** high
  - **Efficiency-** high

Schedules

- **Schedule** – a sequences of instructions that specify the chronological order in which instructions of concurrent transactions are executed
  - **a schedule for a set of transactions** must consist of all instructions of those transactions
  - must preserve the order in which the instructions appear in each individual transaction.
- A transaction that successfully completes its execution will have a commit instructions as the last statement
  - by default transaction assumed to execute commit instruction as its last step
- A transaction that fails to successfully complete its execution will have an abort instruction as the last statement

Schedule 1

- Let T_1 transfer $50 from *A* to *B*, and T_2 transfer 10% of the balance from *A* to *B.*
- A serial schedule in which T_1 is followed by T_2 :

T_1	T_2
read(A)	
$A := A - 50$	
write (A)	
read(B)	
$B := B + 50$	
write(B)	
	read(A)
	$temp := A * 0.1$
	$A := A - temp$
	write(A)
	read(B)
	$B := B + temp$
	write(B)

Schedule 2

- A serial schedule where T_2 is followed by T_1



T_1	T_2
	read(A)
	$temp := A * 0.1$
	$A := A - temp$
	write(A)
	read(B)
	$B := B + temp$
	write(B)
read(A)	
$A := A - 50$	
write(A)	
read(B)	
$B := B + 50$	
write(B)	

Schedule 3

- Let T_1 and T_2 be the transactions defined previously. The following schedule is not a serial schedule, but it is *equivalent* to Schedule 1.

T_1	T_2
read(A)	
$A := A - 50$	
write(A)	
	read(A)
	$temp := A * 0.1$
	$A := A - temp$
	write(A)
read(B)	
$B := B + 50$	
write(B)	
	read(B)
	$B := B + temp$
	write(B)

In Schedules 1, 2 and 3, the sum A + B is preserved.

Schedule 4

- The following concurrent schedule does not preserve the value of (*A* + *B*).

T_1	T_2
read(A)	
$A := A - 50$	
	read(A)
	$temp := A * 0.1$
	$A := A - temp$
	write(A)
	read(B)
write(A)	
read(B)	
$B := B + 50$	
write(B)	
	$B := B + temp$
	write(B)

Problems due to Concurrency

- Dirty-read problem – reading uncommitted value
- Unrepeatable Read – two different values for same variable
- Phantom read – inconsistency in data is being read and retrieved
- Lost-update – Updates made by one transaction

  may be lost due to overriding by other transaction.

Serializability

- Serial execution of a set of transactions preserves database consistency.
- A (possibly concurrent) schedule is serializable if it is equivalent to a serial schedule. Different forms of schedule equivalence give rise to the notions of:
  1. **Conflict serializability**
  2. **View serializability**
- *Simplified view of transactions*
  - Our simplified schedules consist of only **read** and **write** instructions.

Conflicting Instructions

- Instructions l_i and l_j of transactions T_i and T_j respectively, **conflict** if and only if there exists some item Q accessed by both l_i and l_j, and at least one of these instructions wrote Q.

  1. l_i = **read**(Q), l_j = **read**(Q). l_i and l_j don't conflict.
  2. l_i = **read**(Q), l_j = **write**(Q). They conflict.
  3. l_i = **write**(Q), l_j = **read**(Q). They conflict
  4. l_i = **write**(Q), l_j = **write**(Q). They conflict

- Intuitively, a conflict between l_i and l_j forces a (logical) temporal order between them.
  - If l_i and l_j are consecutive in a schedule and they do not conflict, their results would remain the same even if they had been interchanged in the schedule.

Conflict Serializability

- If a schedule *S* can be transformed into a schedule *S´* by a series of swaps of non-conflicting instructions, we say that *S* and *S´* are **conflict equivalent**.
- We say that a schedule *S* is **conflict serializable** if it is conflict equivalent to a serial schedule

Conflict Serializability (Cont.)

- Schedule 3 can be transformed into Schedule 6, a serial schedule where T_2 follows T_1, by series of swaps of non-conflicting instructions.
  - Therefore Schedule 3 is conflict serializable.

T_1	T_2
read(A)	
write(A)	
	read(A)
	write(A)
read(B)	
write(B)	
	read(B)
	write(B)

Schedule 3

T_1	T_2
read(A)	
write(A)	
read(B)	
write(B)	
	read(A)
	write(A)
	read(B)
	write(B)

Schedule 6

Conflict Serializability (Cont.)

- Example of a schedule that is not conflict serializable:

T_3	T_4
read(Q)	
	write(Q)
write(Q)	

- We are unable to swap instructions in the above schedule to obtain either the serial schedule < T_3, T_4 >, or the serial schedule < T_4, T_3 >.

Conflict Serializability Examples

- With precedence graph approach

View Serializability

- Let *S* and *S´* be two schedules with the same set of transactions. *S* and *S´* are **view equivalent** if the following three conditions are met, for each data item *Q,*

  1. If in schedule S, transaction T_i reads the initial value of *Q*, then in schedule *S'* also transaction T_i must read the initial value of *Q.*
  2. If in schedule S transaction T_i executes **read**(*Q)*, and that value was produced by transaction T_j (if any), then in schedule *S'* also transaction T_i must read the value of *Q* that was produced by the same **write**(Q) operation of transaction T_j .
  3. The transaction (if any) that performs the final **write**(*Q*) operation in schedule *S* must also perform the final **write**(*Q*) operation in schedule *S'.*

As can be seen, view equivalence is also based purely on **reads** and **writes** alone.

View Serializability (Cont.)

- A schedule *S* is **view serializable** if it is view equivalent to a serial schedule.
- Every conflict serializable schedule is also view serializable.
- Below is a schedule which is view-serializable but *not* conflict serializable.

T_3	T_4	T_6
read(Q)		
	write(Q)	
write(Q)		
		write(Q)

- What serial schedule is above equivalent to?
- Every view serializable schedule that is not conflict serializable has **blind writes.**

Other Notions of Serializability

- The schedule below produces same outcome as the serial schedule < T_1, T_5 >, yet is not conflict equivalent or view equivalent to it.

T_1	T_5
read(A)	
$A := A - 50$	
write(A)	
	read(B)
	$B := B - 10$
	write(B)
read(B)	
$B := B + 50$	
write(B)	
	read(A)
	$A := A + 10$
	write(A)

- Determining such equivalence requires analysis of operations other than read and write.

Testing for Serializability

- Consider some schedule of a set of transactions T_1, T_2, ..., T_n
- **Precedence graph** — a direct graph where the vertices are the transactions (names).
- We draw an arc from T_i to T_j if the two transaction conflict, and T_i accessed the data item on which the conflict arose earlier.
- We may label the arc by the item that was accessed.
- **Example 1**



Example Schedule (Schedule A) + Precedence Graph

T_1	T_2	T_3	T_4	T_5
	read(X)			
read(Y)				
read(Z)				
				read(V)
				read(W)
				read(W)
	read(Y)			
	write(Y)			
		write(Z)		
read(U)				
			read(Y)	
			write(Y)	
			read(Z)	
			write(Z)	
read(U)				
write(U)				

$$\begin{tikzcd}
T_1 \arrow[rr, bend left, "y"] \arrow[d, bend right, "z"'] & & T_2 \arrow[d, bend left, "x"] \\
T_3 \arrow[rr, bend right] & & T_4 \\
& T_5 &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Test for Conflict Serializability

- A schedule is conflict serializable if and only if its precedence graph is acyclic.
- Cycle-detection algorithms exist which take order n^2 time, where n is the number of vertices in the graph.
  - (Better algorithms take order $n + e$ where e is the number of edges.)
- If precedence graph is acyclic, the serializability order can be obtained by a *topological sorting* of the graph.
  - This is a linear order consistent with the partial order of the graph.
  - For example, a serializability order for Schedule A would be $T_5 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow T_3 \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow T_4$
    - Are there others?



Test for View Serializability

- The precedence graph test for conflict serializability cannot be used directly to test for view serializability.
  - Extension to test for view serializability has cost exponential in the size of the precedence graph.
- The problem of checking if a schedule is view serializable falls in the class of *NP*-complete problems.
  - Thus existence of an efficient algorithm is *extremely* unlikely.
- However practical algorithms that just check some **sufficient conditions** for view serializability can still be used.

Recoverable Schedules

Need to address the effect of transaction failures on concurrently running transactions.

- **Recoverable schedule** — if a transaction T_j reads a data item previously written by a transaction T_i , then the commit operation of T_i appears before the commit operation of T_j.
- The following schedule (Schedule 11) is not recoverable if T_9 commits immediately after the read

T_8	T_9
read(A)	
write(A)	
	read(A)
read(B)	

- If T_8 should abort, T_9 would have read (and possibly shown to the user) an inconsistent database state. Hence, database must ensure that schedules are recoverable.

Cascading Rollbacks

- **Cascading rollback** – a single transaction failure leads to a series of transaction rollbacks. Consider the following schedule where none of the transactions has yet committed (so the schedule is recoverable)

T_{10}	T_{11}	T_{12}
read(A)		
read(B)		
write(A)		
	read(A)	
	write(A)	
		read(A)

  If T_{10} fails, T_{11} and T_{12} must also be rolled back.

- Can lead to the undoing of a significant amount of work

Cascadeless Schedules

- **Cascadeless schedules** — cascading rollbacks cannot occur; for each pair of transactions T_i and T_j such that T_j reads a data item previously written by T_i, the commit operation of T_i appears before the read operation of T_j.
- Every cascadeless schedule is also recoverable
- It is desirable to restrict the schedules to those that are cascadeless

Concurrency Control

- A database must provide a mechanism that will ensure that all possible schedules are
  - either conflict or view serializable, and
  - are recoverable and preferably cascadeless
- A policy in which only one transaction can execute at a time generates serial schedules, but provides a poor degree of concurrency
  - Are serial schedules recoverable/cascadeless?
- Testing a schedule for serializability *after* it has executed is a little too late!
- **Goal** – to develop concurrency control protocols that will assure serializability.

Concurrency Control vs. Serializability Tests

- Concurrency-control protocols allow concurrent schedules, but ensure that the schedules are conflict/view serializable, and are recoverable and cascadeless .
- Concurrency control protocols generally do not examine the precedence graph as it is being created
  - Instead a protocol imposes a discipline that avoids nonseralizable schedules.
  - We study such protocols in Chapter 16.
- Different concurrency control protocols provide different tradeoffs between the amount of concurrency they allow and the amount of overhead that they incur.
- Tests for serializability help us understand why a concurrency control protocol is correct.

Weak Levels of Consistency

- Some applications are willing to live with weak levels of consistency, allowing schedules that are not serializable
  - E.g. a read-only transaction that wants to get an approximate total balance of all accounts
  - E.g. database statistics computed for query optimization can be approximate (why?)
  - Such transactions need not be serializable with respect to other transactions
- Tradeoff accuracy for performance

Levels of Consistency in SQL-92

- **Serializable** — default
- **Repeatable read** — only committed records to be read, repeated reads of same record must return same value. However, a transaction may not be serializable – it may find some records inserted by a transaction but not find others.
- **Read committed** — only committed records can be read, but successive reads of record may return different (but committed) values.
- **Read uncommitted** — even uncommitted records may be read.

- Lower degrees of consistency useful for gathering approximate information about the database
- Warning: some database systems do not ensure serializable schedules by default
  - E.g. Oracle and PostgreSQL by default support a level of consistency called snapshot isolation (not part of the SQL standard)

Transaction Definition in SQL

- Data manipulation language must include a construct for specifying the set of actions that comprise a transaction.
- In SQL, a transaction begins implicitly.
- A transaction in SQL ends by:
  - **Commit work** commits current transaction and begins a new one.
  - **Rollback work** causes current transaction to abort.
- In almost all database systems, by default, every SQL statement also commits implicitly if it executes successfully
  - Implicit commit can be turned off by a database directive
    - E.g. in JDBC,   connection.setAutoCommit(false);

The picture can't be displayed.

End of Chapter

T_1	T_2
read(A)	
write(A)	
read(B)	
write(B)	
	read(A)
	write(A)
	read(B)
	write(B)

T_1	T_2
read(A)	
write(A)	
	read(A)
read(B)	
	write(A)
write(B)	
	read(B)
	write(B)

Schedule 7

T_3	T_4
read(Q)	
	write(Q)
write(Q)	

Precedence Graph for (a) Schedule 1 and (b) Schedule 2


$$\begin{tikzcd} T_1 \arrow[r] & T_2 \end{tikzcd}$$
(a)
$$\begin{tikzcd} T_2 \arrow[r] & T_1 \end{tikzcd}$$
(b)

Precedence Graph


$$\begin{tikzcd}
T_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] \arrow[dr] & T_2 \arrow[d] \arrow[dl] \\
T_4 \arrow[dr] & T_3 \arrow[d] \\
& T_5
\end{tikzcd}$$

fig. 15.21

T_3	T_4	T_7
read(Q)		
	write(Q)	
		read(Q)
write(Q)		
		write(Q)

Implementation of Isolation

- Schedules must be conflict or view serializable, and recoverable, for the sake of database consistency, and preferably cascadeless.
- A policy in which only one transaction can execute at a time generates serial schedules, but provides a poor degree of concurrency.
- Concurrency-control schemes tradeoff between the amount of concurrency they allow and the amount of overhead that they incur.
- Some schemes allow only conflict-serializable schedules to be generated, while others allow view-serializable schedules that are not conflict-serializable.

Figure 15.6

T_1	T_2
read(A)	
$A := A - 50$	
	read(A)
	$temp := A * 0.1$
	$A := A - temp$
	write(A)
	read(B)
write(A)	
read(B)	
$B := B + 50$	
write(B)	
	$B := B + temp$
	write(B)