

Chapter 18 : Concurrency Control

Sistemas de Bases de Dados 2019/20

Capítulo refere-se a: Database System Concepts, 7th Ed

Outline

- Lock-Based Protocols
- Timestamp-Based Protocols
- Validation-Based Protocols
- Multiple Granularity
- Multiversion Schemes
- Insert and Delete Operations
- Concurrency in Index Structures

ACID Properties - Summary

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 preserves the consistency of the database in the end.
- **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.

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
- Testing a schedule for serializability *after* it has executed is a little too late!
- **Goal** – to develop concurrency control protocols that will assure serializability

Optimistic vs Pessimistic protocols

T1	T2
Read(A)	
	Write(A)
Read(B)	
Write(B)	
	Read(A)

- **What to do now?**
 - It may well be that the complete transactions are serializable
 - But they may also turn out not to be serializable!
- **Optimistic protocols** do not stop at potential conflicts; if something goes wrong, rollback!
- **Pessimistic protocols** stop at potential conflicts, until no possible conflict exists; if in the end no conflict happened, it just lost time!
- Let's start with a pessimistic protocol.

Lock-Based Protocols

- A lock is a mechanism to control concurrent access to a data item
- Data items can be locked in two modes :
 1. **exclusive** (*X*) *mode*. Data item can be both read as well as written. X-lock is requested using **lock-X** instruction.
 2. **shared** (*S*) *mode*. Data item can only be read. S-lock is requested using **lock-S** instruction.
- Lock requests are made to concurrency-control manager. Transaction can proceed only after request is granted.

Lock-Based Protocols (Cont.)

- **Lock-compatibility matrix**

	S	X
S	true	false
X	false	false

- A transaction may be granted a lock on an item if the requested lock is compatible with locks already held on the item by other transactions
- Any number of transactions can hold shared locks on an item,
 - But if any transaction holds an exclusive on the item no other transaction may hold any lock on the item.
- If a lock cannot be granted, the requesting transaction is made to wait until all incompatible locks held by other transactions have been released. The lock is then granted.


Schedule With Lock Grants

- Simply having locks does not guarantee serializability!
 - This schedule is not serializable.
- A **locking protocol** is a set of rules followed by all transactions while requesting and releasing locks.
 - Locking protocols enforce serializability by restricting the set of possible schedules.

T_1	T_2	concurrency-control manager
lock-X(B)		grant-X(B, T_1)
read(B) $B := B - 50$ write(B) unlock(B)	lock-S(A)	
	read(A) unlock(A) lock-S(B)	grant-S(A, T_2)
	read(B) unlock(B) display($A + B$)	grant-S(B, T_2)
lock-X(A)		grant-X(A, T_1)
read(A) $A := A + 50$ write(A) unlock(A)		

The Two-Phase Locking Protocol (2-PL)

- A protocol which ensures conflict-serializable schedules.
- Phase 1: **Growing Phase**
 - Transaction may obtain locks
 - Transaction may not release locks
- Phase 2: **Shrinking Phase**
 - Transaction may release locks
 - Transaction may not obtain locks
- The protocol assures serializability. It can be proved that the transactions can be serialized in the order of their **lock points** (i.e., the point where a transaction acquired its final lock).



The Two-Phase Locking Protocol (Cont.)

- Extensions to basic two-phase locking are needed to ensure recoverability of freedom from cascading roll-back
 - **Strict two-phase locking:** a transaction must hold all its exclusive locks until it commits or aborts.
 - Ensures recoverability and avoids cascading roll-backs
 - **Rigorous two-phase locking:** a transaction must hold *all* locks until commit or abort.
 - Transactions can be serialized in the order in which they commit.
- Most databases implement rigorous two-phase locking, *but refer to it as simply two-phase locking*

Lock Conversions

- Two-phase locking protocol with lock conversions:
 - Growing Phase:
 - can acquire a lock-S on item
 - can acquire a lock-X on item
 - can **convert** a lock-S to a lock-X (**upgrade**)
 - Shrinking Phase:
 - can release a lock-S
 - can release a lock-X
 - can convert a lock-X to a lock-S (**downgrade**)
- This protocol still ensures serializability

Automatic Acquisition of Locks

- A transaction T_i issues the standard read/write instruction, without explicit locking calls.
- The operation **read**(D) is processed as:
 - if** T_i has a lock on D
 - then**
 - read(D)
 - else begin**
 - if necessary wait until no other transaction has a **lock-X** on D
 - grant T_i a **lock-S** on D ;
 - read(D)
 - end**

Automatic Acquisition of Locks (Cont.)

- The operation **write**(D) is processed as:

if T_i has a **lock-X** on D

then

write(D)

else begin

if necessary wait until no other trans. has any lock on D ,

if T_i has a **lock-S** on D

then

upgrade lock on D to **lock-X**

else

grant T_i a **lock-X** on D

write(D)


end;

- **All locks are released after commit or abort**

Implementation of Locking

- A **lock manager** can be implemented as a separate process
- Transactions can send lock and unlock requests as messages
- The lock manager replies to a lock request by sending a lock grant messages (or a message asking the transaction to roll back, in case of a deadlock)
 - The requesting transaction waits until its request is answered
- The lock manager maintains an in-memory data-structure called a **lock table** to record granted locks and pending requests

Lock Table



- Dark rectangles indicate granted locks, light colored ones indicate waiting requests
- Lock table also records the type of lock granted or requested
- New request is added to the end of the queue of requests for the data item, and granted if it is compatible with all earlier locks
- Unlock requests result in the request being deleted, and later requests are checked to see if they can now be granted
- If transaction aborts, all waiting or granted requests of the transaction are deleted
 - lock manager may keep a list of locks held by each transaction, to implement this efficiently

Deadlock

- Consider the partial schedule

T_3	T_4
lock-X(B)	
read(B)	
$B := B - 50$	
write(B)	
	lock-S(A)
	read(A)
	lock-S(B)
lock-X(A)	

- Neither T_3 nor T_4 can make progress — executing **lock-S(B)** causes T_4 to wait for T_3 to release its lock on B , while executing **lock-X(A)** causes T_3 to wait for T_4 to release its lock on A .
- Such a situation is called a **deadlock**.
 - To handle a deadlock one of T_3 or T_4 must be rolled back and its locks released.

Deadlock (Cont.)

- The potential for deadlock exists in most locking protocols.
 - E.g. (all versions so far of) 2-PL may have deadlocks
- Deadlocks are a necessary evil when using lock-protocols
- **Starvation** is also possible if concurrency control manager is badly designed. For example:
 - A transaction may be waiting for an X-lock on an item, while a sequence of other transactions request and are granted an S-lock on the same item.
 - The same transaction is repeatedly rolled back due to deadlocks.
- Concurrency control manager can be designed to prevent starvation.

Deadlock Handling

- **Deadlock prevention** protocols ensure that the system will *never* enter a deadlock state. Some prevention strategies:
 - Require that each transaction locks all its data items before it begins execution (pre-declaration).
 - Impose partial ordering of all data items and require that a transaction can lock data items only in the order specified by the partial order (graph-based protocol).

More Deadlock Prevention Strategies

- **wait-die** scheme — non-preemptive
 - Older transaction may wait for younger one to release data item.
 - Younger transactions never wait for older ones; they are rolled back instead.
 - A transaction may die several times before acquiring a lock
- **wound-wait** scheme — preemptive
 - Older transaction *wounds* (forces rollback) of younger transaction instead of waiting for it.
 - Younger transactions may wait for older ones.
 - Fewer rollbacks than *wait-die* scheme.
- In both schemes, a rolled back transactions is restarted with its original timestamp.
 - Ensures that older transactions have precedence over newer ones, and starvation is thus avoided.


Deadlock prevention (Cont.)

■ Timeout-Based Schemes:


- A transaction waits for a lock only for a specified amount of time. After that, the wait times out and the transaction is rolled back.
- Ensures that deadlocks get resolved by timeout if they occur
- Simple to implement
- But may roll back transaction unnecessarily in absence of deadlock
 - Difficult to determine good value of the timeout interval.
- Starvation is also possible

Deadlock Detection

- **Wait-for graph**
 - *Vertices*: transactions
 - *Edge from $T_i \rightarrow T_j$* : if T_i is waiting for a lock held in conflicting mode by T_j
- The system is in a deadlock state if and only if the wait-for graph has a cycle.
- Invoke a deadlock-detection algorithm periodically to look for cycles.



Wait-for graph without a cycle



Wait-for graph with a cycle

Deadlock Recovery


- When deadlock is detected :
 - Some transaction will have to be rolled back (made a **victim**) to break deadlock cycle.
 - Select that transaction as victim that will incur minimum cost
 - Rollback – determine how far to roll back transaction
 - **Total rollback**: Abort the transaction and then restart it.
 - **Partial rollback**: Roll back victim transaction only as far as necessary to release locks that another transaction in cycle is waiting for
- Starvation can happen (why?)
 - One solution: oldest transaction in the deadlock set is never chosen as victim

Multiple Granularity

- Allow data items to be of various sizes and define a hierarchy of data granularities, where the small granularities are nested within larger ones
- Can be represented graphically as a tree
- When a transaction locks a node in the tree *explicitly*, it *implicitly* locks all the node's descendants in the same mode.
- **Granularity of locking** (level in tree where locking is done):
 - **Fine granularity** (lower in tree): high concurrency, high locking overhead
 - **Coarse granularity** (higher in tree): low locking overhead, low concurrency

Example of Granularity Hierarchy

- The levels, starting from the coarsest (top) level are
 - *database*
 - *area*
 - *file*
 - *record*
- The corresponding tree



Insert/Delete Operations and Predicate Reads

- Locking rules for insert/delete operations
 - An exclusive lock must be obtained on an item before it is deleted
 - A transaction that inserts a new tuple into the database is automatically given an X-mode lock on the tuple
- Ensures that
 - reads/writes conflict with deletes
 - Inserted tuple is not accessible by other transactions until the transaction that inserts the tuple commits

Phantom Phenomenon

- Example of **phantom phenomenon**.
 - A transaction T1 that performs **predicate read** (or scan) of a relation
 - **select count(*)**
from *instructor*
where *dept_name* = 'Physics'
 - and a transaction T2 that inserts a tuple while T1 is active but after predicate read
 - **insert into instructor values** ('11111', 'Feynman', 'Physics', 94000)

(conceptually) conflict despite not accessing any tuple in common.
- If only tuple locks are used, non-serializable schedules can be obtained
 - E.g. the scan transaction does not see the new instructor, but may read some other tuple written by the update transaction
- Can also occur with updates
 - E.g. update Wu's department from Finance to Physics

Handling Phantoms

- There is a conflict at the data level
 - The transaction performing predicate read or scanning the relation is reading information that indicates what tuples the relation contains
 - The transaction inserting/deleting/updating a tuple updates the same information.
 - The conflict should be detected, e.g. by locking the information.
- One solution:
 - Associate a data item with the relation, to represent the information about what tuples the relation contains.
 - Transactions scanning the relation acquire a shared lock in the data item,
 - Transactions inserting or deleting a tuple acquire an exclusive lock on the data item. (Note: locks on the data item do not conflict with locks on individual tuples.)
- This protocol provides very low concurrency for insertions/deletions.

Index Locking To Prevent Phantoms

- **Index locking protocol** to prevent phantoms
 - Every relation must have at least one index.
 - A transaction can access tuples only after finding them through one or more indices on the relation
 - A transaction T_i that performs a lookup must lock all the index leaf nodes that it accesses, in S-mode
 - Even if the leaf node does not contain any tuple satisfying the index lookup (e.g. for a range query, no tuple in a leaf is in the range)
 - A transaction T_i that inserts, updates or deletes a tuple t_i in a relation r
 - Must update all indices to r
 - Must obtain exclusive locks on all index leaf nodes affected by the insert/update/delete
 - The rules of the two-phase locking protocol must be observed
- Guarantees that phantom phenomenon won't occur