Phantoms (Πλειάδες φαντάσματα)

- **Phantoms** are tuples that should have been locked but they weren’t, because they didn’t exist at the time the locks were granted.
- **Example:**
  - relation $R$ ($E\#$, name, ...)
  - constraint: $E\#$ is key
  - use tuple locking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$E#$</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phantoms (Πλειάδες φαντάσματα)

T1: Insert <95,White,...> into R
T2: Insert <95,Black,...> into R

For the insertion of each of the above, there is no tuple lock and the key constraint is not violated if T1 and T2 are executed in parallel.

• Solution: To avoid the occurrence of phantoms, we must regard the insertion or deletion of a tuple as a write operation on the relation as a whole (i.e. we must obtain an X lock on the relation and not on the tuples).
Tree Protocol (Δενδρικό Πρωτόκολλο)

• Deals with data in the form of a tree. The nodes of the tree do not form a hierarchy. DB elements are disjoint pieces of data, but the only way to get to a node is through its parent
  – e.g. B-tree

• Different opportunities for applying locking policies
  – 2PL is too rigid in such cases: begins by locking the root node.
  – If we use a standard set of lock modes, (S, X, U etc), and we use two-phase locking, then concurrent use of the B-tree is almost impossible: each transaction starts at the root and locks all nodes in a path (including the root); root cannot be unlocked until all locks are obtained.
Tree Protocol (Δενδρικό Πρωτόκολλο)

- More problems with 2PL
  - inserts or deletes may cause changes to the root node; exclusive or update locks must be used for the root node
  - read-only transactions will be able to execute concurrently
  - more opportunities would arise if the lock to the root could be released early
  - ... but this could violate 2PL and serializability

- Need specialized protocols for tree-structured data, that may violate 2PL

- Must exploit the order of access to nodes for ensuring serializability
Rules for Access to Tree-Structured Data

• Tree Protocol
  – Assumptions: we only have single lock mode; consistent transactions; legal schedules
  – Rules:
    1. The first lock of any transaction may be at any tree node
    2. Subsequent locks are granted to a transaction only if the transaction already holds a lock on the parent node
    3. Nodes can be unlocked at any time
    4. Nodes that are locked by a transaction may not be relocked (even if there still exists a lock on the node’s parent)
## Tree Protocol (Δενδρικό Πρωτόκολλο)

- **Example**

![Tree Diagram]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T_1$</th>
<th>$T_2$</th>
<th>$T_3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$l_1(A)$; $r_1(A)$;</td>
<td>$l_2(B)$; $r_2(B)$;</td>
<td>$l_3(E)$; $r_3(E)$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l_1(B)$; $r_1(B)$;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l_1(C)$; $r_1(C)$;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_1(A)$; $u_1(A)$;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l_1(D)$; $r_1(D)$;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_1(B)$; $u_1(B)$;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_1(D)$; $u_1(D)$;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_1(C)$; $u_1(C)$;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$l_2(E)$ **Denied**

| $l_3(F)$; $r_3(F)$;  | $l_2(E)$; $r_2(E)$;        | $w_3(G)$; $u_3(G)$          |
| $w_3(F)$; $u_3(F)$;  |                             |                              |
| $l_3(G)$; $r_3(G)$;  |                             |                              |
| $w_3(E)$; $u_3(E)$;  |                             |                              |

| $w_2(B)$; $u_2(B)$;  | $w_3(G)$; $u_3(G)$         |                              |
| $w_2(E)$; $u_2(E)$;  |                              |                              |
Why the Tree Protocol Works?

• It enforces a serial order in the execution of transactions:
  – if in schedule S, Ti and Tj lock a common node and Ti locks it first, then Ti precedes Tj

• We can construct a precedence graph to represent these precedence relations among transactions in a schedule
  – If it is acyclic, any topological order of the transactions is an equivalent serial schedule

• **Claim**: schedules following the tree protocol always produce acyclic precedence graphs
  – if two transactions lock several common elements, then they are all locked in the same order
  – if Ti locks the root before Tj, then Ti locks every node that is common to Ti and Tj before Tj does.
Ensuring Serializability

- We can prove that, for every schedule S following the tree protocol, there is some serial order (σειριακή διάταξη) equivalent to S.
- Proof sketch: (by induction on the number of tree nodes)
  - **Base case:** 1 node (root); follows by the previous observations
  - **Induction hypothesis:** there is a serial order for all the transactions that lock nodes in any subtree containing more than one node
  - **Induction:** Must merge the serial orders of the subtrees. Consider for each subtree the set of transactions that lock one or more nodes in the subtree. These sets have as common elements the transactions that lock the root. These transactions lock every common node in the same order they lock the root. Build a serial order for the entire set by starting with the transactions that lock the root in the appropriate order. The rest only need to be placed consistently with the serial order of their subtrees.
Ensuring Serializability

• Example: Assume there are 10 transactions, $T_1$, $T_2$, ..., $T_{10}$ of which $T_1$, $T_3$, $T_4$, $T_6$ lock the root in this order. Assume that the root node has two children nodes: first node is locked by the transactions with an odd index and $T_4$ and the second is locked by the transactions with an even index and $T_3$.
  – Order in the 1st subtree: $T_9$, $T_1$, $T_5$, $T_7$, $T_3$, $T_4$
  – Order in the 2nd subtree: $T_8$, $T_3$, $T_{10}$, $T_4$, $T_2$, $T_6$

• One of the many topological sorts of this graph is: $T_9$, $T_8$, $T_1$, $T_5$, $T_7$, $T_3$, $T_{10}$, $T_4$, $T_2$, $T_6$
**Exercise**: Consider the following transactions that operate on the next tree:

- T1: r1(A); r1(B); r1(E)
- T2: r2(A); r2(C); r2(B)
- T3: r3(B); r3(E); r3(F)

If schedules follow the tree protocol, in how many ways can we interleave:

a) T1 and T2
b) T1 and T3
c) T1, T2 and T3
Timestamp-based Concurrency Control
(Ελεγχος συγχρονικότητας με χρονοσήμανση)

• Basic ideas:
  – each transaction is assigned a timestamp
  – the timestamps of the transactions that last read and write each DB element are recorded
  – these values are compared for ensuring that the serial schedule according to the transactions’ timestamps is equivalent to the actual schedule

• Optimistic approach: it assumes that no unserializable behavior will appear and problems are fixed only when some violation occurs
  – fixing problems involves only abort and restart

• Locking-based methods are pessimistic and preventive. Locking schedulers delay transactions, but do not abort them.

• Optimistic scheduling is better than locking when many of the transactions are read-only.
timestamps (Χρονόσημα)

- Each transaction T is assigned a unique timestamp TS(T)
- Timestamps are assigned in ascending order when transactions begin
- Timestamps are generated by two different approaches:
  - using the system clock
  - a counter maintained by the scheduler: counter is incremented by 1 each time a transaction starts
- The scheduler must maintain a table of active transactions and their respective timestamps
In order to use timestamps for concurrency control, each DB element is associated with two timestamps and an additional bit:

- **RT(X):** read time of X $\rightarrow$ highest timestamp of a transaction that has read X
- **WT(X):** write time of X $\rightarrow$ highest timestamp of a transaction that has written X
- **C(X):** commit bit for X $\rightarrow$ 1 iff the most recent transaction to write X has already committed

This bit is used in order to avoid a situation where some transaction T reads data written by a transaction U that later aborts (dirty read on uncommitted data)
Timestamp problems

- The scheduler assumes that the timestamp order of transactions is also the serial order in which they must appear to execute.
- The scheduler must check that whenever a read or write occurs, what happens *could have happened* if each transaction executed instantaneously at the moment of its timestamp. If not, two kind of problems may occur:
  - **Read too late**: T tries to read X, but write time WT(X) indicates that X was written after T executed, i.e., TS(T) < WT(X). T must not read X and the scheduler must abort T.
  - **Write too late**: T tries to write X, but read time RT(X) indicates that some other transaction should have read the value written by T but it read some other value (WT(X) < TS(T) < RT(X))
Timestamp problems

Read too late

T2 writes X  T1 reads X

Write too late

T2 reads X  T1 writes X
More problems

• T1 reads X and X was last written by T2 and TS(T2) < TS(T1). What if after T1 reads X (the value written by T2), T2 aborts?
  – must delay T1’s read until T2 commits or aborts
  – can check C(X) to determine whether T2 has committed

• TS(T1) < TS(T2) and T2 writes X first. When T1 tries to write, do nothing
  – Thomas write rule: writes can be skipped when a write with a later write-time is already in place

• Policy: when T writes element X, the write is considered tentative (δοκιμαστική εγγραφή) and may be undone if T aborts; C(X) is set to 0 and the scheduler makes a copy of the old value of X and its previous WT(X)
More problems

Dirty read

T2 writes X  T1 reads X

T2 start  T1 start  T2 aborts

T2 writes X  T1 writes X

T1 start  T2 start  T1 commits  T2 aborts
Timestamp-based Scheduling Rules

1. If the scheduler receives a request by transaction T to read X then:
   a. If $TS(T) \geq WT(X)$ then
      i. If $C(X)=1$, grant the request. If $TS(T) > RT(X)$, set $RT(X):=TS(T)$; otherwise do not change $RT(X)$
      ii. If $C(X)=0$, delay T until $C(X)$ becomes 1 or the transaction that wrote X aborts
   b. If $TS(T) < WT(X)$ then abort T and restart it with a new, higher timestamp
**Timestamp-based Scheduling Rules**

2. If the scheduler receives a request by transaction T to write X then:
   
a. If TS(T) >= RT(X) and TS(T) >= WT(X) then
      i. Write the new value for X
      ii. Set WT(X):=TS(T)
      iii. Set C(X):=0
   
b. If TS(T) >= RT(X) but TS(T) < WT(X) then there is already a later value for X.
      i. If C(X)=1, ignore the write by T
      ii. If C(X)=0, delay T
3. If the scheduler receives a request by transaction T to commit then, all the DB elements written by T must be found and their commit bit must be set to 1.

4. If the scheduler receives a request by transaction T to abort or T must be rolled back then, any transaction waiting on X that T wrote must repeat its attempt to read or write.
Multiversion Timestamps
(Πολυεκδοχικά χρονόσημα)

• A variation of timestamp based scheduling maintains old versions of the DB elements in addition to the current version.

• It can be useful if the DB elements are disk blocks or pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T_1</th>
<th>T_2</th>
<th>T_3</th>
<th>T_4</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A | transaction start timestamps TS(T_x) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r_1(A)</td>
<td>RT(A)=150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w_1(A)</td>
<td>WT(A)=150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r_2(A)</td>
<td>RT(A)=200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w_2(A)</td>
<td>WT(A)=200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• If the old value of A were available, T3 could be allowed to read it and not abort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T_4</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r_3(A)</td>
<td>abort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r_4(A)</td>
<td>RT(A)=225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Timestamp-based Scheduling vs Locking**

- Timestamping outperforms locking in situations where either the majority of transactions are read-only or conflicting read/write operations are scarce.

- Locking performs better in high-conflict situations:
  - Locking will delay transactions as they wait for locks; even if deadlock occurs, one of the transactions will be rolled back
  - But, if rollbacks are frequent, even more delay is introduced

- Commercial systems follow a middle-of-the-road approach:
  - Transactions are divided in read-only and read/write
  - Read/write are executed in 2PL; read-only are executed using timestamp-based concurrency control (multiversion timestamping).
Validation-based Concurrency Control
(Ελεγχος συγχρονικότητας με επικύρωση)

• Another optimistic concurrency control strategy:
  – Transactions are allowed to access data without locks
  – Check whether transactions have executed in a serializable manner
  – Just before a transaction starts to write values of DB elements, it goes through a validation phase where the sets of elements it has read and will write are compared with the write sets of other transactions
  – If there is a risk of physically unrealizable behavior, the transaction is rolled back.

• Transactions execute in 3 phases
  – Read
  – Validate
  – Write
Validation-based Concurrency Control
(Ελεγχος συγχρονικότητας με επικύρωση)

• Each transaction that successfully validates may be thought as executing at the moment that it validates

• A validation-based scheduler can use the serial order implied by the validation times of transactions in order to determine whether the transactions’ behaviors are consistent with it

• Scheduler maintains three sets:
  – START: set of transactions that have started but not yet completed validation; START(T):time at which T started
  – VAL: set of transactions that have been validated but not yet finished the writing phase; VAL(T):time at which T validated
  – FIN: set of transactions that have completed phase 3; FIN(T): time at which T finished
Validation Rules

- RS(T): the set of DB elements that T reads
- WS(T): the set of DB elements that T writes
- When the validation of T is attempted:
  1. Compare RS(T) with WS(U) for every U s.t. FIN(U) > START(T) and check whether RS(T) ∩ WS(U) = ∅
  2. Compare WS(T) with WS(U) for every U s.t. FIN(U) > VAL(T) and check whether WS(T) ∩ WS(U) = ∅
Validation problems

• Problem when \( RS(T) \cap WS(U) \neq \emptyset \)

• There is a risk that the actions of T and U will not be consistent with the assumed serial order (dotted lines)
• We must rollback T in both cases

• Problem when \( WS(T) \cap WS(U) \neq \emptyset \)
Comparison of Concurrency Control Mechanisms

• Storage Utilization:
  –Locking: space required in the lock table is proportional to the number of DB elements locked
  –Timestamps:
    • Naive approach: store read and write times for all DB elements
    • Timestamps earlier than that of the earliest active transaction do not matter; only the timestamps for the recently accessed elements are needed
  –Validation: read/write sets and timestamps for each active transaction
  –Timestamping and Validation may use a little more space than locking
Comparison of Concurrency Control Mechanisms

- **Delay Effects**: depend on the degree of interaction, i.e., the likelihood that a transaction will access an element that is also being accessed by another transaction
  - Locking delays transactions but avoids rollbacks (except in deadlock situations) even when interaction is high. Timestamps and validation do not delay transactions but may cause them to rollback, which in turn results in more delays
  - If interaction is low, neither timestamps nor validation will cause many rollbacks and may be preferable to locking
  - If rollback becomes necessary, timestamps discover problems earlier than validation (which permits transactions to perform all work before deciding whether it needs to be rolled back)
View Serializability

• **Conflict serializability** guarantees serializability independently of what transactions actually do
• But…. it is a quite strong condition on schedules of concurrent execution
• A weaker notion that still guarantees serializability is **view serializability**
• The main difference between conflict and view serializability appears in situations where a transaction writes a value that no other transaction reads (but possibly writes later)
  – under view serializability such a write action can be repositioned in the schedule (might be prohibited under conflict serializability)
Definitions

• Let $S_1$ and $S_2$ be two schedules involving the same set of transactions;
  – let $T_1$ be a hypothetical transaction that writes initial values for each DB element read by any transaction in the schedule;
  – let $T_F$ be a hypothetical transaction that reads every element written by the transactions after the schedule ends
  – for every $R_i(A)$, we can find the $W_j(A)$ that most closely precedes it; transaction $T_j$ is called the source of the read action
• $S_1$ and $S_2$ are called view equivalent if for every read action in $S_1$ its source is the same in $S_2$, and vice versa.
• A schedule that is view equivalent to a serial schedule is called view serializable
Example

- Consider the following schedule S:
  
  \[\begin{align*}
  T_1: & \quad R_1(A) \quad W_1(B) \\
  T_2: & \quad R_2(B) \quad W_2(A) \quad W_2(B) \\
  T_3: & \quad R_3(A) \quad W_3(B)
  \end{align*}\]

- S is **not** conflict-serializable
- only the value of B written by \(T_3\) is read by \(T_F\)
- sources for read actions:
  - source of \(R_2(B)\) is \(T_1\)
  - source of \(R_1(A)\) and \(R_3(A)\) is \(T_2\)
  - source of \(R_F(A)\) is \(T_2\)
  - source of \(R_F(B)\) is \(T_3\)
  - S is view serializable;
  - equivalent serial schedule: \((T_2, T_1, T_3)\)
Testing View Serializability

- **Polygraphs**: a generalization of precedence graphs
  - a node for each transaction and additional nodes for the two hypothetical transactions
  - an arc from $T_j$ to $T_i$ for each action $R_i(X)$ with source $T_j$
  - if $T_j$ is the source of $R_i(X)$ and $T_k$ is another transaction that writes $X$, $T_k$ must appear either before $T_j$ or after $T_i$. This is denoted by two arcs in the graph (can choose one of the two). Special cases:
    - if $T_j$ is $T_I$, then the arc from $T_i$ to $T_k$ is introduced
    - if $T_i$ is $T_F$, then the arc from $T_k$ to $T_j$ is introduced